### Social Justice, Equity and Social Inclusion in Australian Higher Education

Literature Review

There are three dominant conceptual framings in the literature included in this review: equity, social justice, and social inclusion. These three conceptualisations are evident in all the different types of contributions included in this review: empirical work, theoretical discussions, literature reviews, research reports. The term ‘equity’ most often connotes with discussions of policy and access to higher education, while the term social inclusion connects strongly with teaching and learning. Social justice is more commonly used to refer to the ideological view of widening participation as a project of recognitive justice, which is one of three conceptualisations of justice put forward by Gale & Densmore (2000, cited in Gale & Tranter, 2011; Nelson, Creagh & Clarke, 2009). This three-part typology of social justice includes *distributive social justice*, which is concerned with proportional distribution (fairness by redistribution of goods equally); *retributive social justice*, which is concerned with fairness by competition for goods; and *recognitive social justice*, which uses democratic processes to achieve fairness (through positive recognition of differences between groups). In their 2011 paper, Gale & Tranter examine the different policy changes that constitute the historical equity landscape in Australia using these three lenses of social justice. They contend that each attempt at widening participation has been accompanied by distributive notions of social justice when the economy has been healthy, with periods of consolidation and retributive notions of social justice when there are economic concerns. Gale & Tranter note that there has been little effort made to engage in a more recognitive approach to social justice, despite the academic arguments to advance a recognitive agenda. Furthermore, Gale & Tranter make the argument that the project of widening participation as equity cannot succeed without the advancement of epistemological equity; they contend that opening access is futile if academic knowledges and discourses and practices prevent engagement and participation.

Despite the detailed conceptualisation put forward from sociologists like Gale & Tranter, Francis & Mills (2012) note that much like ‘equity’ and ‘neoliberalism’, the term ‘social justice’ has “become somewhat overused of late by policy-makers”, resulting in its meaning becoming “both debated and diluted” (p.578-9). The work of Gidley et al. (2010) offers a useful starting point for unpacking these conceptual moves and alignments. In exploring the triple foci of access, quality and success, they assert that:

“…access, participation and success are ordered according to a **spectrum of ideologies** — neoliberalism, social justice and human potential, respectively — by way of a nested structure with human potential ideology offering the most embracing perspective”

(p.124, author’s emphasis).

This conceptualisation has been usefully applied by other scholars to unpack the diversity of the discursive and ideological positions at play at both the institutional policy level (Kilpatrick & Johns, 2014) and the practice level (Cocks & Stokes, 2013). The conceptualisation of a spectrum assists with analysis of the jostling ideologies and degrees of social inclusion taken up/ made possible by different agents in the project of widening participation. Gidley et al. (2010) warn that social inclusion is vulnerable to the tensions and trade-offs that occur as a result of oscillations between neoliberal and social justice forces, arguing that as a result the focus for equity work is too narrowly focused on one broad and homogenously imagined group (low SES students), and thus social inclusion policy pays insufficient attention to certain groups, such as CALD students (including refugees), rural/remote, ageing populations and incarcerated people. This narrow focus is further impeded by the direction of policy/ discourse; Gidley et al. (2010) caution that If policies and interventions remain at the level of a top-down imposition of assumed common values, then it is likely that many of the marginalised groups, even if given access to higher education, may choose not to participate wholeheartedly” (p.130). Gidley et al. (2010) contend that human potential thinking goes beyond neoliberal/ economic and social justice notions to shape the idea that equal rights should “maximise the potential of each human being [through] cultural transformation” (p.135), thus valuing strengths and resisting the seduction of the deficit model.

However, in their analysis of publicly available strategic plans using the model proposed by Gidley et al. (2010), Kilpatrick & Johns (2014) found that very few of the documents analysed instantiated a human potential ideology. Instead, they found that broadly, the older and more research-intensive universities took a more neoliberal view of social inclusion (narrowly aligning with federal policy imperatives to increase access), compared with regional, newer universities, which tended to take a more social justice approach. Kilpatrick & Johns (2014) found that only “a small number of universities have embraced a holistic approach to social inclusion, articulating an integrated suite of strategies spanning the access, participation and empowerment domains” (p.40).

The project of social justice and social inclusion needs to be understood as a whole-of-institution concern; as Slee (2001) points out in the context of equity and teacher education, for inclusive education to be congruent with hope for social justice, institutions need to confront the political nature of teacher education, and work against tokenistic efforts that limit social inclusion to particular foci (for example, special education). Similar arguments have been made about the work of widening participation being restricted to particular spaces and people, such as those working in widening participation units (for example, Burke, 2012). Such institutional approaches - that acknowledge the policy imperatives and talk around equity, but who do not make it ‘everyone’s business’ (Reed, King & Whiteford, 2015) – can be explained by the competing and contradictory imperatives of the neoliberal agenda, driven by efficiency, individual responsibility and competition. As Connell (2012) argues, to engage in the project of social justice requires us to enact and recognise our collective responsibilities, but these are eroded by the logics of competition; as she eloquently argues, “The neoliberal turn in education is ethically damaging precisely because it undermines this web of responsibility” (p.682). Moreover, Lingard, Sellar & Savage (2014) argue **“**…social justice and equity are being transformed through the national and global reworking of education into a field of measurement and comparison” (p.711). The opening of education to the market, and the push from collective to individual responsibility has significantly shifted the imaginaries and possibilities of the project of widening participation conceived as working towards proportional representation of particular under-represented groups in Australian higher education.
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**Equity and Higher Education Annotated Bibliography Series**

**Social justice and social inclusion and higher education**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Citation** | **Annotation** |
| Armstrong, D.; Armstrong, A.; & Spandgou, I. (2011). [Inclusion: by choice or by chance?](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13603116.2010.496192), *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 15(1), 29–39.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *globalisation; development; international; inclusive education*Keywords: *globalization, inclusive education, feel-good rhetoric; export first-world thinking* | **Context:** Explores ‘contestable’ inclusive education movement internationally (e.g. UNESCO’s ‘Education for all’) because of contestations in global power arrangements between global north and south: “In the countries of the North, despite the differences in the ways that inclusion is defined, its effectiveness is closely related to managing students by minimizing disruption in regular classrooms and by regulating ‘failure’ within the educationsystems. In the countries of the South, the meaning of inclusive education is situated by post-colonial social identities and policies for economic development that are frequently generated and financed by international organisations” (abstract). Inclusive education = “export of first-world thinking” (p.30); thus ‘inclusion’ = ‘feel-good rhetoric’. Inclusion derived from traditional dichotomies between ‘mainstream’ and ‘special’ education; able-bodied and disabled students; and as a critical pushback against marketised education reform arrangements such as accountability, control, choice and diversity (p.30), and is also linked to development approaches/ equality/ fairness movements. Draws on Ainscow et al.’s (2006) ‘narrow’ and ‘broad’ definitions of inclusion, and adds ‘fragmented’ category. **Aim:** To “argue that inclusive education should be understood in the context of an approach to the ‘problems’ of social diversity in societies that are highly diversified internally and yet globally interconnected” (p.30)**Methodology:** Essay**Discussion:** Inclusive education in developing world = UNESCO’s ‘Education for all’ policy underpinned by problematics: “in the newly globalising discourse of inclusion, its radical humanistic philosophical premises should be placed in the more sobering context of the intersection between colonial histories and post-colonial contexts of countries in the developed and developing world” (p.32) = export of ‘first-world knowledge and policy solutions’ to developing countries, which are unable to lift themselves out of entrenched historical disadvantages (result of colonialism/ lack of investment) but also opens space to advance social justice agenda with all member countries of UNESCO**Core argument:** “Inclusion and exclusion are interrelated processes and their interplay constantly creates new inclusive/ exclusive conditions and possibilities” (p.36) |
| Armstrong, D. & Cairnduff, A. (2012). [Inclusion in higher education: issues in university-school partnership](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603116.2011.636235?journalCode=tied20), *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16(9), 917–928.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *social inclusion; higher education; partnerships* | **Context:** Low SES students and their underrepresentation and policy on social inclusion in Australia. Sets the scene by arguing that Sydney University broke the norm by admitting students on merit rather than background when it opened in 1852 (but did not extend to women/adult learners). Notes that ‘inclusive education’ is an opaque/ under-defined term that needs to be understood in particular social context/ particular assumptions = there are particular social/policy contexts where inclusive teaching/ social inclusion sit; there are particular practices that advance inclusion. Authors discuss opportunities/challenges of engaging with policy/practice in USYD = long-term outreach program: ‘Compass – find your way to higher education’ (started 2008) – focus on social capital building in low SES communities/schools. Argues that WP initiatives are usually one-off events (including USYD pre-2008) and that much WP work fails because it is atheoretical (Archer, Hutchings & Leathwood, 2001). Maintain that education will always be socially selective: “In workforce planning, it is assumed that there is a part of the population that does not need higher education” (p.921) – assumed to be 60% if HE participation target is 40% **Aim:** Poses these questions: “What does it really mean to have an education system that is ‘inclusive’? Who is thought to be in need of inclusion and why? If education should be inclusive, then what practices is it contesting, what common values is it advocating, and by what criteria should its successes be judged?” (p.918)**Theoretical frame:** Draws on reproduction theory (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977)**Methodology:** **Findings:** Language of social inclusion/ equity = superficial, thus fuelling ‘the problem’ – who can be against social inclusion?: “The language of social equity obfuscates assumptions about economic productivity and wealth creation (for whom?)” (p.921). Argues that ‘social inclusion’ cannot improve until universities engage with it beyond the notions of access and participation; as it is, the language = “a parody of itself”… it “becomes the language of a new form of exclusion dressed up in a rhetoric that allows us to be blissfully disengaged from the genuinely transformative power of education” (p.922) – thus, how can a research-intensive (or any) university contribute to building capacity without engaging in introspection and reflexive exercise?Outreach: cannot be undertaken with idea that engagement/participation might improve league table results/ or hero-mentality of ‘saving’ disadvantaged communities (be careful of patronizing/ deficit assumptions)Compass (as an example of a university=community partnership) = built on 4 principles generated from research: 1) engagement early in schooling; 2) parents are influential on career choices/ post-school education or training; 3) teacher/school capacity makes a big differences; 4) need to increase awareness/understanding of educational pathways.**Core argument:** Engaging in outreach that does not reproduce dominant hegemonic systems: “To be inclusive, we need to learn from working with others and adopt strategies that are owned within schools and communities, not imposed on them from outside” (p.926). Necessitates a “self-critical” approach from all stakeholders (especially universities)“it is reasonable for universities to be asked whether in doing so they are producing leaders in their own image (and in the image of social groups who have traditionally benefited from and reproduced their advantagesthrough these networks) and if not then to be asked how they understand their relationship to the wider communities and what implications this relationship has for their practice” (p.926) |
| Brennan, J. & Naidoo, R. (2008). [Higher education and the achievement (and/or prevention) of equity and social justice](https://www.jstor.org/stable/40269078?seq=1), *Higher Education,* 56, 287–302.UKAnnotation by Anna Xavier Keywords: *meritocracy; widening participation; universities and public good; social reproduction; access to higher education Social inequality*  | **Context:** Concepts of equity and social justice have received considerable policy attention within HE recently, which has consequently driven research and discussion. However, the concepts are argued to have a ‘feel good flavour’ (p. 287) which hides the absence of precise definitions. In addition, two debates are evident in the role of HE in social equity, including the ‘fairness in the allocation of the *private benefits* of HE’ and the ‘*public benefits’* of HE (p. 288). **Aim:** To examine the ‘theoretical and empirical literature on HE’s role in relation to social equity & related notions of citizenship, social justice, social cohesion & meritocracy’ (p. 287). **Theoretical frame:** *Liberal (re-allocative) theories* – highlight role of education in ensuring progressive change by ‘‘producing the human capital required by an increasingly high-skill, science-based economy; promoting the civic values and behaviour appropriate to advanced liberal democracy; developing a meritocratic selection system whereby people can achieve social status by virtue of their actual abilities and contributions rather than having it merely ascribed by the accident of birth; facilitating an open society characterised by high levels of social mobility reflecting the relationship between ability and opportunity’’; *elite reproduction theories* – view educational processes in regards to how they ‘reproduce the privileges and dominance of the ruling class (e.g. through access to educational advantages leading to elite jobs and social positions); secure the legitimacy of capitalist social relations through the inculcation of the dominant ideology; block the development of a counter-hegemonic working-class consciousness that could effectively challenge capitalism; systematically prepare pupils for their differentiated future positions within the capitalist economy and social structure’’ (Moore, 2004, pp. 38-39). **Methodology:** Discussion of theoretical & empirical literature. **Discussion:** 1) Higher education & society: the social construction of legitimate – Scholars differ in ways which they find inequalities in HE participation to be the fault or responsibility of HE or to lie elsewhere in society. Some scholars argue that universities appear ‘far too late in a potential student’s educational and social experience to overturn or compensate for accrued disadvantage’ (p. 292) (Hale 2006). Woodrow (1999, p. 343) presented four myths commonly heard within higher education institutions as arguments against promoting equity: ‘‘it’s not the responsibility of higher education to promote social inclusion’’, ‘‘equity is the enemy of academic excellence. Low status students will lower standards’’; ‘‘the admission of access entrants is the last resort of institutions desperate to recruit’’ ; ‘‘we are in favour of widening participation, but at present we just cannot afford to’’; Barriers to WP - ‘‘the cost of participation; entry qualification requirements; a lack of flexible learning opportunities (including curricula); limited availability of support services and an institutional culture’’ (Thomas 2001, p. 365); HE contribution to meritocracy in society – ‘providing opportunities for individuals to succeed in it and by legitimising the basis of their success’ (p. 293); Criticism of elite reproduction theorists – they ‘neglect the huge expansion of HE & the emergence of *mass* and *universal* systems’ (p. 294), a focus that is ‘too narrow’ on a limited number of ‘elite & privileged institutions’ & students who attend them, where a ‘broader notion of social reproduction’ seems to be applicable to the expanded mass systems functions of HE; Authors highlight the crucial role of social & cultural capital in providing the ‘know-how of where and what to study’, which is often denied to marginalised groups & communities in society. 2)Higher education: a wider impact? – The wider impact of HE is often encapsulated in the notion of HE as a ‘public good’ (p. 295); Identification & measurement of HE present major challenges for research; Broadfoot (1996)- ‘moves towards greater individualism and towards rational and impersonal authority create new tensions between social integration and maintaining inequality’; Barnett (2000, p. 69) - university ‘‘can become a pivotal institution in this process of collective self-enlightenment’’; Wider benefits of HE who those are not direct participants – public benefits: ‘development of new technologies and contributions to local industries but also through ‘‘value-rational claims about the inherent virtues of knowledge, culture or religious inquiry or non-economic accounts of public contributions, such as individual self-development or improved citizenship’’ (Calhoun 2006, p. 12); HE is also linked with ‘the constitution of democratic identities’, although several researchers indicate the forms of democracy advocated with the facilitation of specific socio-economic projects; Research function of HE – Calhoun (2006, p. 23) argues that a ‘broader distinction between knowledge for experts (closed) and public knowledge (open) is important when discussing social equity in respect of access to authoritative knowledge’; HE as a ‘critical & independent space to appraise knowledge claims’, referencing ‘moral responsibilities of academics’ to critique society especially ‘taking truth to power’ (p. 296); authors argue a clear tension between varying functions of HE, especially between HE as a site of ‘disinterested scholarly activity’ and for academics to take on the role of ‘public activists’ (p. 297); Authors highlight the impact of neo-liberal systems on funding & regulatory frameworks, which undermine ‘academic autonomy’ (p. 297); Multiple roles of universities – ‘advocating democracy’, ‘taking truth to power’, ‘colluding in the maintenance of unequal social & political relationships’ (Brennan et al., 2004). 3)Implications: a)Discussions of equity & justice should not be limited to questions of *who* participate in HE & *what* individual benefits gained participants; b)academic autonomy may not necessarily promote equity & social justice, and could in fact be a part of ‘elite reproduction’ (p. 298); c)HE contribution to achievement of equity & social justice may need both ‘cultural change within the academic profession’ and ‘new relationships between HE institutions & societies’ they are a part of (p. 298). **Core argument:** It is important to link issues of social equity to the theme of ‘increasing differentiation’ in HE.  |
| Buchanan, R.; Southgate, E.; & Bennett, A. (2015). [Social justice in the enterprise university: global perspectives on theory, policy, ethics and critical practice](file:///Social%20justice%20in%20the%20enterprise%20university/%20global%20perspectives%20on%20theory%2C%20policy%2C%20ethics%20and%20critical%20practice), *International Studies in Widening Participation,* 2(2), 1–3.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker  | **Context:** Editorial for special issue on social justice/ neoliberalism. Argues that neoliberal goes beyond the economic focus and is “a comprehensive socio-political paradigm that informs our sense of ethical responsibility and social justice” (p.1) and creates subjectivities such as timeliness, accountability, self-entrepreneurship, individualism, competition etc. SI sought perspectives on ‘grappling’ with philosophical, social, theoretical and practical aspects of contemporary higher education. Fovet & Giles = explore whether neoliberalism and critical theory can work together in context of disability provisionSandberg = spaces of subversion in enterprise university in Canada – the ‘alternative campus tour’ explores uncomfortable stories/ public histories of land of campus.Peacock = critical analysis of outreach program in Aus (UQ?) = conflation of WP outreach activity and behavior management.Burke, Stevenson, Whelan = Foucauldian analysis of impact of WP on teaching practices in England – neoliberal discourses of teaching excellence resonate internationallyWhitty & Clement = examination of WP policy in UK and Australia resulting in mixed results. Offer research agenda for future.**Core argument:** “social justice work is not always and everywhere incompatible with neoliberalism” (p.2) |
| Connell, R. (2012). [Just education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02680939.2012.710022), *Journal of Educational Policy,* 27(5), 681–683.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker  | **Context:** Editorial. Starts with “Education is dangerous” (p.681): because authoritarian rulers try to control and ration education; because colonialism construct education as a site of struggle; because not only does it reproduce inequality, but schools and colleges “shape the new society that is coming into existence all around us” (p.681). Mechanisms of inequality change historically (from racial exclusions, class privilege, gender privilege, public v. private). Now new forms of inequality = “based on market mechanisms” (p.681) – corporatization of educational sites + competition (institutions and individuals); teaching workforce = more hierarchical: “Education becomes a zone of manufactured insecurity, with ‘achievement’ through competition as the only remedy. But in a zero-sum competition, achievement for one means failure for all the rest” (p.681). Social justice requires us to enact/recognize our responsibilities, but these are eroded by the logics of competition: “The neoliberal turn in education is ethically damaging precisely because it undermines this web of responsibility” (p.682). Competition requires wins and losses or successes and failures which is enacted through competitive testing (large, quantitative, standardized), which “hoists curricular decision-making out from local settings and locates it in centers of social power” (p.682). **Core argument:** Calls for two things: 1) curricula justice; 2) emphasis on social encounters in policy and philosophy, underpinned by mutual respect |
| Craven, A. (2012). [Social justice and higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603108.2011.611831), *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education,* 16(1), 23–28.UK/ SCANAnnotation by Sally Baker  | **Context:** Examines issues affecting low SES students in UK higher education. **Theoretical frame:** None explicit**Methodology:** Essay**Findings:** Social justice understood as “fair access to rewards for all individuals and groups within a society” (p.23), and universities have a role to play in achieving this. Notes historical context (Robbins report in 1963) and contemporary employment-focused iteration of higher education – makes comparison with Scandinavian approaches (free HE), compared to class-mediated context in England. Discusses how compulsory schooling contributes to current situation, particularly the role of private education to skew the system towards rich (comparison again to Scandinavia – Finland and Sweden). Describes the problem of ‘working class’ students feeling silenced/ a lack of belonging to HE in general and professional programs (Law, Medicine) compared with middle class students. To make a significant difference to stratification of HE, attitudes need to shift across whole of society (e.g., not tacitly discriminating on basis of accent/ dress). *Marketing/ recruitment*: The ways and means of marketing = important for the stratification of HE (participation in and within the institutions themselves): “Universities and society need the best possible matches between the students and their subjects of study even if only from the standpoints of economics and efficiency. The academiccommunity and the whole of society lose out when talented non-traditional students avoid some subjects just because they feel they might not ‘fit in’” (p.25). Author argues that UK could experiment with open access (like Germany), but this would require substantial transformation of the system. Curriculum, pedagogy and support: social justice needs whole-of-institutional investment and support. Suggests strategies like flexible timetabling, evening/weekend tuition, online learning. Notes issues with support (targeting without othering), makes suggestions based on Open University model. Argues that peer support = beneficial, especially when networks brought with (or not) are considered – notes efforts by Goldsmiths. Lecturers/ educators need to plan student-centred and engaging teaching and methods of communication between educator and student need to be well-considered. Considers how a new curriculum model – e.g. the Melbourne Model - might be appropriated to achieve social justice aims. Universities must not ‘water down’ their programs to meet the needs of non-traditional students: “When universities work on matters of quality, everybody benefits” (p.27)**Core argument:** Merely opening access is not enough to achieve social justice through higher education |
| Forsyth, H. & Cairnduff, A. (2015). [A scholarship of social inclusion in higher education: why do we need it and what should it look like](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07294360.2014.975902), *Higher Education Research & Development*, 34(1), 219–222.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker  | **Context:** Points for debate. Acknowledges that Uni Syd has “further to go” than other universities on basis of position/privilege. Discussion threaded with vignettes from teachers and schools [from outreach??] Social inclusion based on some members of community less likely to go to university (ref to James et al. 2008); positive impact on health, well-being, community (ref to Dickson & Harmon 2011); value of community partnerships (but more needed on evaluation). Cultural capital most common theoretical vehicle but still deficit views persist. **Aim: “**seek to develop the habit of taking a scholarly approach to social inclusion, incorporating into our strategy, processes of discovery, reflection and sharing our findings and experiences” (p.219).**Core argument:** Authors argue it is time “to take a cross-disciplinary, scholarly approach to the question of connections between educational opportunity, social and economic disadvantage and university-based knowledge” (p.221). |
| Francis, B. & Mills, M. (2012). [What would a socially just education system look like?,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02680939.2012.710015) *Journal of Education Policy,* 27(5), 577–585.UK/AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker  | **Context:** Introduction to Special Issue.Starts by positioning an idealised ‘socially just education system’ out of reach in context of austerity measures (post-GFC), meaning that governments have clung tighter to neoliberal mechanisms and private investment and “subjected to processes of audit and competition, with the aim of driving up educationalstandards via the facilitation of consumer ‘choice’” (p.577). In both UK and Australia, social inequity in higher education remains a salient and powerful set of determiners for participation and success. Authors express concern that sociological work that offers critique and constructive thinking about inequity and education are becoming “increasingly irrelevant to policy and practice” (p.577) – see for example inclusion of ‘impact’ in REF exercise in UK. Cite argument of Power (2010) that it is not surprising if such work is ignored when it rarely offers solutions to the highlighted problems: “We are arguably in danger of becoming knowing observers of sociological phenomena, comparing clever notes within our own exclusive circle, while practice and policies that exacerbateinequalities continue oblivious and unabated” (p.578). Authors set out to write about what a socially just education might look like (this is a Special Issue on that topic). Authors note that “whilst sociological work in education had been extremely effective in identifying social injustice in education, and in analysing the ways in which education systems reproduce inequality, it had been less good at proposing alternative models” (p.579).**Core argument:** In an attempt to answer the question of what a socially just education system would look like, authors note “we are currently so far from social justice in terms of both educational experiences and outcomes that we need to engage both pragmatic, ‘short-term’ strategies alongside deeper future thinking” (p.583)… “It is vital that our social justice ambitions are not dissipated by the harsh realities and (limited) possibilities of the present – we must continue to ‘think big’, and indeed to identify the limitations of the present” (p.584) |
| Fraser, N. (1995). [From Redistribution to Recognition?](http://bibliopreta.com.br/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Fraser-Redistribution-Recognition-Dilema-1.pdf)[Dilemmas of Justice in a ‘Post-Socialist’ Age](http://bibliopreta.com.br/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Fraser-Redistribution-Recognition-Dilema-1.pdf), *New Left Review*, 212, 68–93.US | **Context:** ‘Post-socialist’ conflicts such as cultural domination and material inequality have given rise to social justice movements for both recognition and redistribution. Uses gender and race to formulate the ‘redistribution–recognition dilemma’ which seem on the face of it at odds. Rather than reject one for the other, Fraser calls for ‘developing a critical theory of recognition, one which identifies and defends only those versions of the cultural politics of difference that can be coherently combined with the social politics of equality.” (p. 69).  Fraser’s assumption is that both redistribution and recognition are required for justice.**Aim:** To examine the relationship between redistribution and recognition by problematising the tension between equity/social justice movements which seek redistribution (on one hand) and movements which seek recognition (on the other). Redistribution movements call for a stripping away of specificity (for example gender equality arguments which argue for abolishing traditional divisions of labour); whereas movements which promote increased recognition rely on group specificity and ‘affirming the value of that specificity’ (p. 74). She seeks to examine alternative ‘remedies’ for social injustice which cross the redistribution–recognition ‘divide’ and introduces ‘affirmation’ and ‘transformation’ which will resolve the ‘dilemma’.**Methodology:** In order to achieve the aim Fraser develops an analytical heuristic in which redistribution and recognition are distinguished from each other, however, she acknowledges that in reality this is not the case.**Conclusions/Findings:** Proposes a four-cell matrix through which to explore the ‘redistribution–recognition’ dilemma (see p. 87). However concludes that there is ‘no neat theoretical move by which it can be wholly dissolved or resolved.” (p. 92), it can only be ‘softened’. “Socialist economics combined with deconstructive cultural politics works best” (p. 92)Fraser expresses concern about the lean to the Right in US politics. She concludes thus: “Our best efforts to redress these injustices [cultural and economic subordination] via the combination of the liberal welfare state plus mainstream multiculturalism are generating perverse effects. Only by looking to alternative conceptions of redistribution and recognition can we meet the requirements of justice for all.” (p. 93). |
| Fraser, N. (1998). [*Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, Participation*](https://sk.sagepub.com/books/culture-and-economy-after-the-cultural-turn/n2.xml), Discussion Paper FS I 98–08 | Claims for social justice: redistributive and recognitive – resulting in perception of need to make choices between class/identity politics, social democracy and multiculturalism. Fraser’s thesis = choices = false: justice needs both redistribution and recognition – but how to combine?Lecture focuses on moral-philosophical and social-theoretical dimensions of combining redist + recog. Poses 3 Qs:1. Is recognition really a matter of justice, or is it a matter of self-realization?
2. Do distributive justice and recognition constitute two distinct, sui generis, normative paradigms, or can either of them be subsumed within the other?
3. Does justice require the recognition of what is distinctive about individuals or groups, or is recognition of our common humanity sufficient?

Fraser questions thinking that equates recognition with self-realisation; she argues it is unfair that some individuals and groups are denied the possibility of full participation on account of their backgrounds. This notion of justice allows for multiple possibilities for recognition (thus denying normative/ singular notions of what/who counts). This therefore gives individuals agency and capacity to create their own conditions of recognition, in “that it is up to men and women to define for themselves what counts as a good life and to devise for themselves an approach to pursuing it, within limits that ensure a like liberty for others” (p.3) = ‘participation parity’. This therefore positions misrecognition as ‘status injury’ based on social relations rather than individual attributes/ behaviours. This social view foregrounds institutional patterns of denial/ misrecognition = “patterns of cultural value that constitute one as comparatively unworthy of respect or esteem” (p.3). This view of justice/recognition also rejects the notion that everyone is entitled to equitable amounts of esteem (because if everyone has it, esteem ceases to exist).Can recognition and redistribution be reduced into one category? No = such a theory needs to include patterns of cultural value – not all misrecognition = result of maldistribution; “It must consider whether institutionalized patterns of interpretation and valuation impede *parity of participation* in social life” (p.4). Also need to consider wider socio-economic forces (such as neoliberal logics that push competition, marketization and profit).Fraser promotes a bivalent view that recognises redistribution and recognition as distinct perspectives on/ dimensions of justice.For parity of participation = 2 conditions must be met: 1) participants’ voices must be sought and heard; 2) institutional cultural patterns of value must express equal respect for all participants and equal opportunity to achieve social esteem.Answer to Q3: no, but critical social theory is needed to understand (mis)recognition in context.Perspectival dualism = social theory that “can accommodate differentiation, divergence, and interaction at every level” (p.7) = constitutes two analytic perspectives that can be applied to any domain (recognition perspective = identify cultural dimensions or redistributive economic policies; redistribution perspective = focus on economic dimensions of recognitive issues. Perspectival dualism poses these questions:Does the practice in question work to ensure both the economic conditions and the cultural conditions of participatory parity? Or does it, rather, undermine them? (p.9) |
| Gale, T. (2011). [Student equity’s starring role in Australian higher education: not yet centre field](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13384-010-0007-3), *Australian Educational Researcher,* 38(1), 5–23. AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *Student equity; Widening participation; Higher education; Education policy; Globalisation* | **Context:** Australian HE sector has changed/ is changing/ is going to change and the view of equity it has/ we have must change too. The Australian sector is “defined by its institutional groupings by their relative claims to selectivity and exclusivity” (abstract) The paper takes a new stance on student equity. Sets out developments (Liberal gov’t set up NCSEHE in 2007; Gillard gov’t commissioned Bradley review and created Ministry of Social Inclusion in 2008) – “sent a strong signal to the sector that matters of student equity were to be centre stage once more” (p.6)**Aim:** To explore how central equity actually is/ to ask whether a new stance on student equity might resonate nationally/internationally.**Theoretical frame:** Draws on Bourdieu/ Marginson (2008): search for field positions = identifying positions of individuals and organisations and what they can do from these positions (p.7) + capital (p.12) / Bourdieu & Wacquant’s notion of ‘feel for the game’**Methodology:** Essay**Findings:** Changed relations in the field mean that ‘what works’ now might not work in the future. Provides a brief overview of history of equity in federal policies (Dawkins – Martin – Nelson - Bradley) – p.9-10. Discusses league tables/ international rankings in relation to ‘field positions and stances’ (and academic capital). Australian HE is characterised by conflict rather than consensus over excellence (elite, exclusive) and equity (public, inclusive). Concerns about the massification of HE diluting the academic capital has hitherto not been born out: increasing numbers of graduates has not seen an increase in the *proportion* of equity group (specifically indigenous/r&r/low SES) students. Notes how NCSEHE was born at a time when equity was high on the national/political agenda and as such needed to “leverage off this ‘moment in the sun’” (p.14) to influence others. Student equity defined by numbers is “social inclusion in its narrowest sense” (p.16)**Core argument:** View of social justice needs to involve more than physical presence when recognising representation of different groups. Need a new view of equity that asks what all students can bring/contribute to HE. Currently, this is packaged for low SES students as potential economic futures (national/individual); = “imagined narrowly” (p.17). “We need to explore new policy settings for equity in these emerging times, for governments, systems and universities” (p.17) |
| Gale, T. (2015). [Widening and expanding participation in Australian higher education: In the absence of sociological imagination](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13384-014-0167-7), *The Australian Educational Researcher,* 42(2), 257–271.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *widening participation, equity, aspiration, sociological imagination* | **Context:** Offers an assessment of whether the Rudd/Gillard policy approach to widening participation ‘worked’. Characterises the 20/40 targets as ‘widening’ and ‘expanding’ participation (40% target dependent on 20% target), achieved in policy terms by attending to equity in and raising aspirations to HE. Contextualises Australian focus with international/OECD countries, noting many share the push to increase numbers of knowledge workers, albeit with social inclusion agenda also prevalent. Notes that ‘universal participation’ has become new social imaginary (Gale & Hodge, 2014); others note that the 20/40 targets are not close to being achieved and recent reviews (e.g. Kemp & Norton, 2014) do not share this vision.**Theoretical frame:** Mills’ (1959) sociological imagination = relations between private troubles and public issues (see p.258).**Methodology:** Essay**Findings:** Absence of sociological imagination in Rudd/Gillard policy = evident in 3 ways: 1) widespread trouble was misrecognised/ misrepresented; 2) misalignment of private troubles/ public issues so that aspirations = located in individuals and social/community issues ignored; 3) policy elevated private issues to public level – limited/no consideration of how existing systems create ‘private troubles’. Furthermore, preference for/reliance on quantitative measurements foreground private issues, whereas qualitative research has a better possibility of illuminating the social-structural constraints. Gale notes how bounded systems (e.g. UG study) = becoming more porous as result of globalisation = discusses high SES students studying in elite universities in other countries to gain positional advantage (geographic mobility)Qualifying equity: not just about access, participation, success in HE; it’s now about those in relation to particular forms of HE and ignores what students bring and HE serves students’ needs (p.264) – therefore focus is on diversity of student body, not HE’s response to accommodating that diversity – there has been more creation of spaces for new bodies but not commensurate consideration of what they embody (ref to Dei’s epistemological equity; also see Connell’s ‘southern theory’)Aspiration strategies: notes how aspiration has been positioned as individual psychological construct (private issue) with information and guidance to individuals and their families held up as best approach to ‘convert’ students to aspiring to HE. “Yet the distinction between desire and possibility remains important: for the advantaged, possibility is mediated by desire but for the disadvantaged, desire is mediated by possibility” (p.266)There is plenty of research that shows that low SES students do have aspirations for HE – thus suggesting that aspiration is not the problem. Instead, perhaps = diminished navigational capacities, less map (‘in the know’) knowledge. Also = problematic positioning of HE as key to ‘good life’“Equity is at once conceived as a public response to the private troubles of individuals and specific groups, while also contributing to the private troubles of these individuals and groups through limited conceptions of social-structural issue… the aspiration troubles of individuals and specific groups are escalated to the level of public issue when they reveal problems with structural arrangements.” (p.260)**Core argument:** Labor (2007-13) policies lacked sociological imagination, resulting in the projection of deficits onto individuals who didn’t want to ‘play’. Also argues that this means that participation of disadvantaged groups = set to continue“A sociological imagination and thus new policy commitments are now required: (1) to expand the application of equity to other parts of the HE system, including and centrally to the nature of HE itself, and (2) to recognize and resource the aspirations of under-represented groups for HE without these aspirations being confined to or by HE” (p.268). |
| Gale, T. & Densmore, K. (2000). [*Just Schooling: Explorations in the cultural politics of teaching*](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Trevor_Gale/publication/313845194_Just_Schooling_Explorations_in_the_cultural_politics_of_teaching/links/5be1fa594585150b2ba30523/Just-Schooling-Explorations-in-the-cultural-politics-of-teaching.pdf)*.* Buckingham: Open University Press. | Offer typology of perspectives on social justice:* *Distributive* = begin from idea that individuals have intrinsic value/ worth, which justifies the (re)distribution of goods and resources. See Rawls (1971). Liberal-democratic view of distribution = deficit model of social justice: “the disadvantaged are those who lack what society deems to be the educational, social and cultural basics” = p.13 (everyone gets resources to get to the same starting point; e.g. remedial classes), leaving equality as ‘baseline measure’ (see p.12). Alternative = difference model (distribution of different social goods for different people = equity), largely through groups rather than individuals
* *Retributive* = concerned with fairness of competition for goods (often connected to meritocratic discourses in educational contexts. Berlin (1969) called regulation and rules/laws that interfere with individual’s freedom to act and possess = ‘negative liberty’ (favours property rights over person rights). Retributive = punishment for illegitimate infringement of rights/ freedoms of others (paraphrasing Carr & Harnett, 1996); related to performance and reward – see wealth/ resources gap. Meritocracy = sham
* *Recognitive* = Young (1990) and Fraser (1995) = acknowledge place of social groups in our understandings of social justice. (Re)distributive notions of social justice = “tend to confine their interests to economic spheres and ignore the cultural politics of social institutions, such as schools” (p.18). Requires the asking of questions, such as ‘who are the people?’ and ‘what is power?’. Recognitive (or positive liberty, reworking Berlin, 1969) needs three conditions: fostering of respect for different social groups through self-identification [reflexivity?], opportunities for self-development/ expression; participation of groups in decision-making that directly impacts them via representation from group bodies. Young (1990) = recognitive justice moves focus from *having* to *doing* (1990: 8)
 |
| Gale, T. & Tranter, D. (2011). [Social justice in Australian higher education policy: an historical and conceptual account of student participation](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17508487.2011.536511), *Critical Studies in Education*, 52(1), 29–46.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *Keywords: education policy; higher education; social inclusion; social justice; student**equity; widening participation* | **Context:** Historic overview of Australian HE through the lens of equity/ social justice. Tracing how HE policy is shaped by (and shapes) social and economic drivers and policies and social justice intentions in HE.**Theoretical frame:** Draws on Gale & Densmore’s (2000) three-part characterisation of social justice: distributive, retributive, recognitive.**Discussion:** 1850 – University of Sydney opened, 1853 – University of Melbourne opened, 1874 – University of Adelaide opened, 1890 – University of Tasmania opened. Little is known about Australian HE students before WWII. In 1945, there were 7 universities with 15,600 students; in 1975 there were 17 universities and 7- AEIs with 273,000 students; in 2007 there were 39 universities and other private HEIs with 772,000 domestic students and 294,000 international students.Widening participation has reached saturation point for the middle-classes; “equity in higher education has now become as much a matter of economic necessity as a matter of social justice” (p.32)**1988-90 (Dawkins reforms**) – brought in HECs and merged universities and CAEs: “private gains of higher education became paramount in policy discourse, replacing the previous emphasis on the overall public good” (p.36). The Howard government then pushed the neoliberal agenda (cut the threshold/increased HECs) on the basis that industry and individuals profited. **In 2002-3**, Nelson commissioned a review of equity groups and performance – findings: women, NESB and people with disabilities showed improved participation; low SES, remote/rural and indigenous – little/no progress. The question was here raised as to whether men in some subject areas should be considered an equity group. Gender was removed, but universities were to continue monitoring it and the other equity groups.Rudd/Gillard government (Labor) were voted in on an ‘education revolution’ platform; they created the Ministry of Social Inclusion. The Bradley report (2008) placed emphasis on social justice/ equity – foregrounding the transformative role of HE (“must be a core responsibility of all institutions that accept public money” (Gillard, 2009). Subsequent created of HEPPP provided the financial means for more collaboration between schools/VET/HE.**Core argument:** Each attempt at expansion has been accompanied by distributive notions of social justice with periods of consolidation and retributive notions of social justice. Social policy has become subsumed by economic policy. Finally, there is no equity without epistemological equity – it’s no good letting people in if academic knowledges and discourses and practices prevent engagement and participation. |
| Gale, T. & Hodge, S. (2014). [Just imaginary: delimiting social inclusion in higher education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01425692.2014.919841), *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 35(5), 688–709.AUS Annotation by Sally Baker *Keywords: social inclusion; higher education; social imaginary; policy effects; aspiration deficits; opportunity trap* | **Context:** Look at social inclusion agenda through lens of OECD and Australia, examining the ‘policy effects’. Argues that social inclusive is ‘just imaginary’ because of systematic/structural disconnections between aspirations and possibilities. Argue that widening participation = strategy to supplant industrial economy with knowledge economy. Draws on Raco (2009) = neoliberalisation and widening participation have created a ‘politics of aspiration’ (expansion = dependent on widening participation to non-traditional students but is sold as a project of self-improvement, individual competitiveness)**Aim:** To unpack three dilemmas at heart of social inclusion discourse and agenda**Theoretical frame:** Taylor’s (2004) notion of ‘social imaginary’ = common understandings/ widespread practices creates legitimacy for new orders/ discourses; ‘cruel optimism’ (Berlant, 2007)**Methodology:** Essay**Dilemmas:**Dilemma 1: Sustainability of social inclusionDraws on Ball’s (1993) idea of first and second order effects (first-order effect = change practice; second-order effect = change of relations/ dominance)**;** thus there can be an appearance of change without any substantial systemic change in terms of the power orderor change being sustained. To date, changes have been sustained because of numerical (first-order) arguments – little evidence of second-order effects. Discusses diminishing political will = conflation of social inclusion with drops in quality (despite evidence to the contrary in terms of increased retention figures), particularly in context of 2013 election and subsequent change of governmentDilemma 2: Expanding HE with uncertain interest: what aspirations? – value of HE not immediately evident, especially to non-traditional students. View of aspirations inscribed in policy (and some practice) = deficit; authors argue that these assumptions are contradicted by the evidence (aka = low SES and other equity groups do generally aspire for further study and HE) – covers a lot of Gale’s work; “Rendering higher education more socially inclusive necessarily involves unsettling ‘the centre–periphery relations in the realm of knowledge’ (Connell 2007, viii) through the legitimation of a variety of knowledges and ways of knowing, so that students are able to recognize themselves and hear their own voices” (p.698)Dilemma 3: increased opportunity/diminished returnsProblem with prospect of government’s vision/ participation targets – credential creep = more graduates competing for fewer jobs/ lower graduate salaries = ‘cruel optimism’. Social inclusion = more than just access; needs support (see classic Engstrom & Tinto (2008) quote: ‘access without support is not opportunity’). Assumptions of deficit fuel assumptions of slipping standards because of increased participation of non-traditional students. Low SES students (congregated in particular disciplines/ occuptions) = most at risk from qualification devaluation/ fewer opportunities post-study because middle-class+ families are able to barter better positional advantage by drawing on enhanced resources (money/ knowledge/ networks)**.Core argument:** Based on Taylor’s (2004) theory that social imaginaries come into being in 2 ways: through ‘penetration’ of theory and through reinterpretation of old practicesDilemma 1: new social inclusion practices are starting, but out of neoliberal logics/throery – therefore new practices = economic rather than socially oriented, leading to restriction to first-order effects.Dilemma 2: Analysis exposes limited theorisation that keeps aspirations as first-order effect (surface change rather than deeper systemic/discoursal changes) resulting in, “The new practices instituted by policy are not being understood by under-represented groups as benefitting them” (p.702). Theories and practices based on strengths and epistemological equity = necessary to move beyond deficit framings of aspiration.Dilemma 3: “points to a cruel trap awaiting participants who have invested on the basis of promised economic rewards, and the need for the images, stories and legends of higher education to be founded on a different basis” (p.703)A ‘just imaginary’ is *just* imaginary |
| Gidley, J,; Hampson, G.; Wheeler, L.; Bereded-Samuel, E. (2010). [From Access to Success: An Intergrated Approach to Quality Higher Education Informed by Social Inclusion Theory and Practice](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/hep.2009.24), *Higher Education Policy,* 23, 123–147.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *access; empowerment; engagement; integration; participation; success* | **Context:** Explores quality, access and success from variety of perspectives. Starts from notion that quality, access and success are “complex and multi-perspectival” and depend on the underlying ideologies (p.124). The authors take the position that equitable access and success are closely connected to social inclusion. “…access, participation and success are ordered according to a **spectrum of ideologies** — neoliberalism, social justice and human potential, respectively — by way of a nested structure with human potential ideology offering the most embracing perspective” (p.124, SB’s emphasis).Spectrum of ideologies = reflected in degrees of social inclusion.Contextualises the paper in terms of globalization of HE; tensions between elite unis and massification (competition, commodification of knowledge, economic rationales); shifting notions of quality – tension between neoliberalism and social justice: “‘the trade-off between excellence and equity’ (Lunt, 2008; on page 128). Authors contest neoliberal notion of quality as a measure of an individual university’s “competitive edge” (p.128).Social inclusion = could be poised to take over dominance of equity and access. Social inclusion policy pays insufficient attention to certain groups: CALD (inc. refugees), rurual/remote, ageing populations and incarcerated people. Also, level of policy/ discourse direction is significant: If policies and interventions remain at the level of top down imposition of assumed common values, then it is likely that many of the groups discussed above, even if given access to higher education, may choose not to participate wholeheartedly” (p.130).Degrees of social inclusion: *Access through lens of neoliberalism* = investments in human capital/ contribution to knowledge economy, so that access is about creating higher numbers (to fuel economic production) from outside of ‘saturated’ populations; works from deficit position and scarcity of resources; reduction of social explanation to economic framework is a “conceptual reductive integration” and lifeworld reduction = “cultural assimilation and stakeholder dominator hierarchies” (p.133).Participation and engagement through lens of social justice = “is about human rights, egalitarianism of opportunity, human dignity and fairness for all” (p.134). Notes link with critical educational theories (e.g. Giroux and Freire). University-community partnerships = example that shifts away from notion of ‘ivory towers’ of academy**Aim:** Responds to this question: ‘Are equitable access, success and quality three essential ingredients or three mutually exclusive concepts for higher education development? Key question: ‘To what extent does the new term, social inclusion , reflect a shift in policy; or is it merely old policies repackaged?’ (p.129)**Theoretical frame:** Integrative analysis. Uses integrative — or joined-up — thinking to offer some futurepolicy directions.**Methodology:** Literature review**Findings:** Human potential ideology – goes beyond economic/social justice notions to idea that equal rights = “to maximise the potential of each human being [through] cultural transformation” (p.135) = opposite to deficit model/ ideology. Refers to Hope Theory (see Synder in Egan et al 2008). Based on notion that there is no one ideal model of human development – people do not ‘fit in’, rather they “bring with them the richness of their individual difference” (p.137)*Suggestions of interventions to increase access* (p.139) include more equity scholarships, better income support, better regional infrastructure, improved physical modification of facilities for people with disabilities, more teaching (language-culture) support for CALD students, better counselling services*Suggestions of interventions to increase participation* (p.140): partnerships, social enterprise, mentoring, learning networks, arts/sports interventions, outreach*Suggestions of interventions to increase success and empowerment* (p.141) = pathways, hearing voices, dialogue, futures interventions, hope interventions, cultural festivals.**Core argument:** Presents 2 notions of quality: *justice globalism* (prioritising collaboration rather than competition) and *human potential* (related to human potential and transformation)Towards an integrative approach to quality: involves spectrum of ideologies and degrees of social inclusion; “quality in higher education is synonymous with a broad interpretation of social inclusion in higher education in that both are concerned with equitable access, participatory engagement and empowered success” (p.142). |
| Hey, V. & Leathwood, C. (2009). [Passionate Attachments: Higher Education, Policy, Knowledge, Emotion and Social Justice](https://doi.org/10.1057/hep.2008.34), *Higher Education Policy,* 22(1), 101–118.UK Annotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *affects desire emotion gender HE policy* | **Context:** Examine ‘the affective turn’ in HE policy studies, with particular interest in ‘employable student’ and ‘non-traditional student’ subjectivities, and policy sites/ discourses of WP and employability. Widening participation = 2 developments in particular: new emphasis on creating support/ivelearning cultures – seen in new focus on well-being and belonging, mentoring, WP projects, support for all students (rather than remedial support for deficit subjects). Such developments = often focused on student retention. 2nd development = creating ‘employable’ subjects who are emotionally literate/ intelligent. Authors note that these are “a difficult ideological assemblage to be ‘against’” (p.104); however = not clear who the ‘addressee’ of these policies and practices. Authors point to long history of such inquiries into affective from feminist perspectives (Freire, hooks, Boler) – recognizing that emotion/ pedagogy/ agency = “having passionate components and thus to fundamentally question the traditional binary split between emotion and reason” (p.105). Psychosocial understanding = sees affective/emotions not as ‘things’ to be studied, but rather as a ‘flooding’: “anovercoming or a momentary disturbance in one’s equilibrium or has been seen as socialized, conceived as a shared apprehension, or collective panic” (p.105).**Aim:** **Theoretical frame:** Feminist scholarship that has worked with emotions: Judith Butler – identity and subjectivity as subjectivation (1990, 1997) and embodiment of subjectivity. Also draws on Butler’s take on Foucault – genealogical analysis of policy, which “questions the notion of origin and linear progression, instead emphasizing discontinuities, interruptions and contingencies” (p.102)**Methodology:** Argue for psycho-social methodology to ‘tease out the affective in policy’**Analysis of policy:** Analysis of New Labour education policy in UK = positioned as “key driver of subject re/formation” (p.107), in line with new modes of accountability and surveillance – what happens to the social, the collective and the community when individuals become competitive self-entrepreneurs? Psychosocial lens offers a way in to exploring risk (manufactured by New Labour policy as a ‘fear of being left behind’). Authors also apply psychosocial lens to micropolitics of being staff or a student in contemporary HE – policy discourses serve to deny difference “by striving to ensure subjects’ singularity and ‘fitness for purpose’ in terms of the market and consumption” (p.110), so that students are changed, rather than institutional structures or cultures.**Core argument:** Paper argues for value in psychosocial reading of higher education policy. Main findings = 1) policy reflects feelings about social change and difference (in relation to ‘the other’); 2) desires to manage risk = limiting subjectivities recognised (‘employable’ ‘emotionally intelligent’ subject, p.113); 3)HE = formation of cultural feelings and ideas (see also Clegg & David, 2006) |
| Hughes, K. (2015). [The social inclusion meme in higher education: are universities doing enough?,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603116.2014.930518) *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 19(3), 303–313.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *higher education, low socioeconomic students, social inclusion, widening participation* | **Context:** Discusses social inclusion/ WP agenda – LSES students – addressing notion that both students and universities are in deficit**Theoretical frame:** Bourdieu’s habitus, cultural capital**Methodology:** Essay**Discussion points:** Notes the different understandings/ practices that HSES students bring with them to the academy: “Students from educationally well-resourced backgrounds naturally bring with them a bank of knowledge, an understanding of etiquette and self-confidence that they belong within a university and will successfully manage it” (p.307). Notes that literacies in particular are “mysterious” to many students, particularly LSES and ‘other educationally disadvantaged backgrounds’ (p.307).Two sets of deficits (according to Devlin, 2011): students lacking or universities lacking (“are obliged to work harder to better meet [students’] needs” (p.309)) – but points to Go8 argument that standards will slip if students with lower entrance scores are ‘let in’. Conflation of school entrance marks and ability is “at best naïve” and a clear example of Bourdieu’s misrecognition of role schools play in reproduction (p.309). Draws on Archer’s (2007) classification of ‘gold’, ‘silver’ and ‘bronze’ universities (with bronze ‘carrying most of the load’ in terms of LSES students)**Core argument:** “Universities were not designed for LSES students, but their opposite, and they perpetuate a comprehensive suite of discourses, manners, literacies, expectations and behavioural norms which unsurprisingly work to the benefit of the middle and upper classes” (p.307). Some universities [probably ‘gold’ but not made explicit] “appear to be using the discourses of social inclusion and offering greater ease of entry for ‘diverse’ students whilst not necessarily altering their teaching and learning practices” (p.310). ‘Gold’ universities need to do more unless they seek to preserve 3-tiered sector (which is essentially the opposite of social inclusivity) |
| Kilpatrick, S. & Johns, S. (2014). [Institutional Responses to Social Inclusion in Australian Higher Education: Responsible Citizenship or Political Pragmatism?,](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Institutional-responses-to-social-inclusion-in-or-Kilpatrick-Johns/c53a210c0c1e00fac7f968455865aaccbf2f3815) *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 16(2), 27–45.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker Key terms: *equity; higher education; social inclusion; strategic planning.* | **Context:** Social inclusion policy and practice = underpinned by differing ideologies. Social inclusion = “focuses on informing aspirations, providing opportunities, and creating a supportive environment so that all students with the ability to succeed at higher education are empowered to realise their potential and become agents of social transformation” (p.29). No ‘one-size-fits-all’ model for social inclusion – see Devlin, 2011; Naylor, Baik & James, 2013.**Aim:** To offer analysis of Australian universities’ strategic planning documents, looking for evidence of strategies to implement social inclusion agenda (positioned on spectrum of neoliberalism – social justice – human potential empowerment); and “specifically to question whether Australian universities’ strategic plans include social inclusion strategies that have integrity and are sustainable” (p.28).**Theoretical frame:** Draws on social inclusion conceptualisations offered in Gidley et al. (2010): neoliberal – social justice – human potential empowerment.**Methodology:** Desktop audit of publicly available documents pertaining to social inclusion strategies. Content analysis (Babbie, 2004) undertaken. 19 universities made disability action plans available (but these were excluded). Selection criteria: “To be counted has having social inclusion access strategies, universities’strategic or sub plans had to state actions that targeted groups underrepresented in Australian higher education to assist them to apply for or enrol in a place at that university, or state an intention to increase numbers from one or more named underrepresented groups” (p.37).**Findings:** Broadly, older and more research-intensive universities = more neoliberal compared with regional, newer universities (more social justice/ human potential). Only “a small number of universities have embraced a holistic approach to social inclusion, articulating an integrated suite of strategies spanning the access, participation and empowerment domains” (p.40).“In general terms, older, more prestigious, research intensive universities appear to be willing to accept students who have been able to demonstrate ability despite any educational cultural capital barriers they may have had to overcome, while locally connected, often younger universities are proactive in supporting the aspiration and transition of non-traditional students to higher education” (p.42).* 38 universities had publicly available strategic plans;
* 11 also had sub-plans publicly available
* 15 had separate Indigenous education/ Reconciliation plans available
* 34 of the strategic plans explicitly referred to social inclusion and most (n=29) included strategies to address social inclusion, equity and/or access for underrepresented or disadvantaged groups; the other 5 set out social inclusion principles and provided strategies in sub-plans
* 1 set out strategies for Indigenous students only
* 1 had strategies that related to social inclusion but were not explicitly labeled as such
* 2 did not have strategies
* 1 did not have a plan
* 33 of universities with publically available plans =mentioned at least one targeted/ equity group and it was Indigenous people
* 28 =made specific mention of low SES, underrepresented, disadvantaged or non-traditional
* higher education participant groups
* 12 = mentioned students with disabilities
* 11 = mentioned geographic disadvantage
* 6 = mentioned CALD
* 16 = targets for various equity groups in their publicly available strategic plans or sub plans (mostly low SES and Indigenous)
* 25 = explicitly mentioned social inclusion strategies with relation to staff (22 of which = increase Indigenous employment and women in senior positions
* 34 = articulate plans around access
* 26 = articulate participation strategies
* 15 =empowerment approach (“strategies framed in positive terms (strengths based) and including social, psychological and economic dimensions” (p.36). 9 of these targeted only Indigenous students
* 18 = identified access/ pathways but 14 of these = access strategies; other 4 = focus on access and pathways to open access and improve participation.
* Participation strategies = categorized as pathways, student experience, empowerment
* Language used: neoliberal strategies = reflected deficit views (“‘Build education and training opportunities for
* disadvantaged urban populations” (ATN university); social justice approach = strengths based (“continue to attract and support students from low socio-economic backgrounds” (IRU); human empowerment (“Learn in partnership with Indigenous students, staff and communities” (IRU)
* Institutional strategies are influenced by context of research intensity, tradition, culture (p.40).
* Go8 universities tend to emphasise access for high achievers
* Newer universities (particularly those that have evolved from technology-based education; ATN) = more likely to foreground pathways
* Newer universities (e.g. IRU) = “are more likely to have integrated pathway strategies, that move beyond access to facilitate participation” (p.40).

**Core argument:** “socially inclusive universities articulate a comprehensive and integrated suite of strategies spanning the access, participation and empowerment domains”, which include “a high level plan or framework that articulates goals, agreed strategies for building and sustaining a socially inclusive organisation, and indicators of success” (p.27). Need to consider same patterns in context of history – to understand how universities have evolved in particular ways.“Socially inclusive universities’ strategies are underpinned by the following principles:• A strengths-based approach, in which students and staff who may be socially disadvantaged are not seen as having problems that need to be fixed, but as bringing different strengths and diversity to the university which should be celebrated.• An all-encompassing and proactive approach, where social inclusion is embedded in the core activities of the university (learning, teaching and research), and facilitated through a range of participation and empowerment strategies.• An integrated strategy that focuses on social inclusion at all levels – access, participation and empowerment.• A holistic view of participation and engagement which extends across the student engagement cycle, from shaping aspirations through to graduate transitions (all p.41)Universities that have aligned closely (narrowly) with the Australian Government’s social inclusion agenda = “may be missing a valuable opportunity” (p.42) |
| McMahon-Coleman, K.; Percy, A.; & James, B. (2012). [Editorial: Social inclusion – are we there yet?,](https://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/view/220/138) *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 6(2), E1–E6.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *inclusion, we, there, editorial, yet, social* | **Context:** Editorial for JALL issue which arose from Forum titled ‘Critical Discussions about Social Inclusion’ (held at UOW in June 2011). Sets out to explore social inclusion agenda from perspective of academic language/ learning advisors. Authors argue that: “Australian universities have been subject to expansion, diversification and increasing “inclusion” almost since their outset: it is just the discursive, regulatory and operational environment that continues to change” (p.E-1). Offers historical account of equity-related policy changes (Martin, 1964; Whitlam, 1973; Dawkins, 1989; Nelson, 2002; Bradley 2008)**Theoretical frame:** Notes influence of Foucault (understanding power). Draws also on Butler (2004): “As a critical endeavour, we want to begin to mark out and question more specifically the domain of actions and subjects who are understood as “intelligible” or “viable” (Butler, 2004, p. xvii) within the current social inclusion focus in Australian higher education” (p.E-3)**Contributors to SI:** Nakata (2012): under-preparation of indigenous studentsWilliamson (2012): Generation 1.5 blind spotAshton-Hays & Roberts (2012): inclusion of international students in discussions around social inclusion and potential of “neo-imperial economic exploitation of Asia” (p.E-4)Hitch et al. (2012): ‘resource-based approach’ to supporting students which capitalizes on students own/home knowledges and practicesKeevers & Abuodha (2012): call for shift away from deficit model – students’ experiences of inclusion and belongingDearlove & Marland (2012): examines links between financial/ time constraints for low SES studentsBosanquet et al. (2012): explores lived experiences of students by looking at inclusion/ exclusion in terms of Graduate Attributes agenda |
| Mills, C. & Gale, T. (2011). [Re-asserting the place of context in explaining student (under-)achievement](https://www.jstor.org/stable/41237659), *British Journal of Sociology in Education,* 32(2), 239–256.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *context, student achievement, Bourdieu, SES, schooling* | **Context:** Works from argument that improving quality of teaching = fix for student under-achievement. Focus on low SES students – but low SES students are not the only group who do not experience high-quality teaching. Assumption = locus of control/blame for less than satisfactory teaching is the teacher**Aim:** To “draw attention to the context of students’ schooling as one complementary explanation for students’ academic achievement, particularly with regard to the achievement differences between students from differentsocio-economic backgrounds” (p.240). Reminds reader of importance of context (ref to Whitty, 1997). Need to consider external constraints**Theoretical frame**: Bourdieu: field, **Analytic frame:** Critical discourse analysis**Methodology:** Qualitative. Research in one secondary school in ‘economically depressed rural town’ (ex-mining town). 75% students from town, 25% from rural surroundings. 28% have learning difficulties; 24% = Indigenous. School has high staff turnover and staff are generally inexperienced. Conducted 23 interviews with teachers, parents, students = purposefully sampled (for gender, age, ethnicity, SES, academic achievement). Worked with school for 1 year to develop relationship**Findings:** Problematises egalitarian, social-equaliser view of education – notes relationship between low achievement and low SES (and related under-representation in higher education).Examines student positioning*Students positioned as without resources* (e.g. food = hunger; homes = homelessness; money = financial hardship). Teacher described situation where children had textbooks taken back (due to loan scheme) so she went to library and borrowed 12 copies in her name = “the institutional habitus of the school can work against students’ access to resources, how teachers are positioned in this and the stances that are available to them; what they can and cannot do” (p.246). Resources = responsibility of individual rather than system: “Theconnection between under-resourcing and failure seems to be built into the system” (p.247).*Students positioned without a working future*: what happens when the traditional industry of a place is gone? Students = conscious of town’s economic vulnerability – educational qualifications seen as passport to job/money/security, there is also disillusionment and the real value of schooling. After school only 2-3% of students proceed to tertiary education/ some apply for work/ ‘many others’ apply for unemployment benefit. Lack of occupational models.Examines stances of school*Students not likely to do well and parents don’t care*: “In schools servicing disadvantaged communities, ‘low expectations and aspirations for student achievements are often endemic features of school cultures’ (Lingard et al. 2003, 131)”, p.250. Low expectations and deficit views do not serve best interests of studentsAcademic curriculum = not everything: Idea that children in this school need ‘hands-on alternatives’ = communicates message of low expectations = deficit stance |
| Nandy, L. (2012). [What would a socially just education system look like?,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/02680939.2012.710021) *Journal of Educational Policy,* 27(5), 677–680.UKAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Viewpoint from UK politician (Labour; opposition party perspective). Set in post-2010 Conservative-Lib Dem coalition. Speaks to the agenda of competition as ‘school choice’, academic rigour, so that “intelligent children from poorer backgrounds will have the same chance to succeed as their more affluent peers” (p.677), while others have accused the Secretary of State. **Aim:** To describe the Labour vision for a socially just education system**Theoretical frame:** None – explicitly political**Methodology:** Viewpoint essay**Discussion:** Lisa Nandy defines a socially just education system as “one where all children are enabled to achieve their full potential in academic, vocational and social education regardless of background” (p.677) – to equip children for life, not just work. This needs to be underpinned by these principles:1. must be collaborative (not competitive and not a call for mediocrity as per Tory politician); gives example of ‘Great Manchester Challenge’ - see p.68. Challenge is how to act upon poor practice and systematic failures;
2. Performance should be published on basis of ‘intelligent measures’ that reflect the local context and home lives of children, rather than league tables;
3. Recognise difference through provision of different pathways into academic/ vocational qualifications, which involves shifting perceptions of vocational education as subordinate to academic education.
4. The system needs to recognise it doesn’t always work in the way intended, requiring investment in lifelong learning
 |
| Nelson, K.; Creagh, T., & Clarke, J. (2009). Social justice and equity in the higher education context. Literature analysis and synthesis: Development of a set of social justice principles. OLTAUS Annotation by Sally Baker  | **Context:** Report produced from ALTC-OLT grant-funded project “Good practice for safeguarding student learning engagement in higher education institutions”, which was designed to review Monitor Student Learning Engagement (MSLE) initiatives. Intention of this report is to review the literature on social justice and craft a set of social justice principles that should be considered when designing/implementing MSLEs.**Methodology:** Literature review – covers concepts/ perspectives/ definitions of social justice – works particularly from:Sturman (1997): 3 aspects of social justice in education: distributive component – equality of opportunity; curricular justice; non-material component = ensuring students are equipped with ‘skiils’ such as decision making. Gale’s (2000) three-part typology of social justice: distributive = proportional distribution (fairness by redistribution of goods equally); retributive = fairness by competition for goods; recognitive = democratic processes (fairness through positive recognition of differences between groups). Enacting social justice in HE: social inclusion as a method for ‘progressing fairness’ (Marginson, 2011); discusses widening participation in UK/ NZ/ US (very brief mentions)Focus on student engagement (student engagement surveys) + ref to holistic approach (Nelson, Kift & Clarke, 2012; see also Trowler, 2010) Zepke & Leach, 2005 argue for changing institutional culture rather than students having to adapt (discourses).**Core argument:** Social justice principles to guide MSLE initiatives:1. **Self-determination**: students participate in program design, enactment and evaluation and make informed decisions about their individual participation in the program
2. **Rights**: MSLE initiatives should ensure that all students are treated with dignity and respect and have their individual cultural, social and knowledge systems recognised and valued
3. **Access**: Programs are designed to serve as active and impartial conduits to the resources of the institution (e.g. curriculum, learning, academic, social, cultural, support, financial and other resources)
4. **Equity**: Programs are designed to demystify and decode dominant university cultures, processes, expectations and language for differently prepared cohorts
5. **Participation**: MSLE programs lead to socially inclusive practices and students experience a sense of belonging and connectedness
 |
| O’Shea, H.; Onsman, A.; McKay, J. (2011). *Students from low socioeconomic status backgrounds in higher education: An annotated bibliography 2000-2011.* Higher Education Research Group (HERG): Deakin AustraliaAUSAnnotation by Sally Baker  | **Context:** Works from idea that social inclusion is a fairly empty discourse – translation into practice/pedagogy not easily visible. Examines impact of widening participation + casualization of workforce/ increased workload of academics (see Bexley, Arkoudis & James, 2013). Examines literature relating to academic capital/ institutional habitus of university and impact on ‘non-traditional’ students = impact of deficit discourse (Foucauldian position adopted; aka – not residing in individual, but as product of discourses. Smit (2012) = argues that ‘disadvantage’ = “umbrella term to cover a wide array of perceived shortcomings’ (p. 370)” (p.10)**Aim:** To examine the perceptions and understandings of university staff – how they perceive their role in relation to social inclusion**Theoretical frame:** Foucauldian notion of discourse, power, deficit**Methodology:** 2-stage mixed methods; in-depth interviews with 32 academics (representing broad spectrum of roles/levels/employment types) and an online survey (n=272) – 26 questionnaire items including: ‘What does the term inclusivity mean to you?’, ‘Which students tend to require extra support with their learning, assessments and completion of coursework?’, ‘How do you implement inclusive pedagogies in your coursework?’, ‘How would you describe/identify student from LSES backgrounds?’ and ‘Do you feel you need extra support/what could the university do to support inclusive teaching?’ (p.5). 63.6% = female; 36% = male. 84.9% = experience of UG teaching; 27.9% =HDR experience; 58.1% = casually employed/ on session contracts (thus ineligible to supervise HDR). Only 4% = professors**Findings:** Survey = strong support for notion of inclusive teaching = “essential to HE” and “basics of good teaching” (81%), but also 20% expressed cynicism/ lack of clarity/ neutral (“lip service is not enough”, p.6; “inclusive is a vague term”, p.8). Concern expressed about terminology and that inclusive teaching = ‘dumbing down’ (p.7). Concern also about adding to workload. 79% agreed that inclusive teaching = difficult to do well, especially for casual staff (lack of resources – time, money, space, practical assistance). But 63% thought that inclusive teaching = not enough to overcome challenges faced by students: 22 comments = teachers have responsibility; 28 = responsibility outside remit of teaching role; 20 comments = students ill-prepared for university**Core argument:** “From the analysis of our data, it is difficult to get away from the conclusion that, followingFoucault (1984), for LSES students the politics of truth is one entwined with deficit” (p.10) – existing practices “promulgate deficit discourses” (p.10). Framework of deficit [appears to operate on a continuum] – one extreme =notion of student deficit (student must adapt); at other end = focus on institution (needs to respond to diversifying student body). There is a level of misunderstanding that keeps inclusion/ equity a concern. Also point to influence of casualisation: “It is difficult to expect people to enact inclusion when they do not feel included or valued in the institution… The lack of permanency may also translate into a sense of powerlessness around the issue of inclusion: how can staff make others feel included when they feel excluded?” (p.11) |
| Osei-Kofi, N., Shahjahan, R. & Patton, L. (2010). [Centering social justice in the study of higher education: The challenges and possibilities for institutional change](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10665684.2010.483639), *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 43(3), 326–340. USAAnnotation by Anna Xavier Keywords (Anna’s): *social justice; higher education; institutional change*  | **Context:** Set in a context where several academic programs placing emphasis on social justice have emerged in US and Canada, although HE has only recently been viewed as a ‘major social institution worthy of study’ (p. 327) (Altbach, 2006) in regards to the role of education in social justice. Institutional context: A small group of faculty & students at Iowa State Education created a Social Justice Concentration in their Ph.D. program in HE. Course context: Course reflects a wide range of expertise in the faculty; most critical course – introductory course, which provides students with ‘multidisciplinary theories & concepts grounded in social justice, from individual to structural perspectives’. **Aim:** To ‘illustrate and grapple with the challenges of doing social justice work in a neoliberal academic environment’ (abstract) in HE at this point of time. **Theoretical frame:** Not specified in study.**Methodology:** Essay on challenges & possibilities of developing a social justice concentration. **Discussion:** 1) Challenges & possibilities of resources – challenges: insufficient resources (largest struggle for concentration); limited human resources; possibilities: diverse range of expertise in faculty; support from department chair; students interested in the concentration (great resource).; 2)Challenges & possibilities of organisational structure – challenges: institutional structures & constraints which fragment collectivistic & shared leadership; possibilities – informal networks & alliances across the university to build support among colleagues; 3)Challenges & possibilities of centering subjugated knowledges – challenges: questioning the fundamental “organizational forms of the university,” by including perspectives that go beyond the focus on “rational, impersonal, non-emotive, and non- experiential learning” (Arthur, 2009, p. 82); possibilities: introducing elements (eg: arts-based inquiry & contemplative practices) which aid in valuing & centering a wide range of perspectives to ‘challenge the status quo and nurture a dialogue’ (p. 335) about what valid knowledge is in HE; 4)Challenges & possibilities of impact – challenges: ensuring that the way social justice is engaged ‘values diverse perspectives’ (p. 335); 5)Implications: a)The social concentration development process suggests that change strategies employed are impacted by the “logics of the institution” (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008, p.76) – there is therefore a mutual interdependence among the structure, the logic of the institution and the critical agency of HE practitioners (Armstrong & Bernstein, 2008; Canaan & Shumar, 2008); b)Despite the need to contextualise each situation in terms of challenges, it should be recognised that these challenges are not in isolation, but interconnected, where efforts of HE practitioners in addressing on challenge may ultimately affect other approaches or outcomes to other challenges. **Core argument:** Althoughthe challenges in developing a social justice concentration in the selected HE institution match and in some cases far outweigh the opportunities, there is no acceptable alternative for not advocating social justice in HE. HEIs should ‘continue to strive to center subjugated knowledges in the academy, to honour different ways of knowing, and to work for progressive social change by engaging in projects that create an academy that is truly inclusive’ (abstract).  |
| O’Shea, S.; Lysaght, P.; Roberts, J.; & Harwood, V. (2016). [Shifting the blame in higher education – social inclusion and deficit discourses](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07294360.2015.1087388?journalCode=cher20), *Higher Education Research & Development,* 35(2), 322–336.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *equity, higher education, inclusive pedagogies, social inclusion* | **Context:** Works from premise that on principle, social inclusive has been embraced by HEIs but in practice, it is difficult to operationalize in pedagogy. Located in Australian university with 14% low SES student population**Aim:** To examine staff perceptions of social inclusion and inclusive pedagogies in one Australian university, particularly with regard to teaching low SES students. Starts from widening participation/ post-Bradley review context. Notes difficulties created by increasing casualization of academic workforce. Notes that attrition remains concerning (12.8% in 2012). Scopes literature on non-traditional students (incl. Bourdieu, Liz Thomas, Jennifer Lawrence) – particularly focusing on ‘institutional habitus’. Also scopes SA work (McKenna, Smit) on deficit**Analytic frame:** Foucauldian discourse analysis**Methodology:** Mixed methods approach: online survey for all academic staff (n=272; 60% of whom = casual/sessional staff) and in-depth interviews with academic staff (n=32) – from variety of disciplines/ faculties and roles/responsibilities**Findings:** *Discourse of inclusivity*: survey responses = strong support for idea of inclusive teaching (86.5% agree/strongly agree) = essential and contributed to ‘rich learning environment’ (e.g “like putting a big blanket over whole cohort to make them feel included”). Two respondents questioned meaning of inclusivity – commenting that it sounds like a ‘buzzword’ and questioning how anyone could be opposed to inclusivity (p.328)*Enactments of inclusive pedagogies*: many respondents concerned with equality (meaning equal access to materials) and requires extra work. 79% agreed that it is difficult to ‘do’ inclusive teaching well (construed as ‘catering for difference’ by one respondent and ‘giving every student opportunity to participate’ by another). Lack of time/ space= noted as significant barrier to successful inclusive teaching.Challenges to inclusivity: 63% = being ‘inclusive’ not enough to overcome challenges faced by students. 22 respondents = viewed responsibility as residing with lecturer/ 28 respondents = viewed responsibility as residing with students (aka – their responsibility to seek help). 20 = students too underprepared to succeed.Authors argue that findings suggest “strong sense of student responsibility in terms of inclusive practices” (p.331) – refuting Devlin’s 2013 claim that such deficit positions are shifting [ha, as if!]. Authors also point to impact of casualization on inclusivity: “It is difficult to expect people to enact inclusion when they do not feel included or valued in the institution” (p.332)**Core argument:** Similar to Devlin, argues for ‘dual responsibility’ to be shared by staff and students to move beyond deficit perspectives. |
| Ruebain, D. (2012). [Aren’t we there yet?,](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603108.2011.611834) *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education,* 16(1), 3–6.UKAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Viewpoint from Chief Executive of Equality Challenge (the body tasked with advancing equality anddiversity in higher education) – equality stubbornly remains a problem in universities. **Methodology**: essay**Discussion**: Inequality = based on two incorrect assumptions: 1) there is a ‘correct’ identity and 2) cultural norms = unchangeable, which lead to irrational judgments and the othering of non-normative identities. Discusses developments in racial equality in general. However, this equality is not as deep as it should be; Ruebain notes that although the representation of BME students in English HE has improved, graduate/ employment outcomes for BME students are lower than for white students. Equality legislation in HE that has responded to the broader societal/cultural shifts illustrates progress. Author makes the case that in the context of increasing globalization and competition, this is the perfect time to focus on equality and diversity: “If organisations are able to manage and harness diversity through fostering a culture that can flexibly meet different requirements and which values difference, then they are more likely to be competitive, have a more satisfied and productive workforce and importantly, be attractive to both staff and students in what is a globalized working and learning environment” (p.5). Notes how chronological age can function as a form of discrimination/ discriminatory behavior. Also, HEIs have been competing to demonstrate how welcome and embracing they are. Core argument: Paradigm shifts have already happened in recent history, we need to continue “to ensure a high-quality, world-leading HE sector” (p.6) |
| Shay, S. & Peseta, T. (2016). [A socially just curriculum reform agenda](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13562517.2016.1159057), *Teaching in Higher Education,* 21(4), 361–366.SAAnnotated by Sally Baker | **Context:** Editorial for TinHE. Starts with comment about ‘Rhodes Must Fall’ movement in South Africa (2015) – focusing on globalised system that is “increasingly characterized by inequality” (p.361). Special issue = focused on socially just curriculum reform, with a shared “concern about the ways in which curricula are deeply implicated in the processes of producing and reproducing inequality” (p.361)Editors draw on Fraser’s notion of ‘parity of participation’ and mis/recognitionMiller (2016) = brings instrumentalist drivers for curriculum reform into foreground – with calls for inter-disciplinary research to ‘solve’ big problems glossing over epistemic tensionsAnwaruddin (2016) focuses on role of curriculum in relation to inequality in Second Language Teaching EducationHordern (2016) = recontextualisation can lead to misleading knowledge valuesColeman (2016) = recontextualisation of academic knowledge/ literacies from professional context and into curriculumWinberg et al. (2016) – looks at engineering curricula and epistemological flows/ semantic wavesLuckett et al (2016)= uses post-colonial theory to examine entry to privileged/white university in South AfricaAbbas et al. (2016) = examines societal transformative potential of curriculum and pedagogy, particularly through acquisition of disciplinary knowledgeClegg (2016) = looks at what reframing curriculum could look like/ do (social realist perspective) |
| Singh, M. (2011). [The place of social justice in higher education and social change discourses](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03057925.2011.581515?journalCode=ccom20), *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 41(4), 481–494.UKAnnotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *social justice, higher education, knowledge society discourses, social inequalities, inclusion, quality assurance* | **Context:** Unpacks instantiations of social justice discourse in discussions about higher education and social change – has social justice “been appropriated into a neo-liberal strategy for growing competitive economies” (abstract)? Can an instrument of public management be used to advance social justice in HE?Makes case that social justice does not have ‘common set of understandings’ “at the level of political ideology, normative principle, and social policy and strategy” (p.481), and as a result it gets reappropriated by different stakeholders with differing ideological/normative underpinnings (p.483). Social justice gets 'stretched in different directions”, depending on how policy goals are characterised (p.482).“The pursuit of social justice can be seen as the search for a fair (not necessarily equal) distribution of what is beneficial and valued as well as what is burdensome in a society” (p.482). Social justice is often discussed in terms of/ relationship to policy, philosophy and ethics, but structural material and cultural frames are also significant (p.482). Discusses social justice in HE in context of European Science Foundation foresight exercise on higher education in Europe beyond 2010.Discussion of literature on knowledge societies and social justice; main points:Some claim that knowledge societies have democratizing function (because of expanded access to information/ technology) – but see commodification of knowledge argumentIntensification of competitionHE is a public good (universally accessible but partially available) = confers private benefits and public gains but it also has potential to sustain/perpetuate inequality. What does social justice look like in low income countries? Discusses social justice in South Africa**Aim:** To “to track what happens to social justice in making this transition from philosophical principle and normative aspiration to strategic goal and targeted intervention in the world of social policy” (p.483) and explore these RQs:\_ Has the notion of social justice in higher education been appropriated into a neo-liberal strategy for growing competitive economies?\_ Conversely, is it possible to deploy an instrument of new public management for advancing the purposes of social justice in higher education?**Findings:** Appropriation of quality assurance = ‘indispensable’ and “ubiquitous imperative” (p.487) that has spread rapidly and been professionalised. Policy rationales = economic/ efficiency/ value for money = not necessarily educational improvement. Mostly positioned as negatively, as ‘audit culture’. Predominant identity of QA = instrument of new public management. What are possibilities of reframing QA in a way that addresses social justice?Describes how South Africa implemented a new QA system that included the social justice/transformation imperative in its definition of quality |
| Slee, R. (2001). [Social justice and the changing directions in educational research: the case of inclusive education](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13603110010035832), *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 5(2-3), 167–177.AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *inclusive education, disabilities* | **Context:** Disabilities. Speaking to an audience of like-minded people so explicitly does not need to debate the merits of inclusive education, but cautions against resting on assumptions about shared definitions: “The absence of a language for inclusive education that stipulates its vocabulary and grammar increases the risk for political misappropriation” (p.167). Discusses inclusive education in context of special education (with particular focus on disabilities). Frames discussion around introduction of special/ inclusive education – notes how inclusive education = narrowly framed around disorders and defects, rather than acknowledging inclusive education= for all students.**Aim:** To discuss “human rights and the production and reproduction of meaning as it adheres to the intersection of disablement and education” (p.169). Asks questions about how to teach and what research to draw on when teaching education students about inclusive education**Theoretical frame:****Methodology:** Essay**Discussion:** Scopes the evolution of ‘special education’. Argues that “The exclusion and `othering’ of young people through the forms and processes of education is endemic” and “The context of education policycreates the conditions for exclusion that militate against an inclusive educational project” (p.172). Makes the point that schooling was never designed to be for everyone, so the more education has opened to the masses, the more it has “developed the technologies of exclusion and containment” (p.172). Makes 3 propositions for teacher education:1. inclusive education = cultural politics
2. consider cross-cultural dialogue (inter/intra-disciplinary with a focus on social justice)
3. teaching focus should shift to difference and identity politics

**Core argument:**  For inclusive education to be congruent with hope for social justice, need to confront political nature of teacher education, and work against tokenistic and surface “strive against the notion that compulsory special education units for trainee teachers is better than nothing” (p.175). |
| Thomas, L.; Bland, D.; & Duckworth, V. (2012). [Teachers as advocates for widening participation](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Teachers-as-advocates-for-widening-participation-Thomas-Bland/5c748cb6eae1af36bc760fda40efd2e00d99755c), *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning,* 14(2), 40–58.UK/AUSAnnotation by Sally Baker Keywords: *pre-service teacher education; initial teacher training; newly qualified teachers; widening participation; access; students; advocates; ambassadors*. | **Context:** Widening participation in context of teacher training/ pre-service teacher education in Australia and UK. Focus = outreach programs/ mentoring/ aspiration raising and teachers’ contributions/ contributions of teacher education**Aim:** To examine how teacher education programs contribute/ how they should contribute to preparing teachers to advocate for WP and to reimagine how WP might work; “as agents of a ‘pedagogy of difference’” (p.43).**Theoretical frame:** Draws on Bourdieu’s tools: (classed) capital, habitus. Offers working definition of ‘advocacy’ on p.45**Methodology:** Literature review: role of school teachers in WP/ student ambassador/ mentors (evaluation of). Asks 3 questions to frame review of 60 papers (published literature and grey literature):1. In what ways can teachers and pre-service teachers be advocates for WP?2. How does teacher education and training prepare them to be advocates for WP?3. How could pre-service teacher education be enhanced to enable more teachers and pre-service teachers to be better advocates for WP? **Findings:***Question* 1: scopes literature that illustrates narrowing/ deficit conceptions of teachers with relation to NZ indigenous v. European students (Rubie-Davies, Hattie and Hamilton (2006); class-based assumptions in UK (Preston, 2003); unexamined prejudices in Australia (Allard & Santoro, 2006); lack of representation of minority groups in teaching staff in UK (Menter et al., 2006), USA (Bartolomé, 2004). Also, note work by Basit & Santoro (2010) = ‘ethnic’ teachers can be cultural experts. Authors push back against this idea = teacher training should ensure all teachers = advocates for WP: “Advocacy for WP requires more than employing teachers who reflect the communities they serve and extends beyond ethnicity” (p.47).*Question* 2: Notes literature that asserts that teacher education tends to treat student diversity in “a superficial and fragmentary way” (p.48): e.g, Mills et al., 2008; Abbott-Chapman, 2011. Include attention to teacher identity (lack of focus on teachers’ identity formation), teachers’ empathy, valuing diversity – draws on New Literacy Studies (Barton et al., 2007), critical reflection, and advocacy and dealing with conflict (fear of conflict: Athanases and de Oliveira, 2007).*Question* 3: Examines literature on student mentors/ambassadors – evidence that student ambassadors = effective approach to WP (Austin and Hatt, 2005; Church and Kerrigan, 2010; Hatt, Baxter and Tate,2007; HEFCE, 2003; Thompson, 2010). Argues that institutions “have largely failed to take a strategic approach to partnership with schools” (p.51). Students can be role models or a form of ‘hot knowledge’ [but see Slack et al., 2013 for argument positioning students as ‘warm information’]**Core argument:** Although teacher training education = well place to advance WP agenda, WP and teacher education do not work collaboratively to achieve this end. Authors intend to “review current teacher education programmes to assess the degree to which potential WP advocates are already prepared for the role [of WP advocates]” (p.54) |
| Whiteford, G.; Shah, M., Chenicheri, S.N. (2013). [Equity and Excellence are not Mutually Exclusive](https://research-repository.uwa.edu.au/en/publications/equity-and-excellence-are-not-mutually-exclusive-a-discussion-of-), *Quality Assurance in Education* 21(3), 299–310.AUSAnnotation by Georgina RamsayKeywords *Disadvantaged groups, Social inclusion, Higher education, Government policy, Academic standards, Australia, United Kingdom* | * Contemporary HEIs concurrently focusing on: access and widening participation; improving the quality and standard of HE; enhancing reputation and competitiveness. Are these aims mutually exclusive? Discourse: increased enrolments of students of disadvantaged backgrounds must not compromise quality outcomes
* Those working in academia have suggested that students with lower entry scores/disadvantaged backgrounds are able to compete with students with higher entry scores/privileged backgrounds if there is attention to inclusive curriculum, greater academic support, quality teaching, and counselling
* Difficulty for social inclusion agenda is pre-occupation with rankings at an international scale. Diversity is not accounted for in these leagues, and represents a risk for institutional reputation
* Class and race have complex factors that shape ‘success’ in HE
* Preconception that disadvantaged students will be underperforming students; and time spent with them disadvantages higher performing students (thus leading to academic decline)
* Research shows that student achievement and experience benefits from having diverse student cohorts (so this would be a protective factor in the ‘excellence’ paradigm)

Hence this article argues that a social inclusion agenda related to increasing the equity of access and participation of disadvantaged students does not have a negative impact on academic standards and outcomes, despite preconceptions; but argues that there needs to be adequate support structures through policy, community, adequacy of preparation, and the institution to enable this ‘excellence’ |
| Wilson-Strydom, M. (2015). [University access and theories of social justice: contributions of the capabilities approach](https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1048861), *Higher Education,* 69, 143–155.SAAnnotation by Sally BakerKeywords: *Social justice, Capabilities approach, Access, Widening participation* | **Context:** University access in South African context. Examines social justice (theories of and application) in consideration of WP. Argues that social justice as a much-used term has lost much of its meaning; therefore justifiying the revisiting of social justice theory and how helpful it can be to understand inequality in HE: “The difference between increased participation and widened participation and the ways in which these terms are used in policy discourse and practice is one example of how competing social justice claims play out in the access terrain” (p.144). Offers an overview of the South African HE landscape post-Apartheid (now 23 HEIs). Proportional representation of African students (coloured/ black) = an issue, compared with White African participation**Theoretical frame:** Three theories of social justice drawn on: Rawls (distributive justice); Young (justice and the politics of difference), to argue for Capabilities Approach (Sen; Nussbaum)**Methodology:** Essay**Findings:** *Rawls (1999) = Justice as Fairness (aka distributive justice)* – This is an ideal notion of justice, which works from notion of ‘original position’ = hypothetical starting point of innocence/ ignorance of difference and status, which recognised the plurality of views of what a ‘good life’ is for different people/ groups. If this ‘original position’ existed, we would make decisions based on utilitarian notions of what is fair to all. Rawls proposed two main principles for basis of just society: 1) position in society = based on ‘natural lottery’, thus morally arbitrary; 2) = ‘difference principle’ = assessment of what ‘primary goods’ (means and resources): “inequalities can only be seen as just should the inequality lead to the greatest benefit for the least well off (in terms of their holdings of primary goods)” (p.146). Two arguments against applying Rawl’s ideas about justice to access to HE: 1) as Sen points out, the focus on primary goods does not take into account what people can do with their resources [aka: it only focuses on what people have, not how they use it] and 2) doesn’t take into account the circumstances within which people live (equality is not the same as equity) – see critique of distributive justice from Young and Fraser (below)*Young (1990) = Justice and the politics of difference*. This is a multidimensional notion. Begins with critique of distributive notion of justice because of the focus on the allocation of resources concealing the importance/ influence of sociocultural structures and institutional contexts. Where primary goods were explicated to include non-materials goods (such as agency, voice etc.), Young argued these were constructed in linear/ non-dynamic ways that fail to account for the complexity of social processes. Young argues that a focus on distribution is not enough; there are 2 social conditions that impede justice: oppression and domination, and she identifies 5 forms of oppression: exploitation, marginalisation, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence – these make up the constituent parts of injustice. Eisenberg (2006) has taken up Young’s ideas in the context of education, and suggests that elements where concrete strategies to resist oppression play out at the level of curricula and programs, “that both reflect and raise awareness of societies consisting of multicultural, multinational and multilingual groupings, as well as tackling issues of oppression and domination such as racism, sexism and so on” (p.148), as well as seeking the involvement of people who represented disadvantaged groups. Limitation = not sufficient analytic space for understanding individual difference [as opposed to group difference] and agency. In the specific context of access to HE, therefore, needs the application of groups as units of analysis which can ignore the experiences of individuals; “Thus, Young’s analytical privileging of the group over the individual limits the value of this approach for fully understanding inequality and injustice in higher education” (p.149).*Fraser (1996, 1997) Parity of Participation* = also acknowledges the distribution is important but not sufficient for explaining issues of social justice. Her tritaparte version of social justice = redistribution (socioeconomic dimension/ form of socioeconomic justice), recognition (cultural dimension) and representation (political dimension). Together = form an analytic frame for examining parity of participation. With specific application to HE, widening access = broadly about expanding participation. Redistribution = largely understood at level of financial resources (e.g. funding, scholarships, other forms of financial support). Recognition = needs to connect with issues related to language of study/assessment, the welcoming of diverse students, support and identification of ‘at risk’ students. Limitation = again there is a lack of analytic space to account for individual agency, which Leibowitz argues = based on the assumption “that higher education is an activity that is done to students and not with them” (2009: 94; cited p.150).*Sen (1999)/ Nussbaum (2000) = Capabilities approach.* Takes as starting point the well-being of individuals and quality of life/ values. With regard to university access = involves asking questions of what students can do and why they want to be there. Focus on wellbeing = antithesis to large-scale standardized assessment for enrolment. Capabilities = ‘opportunity freedoms’, therefore the freedom “an individual has to enjoy the functionings necessary for their well-being” (p.151). Capabilities brings agency and structure together (thus moving beyond the limitations of Young and Fraser) through ‘conversion factors’, so that the analytic lens can focus on how well (or not) people are able to convert opportunities into achievements, which allows for individual/ structural difference of opportunity to be accounted for. Conversion factors include “personal heterogeneities, environmental diversities, variations in social climate, differences in relational perspectives, and distribution within the family” (Sen, 1999: 71; cited p.151)**Core argument:** The capabilities approach offers a more holistic analytic frame for understanding issues of social justice in HE because it “draws attention to the importance of understanding students’ everyday lives and experiences, and the conditions (personal, social, economic, environmental) that enable and constrain students’* wellbeing and performance” (p.152), and foregrounds the ‘unqeual conversion’ of HE opportunities. Making resources available (e.g. more places in HE) = not enough to address social justice issues; “It is the relationship between the available resources and the ability of each student to convert these into valued capabilities and then make choices which will inform their actual functionings (outcomes) that ought to be evaluated” (p.151-2)
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