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It has been a great honour and privilege, and I believe that BERA is in excellent shape to face whatever the future may hold. I have found a number of aspects of BERA to be especially noteworthy during my tenure. I’ll try to share with you some of my most lasting impressions, in no particular order. Here goes.

First, I would say that BERA is now a very professional outfit – much more so than when I first came on to Council several years ago – due to deliberate efforts to make ourselves more efficient and effective. Behind the scenes there is always an amazing amount of work being done to keep us going, and I hope we never take this for granted. At the same time, we should not be totally dependent on professional support, and I am always very impressed by the amount of academic involvement there is in our activities, both in leadership roles and in taking part and contributing in all sorts of ways. BERA has always been a body that is supported by its own membership, and this continues to be essential.

Our new developments with heads of departments will, I hope, highlight the importance of this work in the interests of particular institutions, as well as for the general health of educational research.

Third, I must pay tribute to our special interest groups (SIGs) – an outstanding example of a specific type of academic support, pursuing specialist activities in a very wide range of research areas that promote the quality and overall impact of our work. Just a couple of months ago I was invited to take part in one SIG conference held in Manchester, and I was once again enthralled by the commitment shown by our members. Our regular meetings with SIG convenors are always positive and energising to take part in.

Number four – and I’m running out of space here as well as time – I think we are becoming more outward-facing as an organisation. We take our continuing links with European associations very seriously, as we do developing our relationships around the world. Increasingly our conferences welcome delegates from many different countries, often through our bursary schemes, and I hope that we will be able to support research in other countries and learn from them too.

And finally, I don’t see BERA resting on its laurels: there are always new initiatives, such as our doctoral fellowship scheme which has just started, as well as a growing number of awards for excellence of different kinds which we are able to support. Long may this continue.

There I must rest, bid a fond farewell to a role that I have found greatly stimulating and always interesting, and pass it on safely to my good colleague Dominic Wyse. See you, I hope, at our upcoming conference in Manchester!

Professor Gary McCulloch
UCL Institute of Education

Surely not – can two years speed past quite so quickly?
So it seems: time flies, and this is my farewell to the BERA community as your president.
SPRING AND SUMMER BERA EVENTS: A LOOK BACK

Among the many excellent events held by BERA in recent months was the first in a series of seminars on school-readiness as part of our research commission on Competing Discourses of Early Childhood Education and Care, which will report next year. Held in Manchester on 9 May, the event was a sold-out success: look out for announcements of further events in other locations arising from this project.

Also particularly popular was ‘Statutory Relationships and Sex Education: Issues of Cultural and Moral Diversity’, another sold-out event which sought to connect the best practice-oriented research in these complex areas with curriculum, policy and lived experience.

We also held inaugural events for two new special interest groups (SIGs): the Nature, Outdoor Learning and Play SIG on 2 July, and the Mental Health, Wellbeing and Education SIG on 12 July. Both well-attended conferences assessed the state of their respective fields and set agendas for driving forward and sharing new research.

BERA PRESIDENCY: GARY MCCULLOCH PASSES THE MANTLE

Professor Gary McCulloch’s column in this issue of RI (page 4) will sadly be his last as president of BERA, as he will be stepping down in September 2019. In his two-year presidency, Gary oversaw growth and innovation for the Association, including the landmark Future of Education in Wales conference and the extensively revised and expanded fourth edition of BERA’s Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research. The BERA office would like to thank Gary for his service and good counsel throughout his tenure (though we hope to continue to benefit from both).

As announced in issue 136, Professor Dominic Wyse of the UCL Institute of Education will assume the presidency at BERA’s AGM in September.

ANNOUNCING THE 2019 JOHN NISBET FELLOWS

The annual John Nisbet Fellowship celebrates the contributions that individuals have made to educational research, policy and practice across their careers.

This year BERA honours three leaders in the field whose work has been, and will continue to be, of great benefit both to our community and to the public at large. They are:

- Professor Walter Humes, University of Stirling
- Professor Mary James, University of Cambridge
- Professor Andrew Pollard, UCL Institute of Education.

See pages 6–8 for features on the careers of the three winners, each of whom will attend BERA Conference 2019 in Manchester on 10–12 September: Mary James and Andrew Pollard will present a joint keynote, and Walter Humes will present a breakfast session.

BERA’S PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND IMPACT AWARD 2019: NOW OPEN TO APPLICATIONS

This annual award – which celebrates significant educational research and activities that have demonstrably engaged the public and policymakers – is now open to applications. See page 15 for details on how to apply by the deadline of 27 September 2019.

For special features on the winning and commended research projects from 2018 turn to pages 11–14.
Since 2014 BERA has awarded the John Nisbet Fellowship to one or more people who are deemed to have made outstanding contributions to educational research over their careers. Named in honour of BERA’s first president, the award recognises individuals who exemplify BERA’s commitment to encouraging educational research and its application for the improvement of practice and public benefit.

His publications range over a number of fields within educational studies – policy analysis, curriculum development, history of education, teacher education, professionalism, leadership and management. Some of his work has employed a form of discourse analysis, but he is not committed to a single approach, favouring methodological eclecticism.

The recurring theme of his writing has been a desire to question orthodoxies and challenge the complacency of much official thinking. *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education, 1800–1980* (John Donald Publishers, 1983), co-edited with H. M. Paterson, sought to open up new lines of enquiry about the Scottish educational tradition. *The Leadership Class in Scottish Education* (John Donald Publishers, 1986) raised uncomfortable questions about the official narrative promoted by political and professional leaders, particularly in relation to claims about the democratic character of the policy community. Its naming of individuals and critical scrutiny of key agencies (the inspectorate, directors of education, teachers’ organisations) caused controversy by departing from the deferential culture of approved professional discourse.

The establishment of the Scottish parliament in 1999 created an opportunity to provide informed analysis of new developments in Scottish education. This led to the publication of successive editions of *Scottish Education* (1999, 2003, 2008, 2013, 2018), a 1,000-page text covering all sectors of the educational system. Walter co-edited the first three editions with T. G. K. Bryce; for the fourth and fifth editions, two additional editors – Donald Gillies and Aileen Kennedy – were brought on board. The book has become a standard text, widely cited by students, researchers and professionals.

Although the main focus of Walter’s work has been on education in Scotland, he has also written about topics that will resonate with researchers in other countries – globalisation, the corporate drift of higher education, the infrastructure of educational research and the teaching of controversial issues. As well as his academic output, he has published a substantial amount of journalism, having been a columnist for the *Times Educational Supplement* (Scotland) for 10 years and a contributor to the online journals *Scottish Review* and *Sceptical Scot*. His recent work has combined biography and history, tracing the links between social context and the achievements of educational radicals (A. S. Neill, R. F. Mackenzie, Margaret McMillan, William Boyd, John Maclean). He is a member of the Royal Society of Edinburgh’s education committee, which seeks to inform government policy through representations to the Scottish parliament and the production of advice papers. In 2010 he was made an honorary member of the Scottish Educational Research Association.
In 1979 she gained a part-time MA(Ed) in curriculum studies at the Institute of Education, London, and then started a career in educational research at the Open University (OU) where, in 1990, she gained a PhD by published work.

From 1979 to 1989 she worked as a contract researcher: first as a support to the curriculum group at the OU, then on a dental health education project at the University of Cambridge, then back to the OU to work on the national evaluation of records of achievement. In 1989 she secured a permanent position as a tutor at the Cambridge Institute of Education, which in 1992 was incorporated into the University of Cambridge. There she became lecturer, senior lecturer and then reader. She was also elected a fellow of Lucy Cavendish College, Cambridge in 1996, where she remains a fellow commoner.

Throughout her career Mary has focussed on how teachers can improve learning by investigating what happens in their interactions with students, the curriculum, assessment processes and school structures – an interest that initially developed into research and teaching on school self-evaluation and teacher action-research. She later became increasingly interested in assessment by teachers in classrooms as a powerful tool for improving learning, and in the impact of national, local and school policies on classroom practice and students’ experience. She has published widely in these areas. Her most widely read work explores the relationship between assessment, teaching and theories of learning. Her more than 100 published books, articles and chapters include her ‘selected works’, published in the Routledge World Library of Educationalists series.

She was a founding editor (1990–1996) of the *Curriculum Journal*, and a member of the Assessment Reform Group (ARG) from 1992 to 2010.

In 2004 she was appointed to a chair in education at the Institute of Education, London, linked to her role as deputy director of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Teaching and Learning Research Programme (TLRP). In 2008, after completing an ESRC programme director’s fellowship, she returned to the Faculty of Education at the University of Cambridge as associate director of research. In 2011, she was a member of the Coalition government’s expert group for the review of the national curriculum. She retired at the end of 2013.

In ‘retirement’, Mary has continued to do advisory work with professional, research and governmental groups. From 2000 to 2014 she advised the Hong Kong government’s education bureau on its educational reform programme, and since 2013 she has been a member of the scientific advisory board for the NordForsk Education for Tomorrow Programme in the Nordic countries. From 2011 to 2013 she was honoured to be president of BERA.
He taught through the 1970s, was a teacher-educator in the 1980s, a researcher in the 1990s, a research programme director in the 2000s, and semi-retired in the 2010s.

As a former school teacher, Andrew’s research interests focussed on teaching–learning processes and learner experiences, and on the development of evidence-informed classroom practice. His first book, *The Social World of the Primary School* (Cassell, 1985), analysed teacher–pupil relationships. His work on classroom practice led to the establishment of a popular textbook, *Reflective Teaching*, which has evolved through a dozen versions since 1987 and has been used by many thousands of trainee teachers over the years.

He worked extensively on the effects of national and institutional policies on learning. For instance, he co-directed the Primary, Assessment, Curriculum and Experience (PACE) project, tracking the impact of the 1988 Education Reform Act on practices and experiences in English primary school classrooms. His early qualitative work developed into the Identity and Learning Programme (ILP), a pioneering longitudinal ethnographic study of the interaction of identity, learning, assessment, career and social differentiation in children’s experiences of schooling from the ages of four to 16. He was the first professor of primary education to be appointed at the University of Cambridge.

Andrew advised governments and their agencies in the UK and internationally, particularly on primary education, beginning in 1991 though committees on England’s key stage 1 curriculum. In 2010 he worked with Mary James on the Coalition government’s policy on national curriculum reform – trying, unsuccessfully, to moderate its extremes.

From 2002 until 2009 he was director of the Teaching and Learning Research Programme (TLRP) – the UK’s largest ever programmatic research investment in education. With a budget of £43 million, TLRP involved over 700 researchers in higher education institutions across the UK, and its scale and influence generated wide-ranging networks. Andrew contributed to the establishment of the World Education Research Association (WERA) and led the UK Strategic Forum for Research in Education, whose 2010 report, *Unlocking Learning*, remains relevant today and is available on the BERA website.

Having served on the 1996 and 2001 Research Assessment Exercise education sub-panels, he was invited to chair the education sub-panel for the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF). The outcome, in which 30 per cent of the assessed work was deemed to be of ‘world leading’, four-star quality, demonstrated that the best education research compares well with work in other fields. Andrew’s recommendation that BERA should investigate how to identify high-quality close-to-practice classroom research was taken forward, and the results of that project are now available to support the judgements to be made in the 2021 REF.

Andrew is now semi-retired, but retains a 0.3 full-time-equivalent role as professor of policy and practice in education at the UCL Institute of Education (IOE). In recent years he has led the development of impact strategies at the IOE, and advised on the introduction of formative processes for the improvement of outputs. In 2017/18 he reviewed relationships between research activity and initial teacher education (ITE) within IOE, leading to new policies in support of high quality, research-informed ITE.
This article presents an overview of a school-university research partnership, funded by the BERA British Curriculum Foundation (BCF) Curriculum Innovation Grant, that sought to investigate whether teaching the Scots Language Award qualification to Scots-speaking pupils boosts their self-esteem and wider achievement within school.

Scots is one of Scotland’s three indigenous languages, alongside English and Gaelic, but since the Education (Scotland) Act of 1872 English has been the language of education (Imamura 2003). Scots has been stigmatised, and several of our participants said they thought Scots was ‘just slang’ or ‘bad English’, and weren’t aware that it was a language, before they took the Scots Language Award.

However, the status of Scots is changing rapidly. The Scots Language Award was launched in 2014 by the Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA, 2019). Dr Jamie Fairbairn, head of humanities at Banff Academy, was an early adopter of the Award; he teaches Scots in the humanities faculty, rather than in English or modern languages as in other schools. Jamie had gathered anecdotal evidence that teaching Scots boosts self-esteem and wider achievement. Together we received a BCF grant to investigate this, and to further develop Scots-language teaching in Banff as part of a wider initiative to promote the use of Scots and raise the status of the language.

I am a PhD student of ethnology at the Elphinstone Institute, University of Aberdeen. My research area is the contemporary use of Scots, particularly among young people; Banff Academy is my main field site. I visited the school weekly over the course of a year, with intense periods of engagement during our Scots Language Week in November 2018, and also in April, when I recorded one-to-one interviews with pupils and staff; I also conducted interviews with Scots-language experts who contributed to the course.

During Scots Language Week we produced artwork for an exhibition; changed the linguistic landscape of the school with huge displays of Scots words; developed a survey, based on earlier sociolinguistic research (Durham, 2014; Macafee & McGarrity, 1999), to gather information about the status of Scots in school; and trained the pupils in research methods. The questionnaire data was used to make a research skills booklet in Scots, which is now used as a teaching resource.

The ethnographic interviews yielded rich qualitative data describing people’s attitudes towards Scots, what they think can be done to improve its status and what they believe its future holds. This data is being used to influence language policy within the school. For example, one pupil said he wanted to...
use Scots across the curriculum, so Jamie has now trialled Scots-medium education, in geography, and informed the SQA about the process.

Scots is very much a living language in Banff Academy: it is the language that the majority of pupils bring to school, and census data confirms that more than 50 per cent of people in northern Aberdeenshire use Scots (NRS, 2011). Some clear findings emerged from our survey results. Interestingly, when asked about writing in Scots, pupils reported that they use Scots more than English when using social media – especially in WhatsApp, Snapchat and texting – whereas adult respondents were less likely to write in Scots (in part because they more frequently write in formal/professional contexts). So to summarise: most informal online written communication by young people is in Scots, but adults are more likely to write in English, and in more formal contexts.

Our project has succeeded in raising the profile of Scots within the school. One pupil said she is better able to understand her mother and grandmother when they talk to each other, as a result of what she has learned in the Scots language class.

Alan Horberry, headteacher at Banff Academy, said,

‘...what’s definitely apparent to me from meeting the young people here is that promoting Scots language definitely gives them a sense of identity, builds confidence and builds resilience, because they are proud of their language. As a result of that, they can use those skills in another context, because they are proud of where they come from and the language they speak – that allows them to be more successful than if we hadn’t done that. So the link between success and wider achievement is clear to me.’

Through our work we have shone a light on the good practice that is happening inside the Scots language class within Banff Academy. We have raised the profile of Scots as a subject worthy of study, and the kids have learned transferable skills including research techniques, creativity and local studies.

By sharing our work widely, to academic and non-academic audiences, we are influencing language policy and working to improve the status of Scots.

REFERENCES
Supporting Equitable Engagement with Science

A ‘science capital’ approach

By Louise Archer & Emily Macleod,
UCL Institute of Education

CONTEXT: THE STEM SKILLS GAP
Increasing and diversifying participation in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) subjects is a priority issue for government, industry and policy and practice communities (see for example EngineeringUK, 2015), reflecting wide agreement that STEM is important for national economic competitiveness and for ensuring active citizenship and social mobility. There is an urgent need to broaden the gender, ethnic and social class profile of those who study STEM post-16 – particularly in the physical sciences and engineering, in which women and some minority ethnic and working-class communities remain starkly underrepresented (NAO, 2018). Despite decades of investment in efforts to understand and address these issues, participation rates remain stubbornly resistant to change.

OUR RESEARCH
The ASPIRES and ASPIRES 2 projects (funded by the UK’s Economic and Social Research Council) form a 10-year study of young people’s science and career aspirations. The study, now in its final year, tracked a cohort of young people from the age of 10 to 19, exploring how identities, inequalities and experiences – inside and outside the classroom – influence attitudes and aspirations. To date, over 40,000 young people have been surveyed for the study, and we have conducted over 650 in-depth longitudinal interviews with more than 60 students and 60 of their parents.

As shown in figure 1, our data revealed that while most young people find school science interesting, this interest does not translate into aspirations towards a career in science, or feelings that science is ‘for them’. Moreover, those who did aspire to science careers were more likely to be male and middle-class – a trend that was evident from age 10. We developed the concept of ‘science capital’ to try to help explain these patterns. It builds on the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu – most notably his theory of social reproduction, in which relations of inequality are reproduced through interactions of habitus (socialised dispositions and ‘feel for the world’), capital (economic, social and cultural resources) and field (socio-spatial contexts, comprised through relations of power) (see for example Bourdieu, 1986).

Whereas Bourdieu largely conceived of cultural capital in terms of the arts (Bourdieu, 1984), we extended his ideas to incorporate scientific forms of capital. We employ the concept of science capital not as a separate ‘type’ of capital but rather as a device for collating science-related aspects of habitus and (social and cultural) capital (Archer, Dewitt, & Willis, 2014; Archer, Dawson, DeWitt, Seakins, & Wong, 2015).

Our statistical analysis showed that students with high levels of science capital were significantly more likely to both aspire to and pursue post-16
Our statistical analysis showed that students with high levels of science capital were significantly more likely to both aspire to and pursue post-16 science. Science. Our theoretical framework also helped us to understand why particular social groups are less likely to feel that science is ‘for me’, and how this reflects and is produced through relations of power and privilege. This work was extended through the Enterprising Science project, in which we worked collaboratively with teachers to co-design the science capital teaching approach. This is a social justice pedagogical approach that focuses on changing the field of science education rather than seeking to change the young person, and which encourages teachers to value wider student identities and ways of being and knowing in science, closing the ‘gap’ between habitus, capital and field, particularly among young people and communities who have traditionally been under-served by science.

The science capital teaching approach (see bit.ly/SCTeach) is designed to work with any curriculum. Over four years we worked with 43 teachers and over 1,200 students to co-develop and pilot the approach, which seeks to build science capital by changing both power relations and the dominant ways in which science is currently presented, framed and related to students. Evidence from two year-long trials showed that the approach led to significant increases in students’ science capital and A-level science aspirations, and improved attitudes towards science. Moreover, teachers reported that it raised attainment, improved engagement among a wider range of students, and supported their own agency and professionalism. The collaboration resulted in the production of a free 64-page teaching resource, available in English and Welsh, which provides practical examples and tools to support teachers to adapt existing lesson plans and activities to help build students’ science capital.

**IMPACT**

Our research has had a wide-reaching impact on science education policy and practice in schools and informal science learning settings, such as science centres, museums and STEM enrichment. Many organisations now work with younger and more diverse audiences as a result of our findings. The concept of science capital is mainstreamed within the strategic plans of numerous organisations and professional societies, and our findings regularly inform policy and practice internationally.

Since its launch in 2017, the science capital teaching approach has been implemented in over 18 countries, reaching hundreds of thousands of students. Arising from interest and demand from schools, we also have a new Primary Science Capital project starting in September 2019.

**LOOKING AHEAD**

We continue to develop the concept of science capital, and to work with others on its wider use and application. This has been a fascinating and rewarding journey for us, and we look forward to continuing to learn from our partnership work and attempts at praxis.

**REFERENCES**


**FURTHER RESOURCES**

+ ucl.ac.uk/ioe-sciencecapital
+ ioe.sciencecapital@ucl.ac.uk
+ @_ScienceCapital
This group of colleagues from the Durham University Evidence Centre for Education (DECE) were highly commended in the 2018 BERA Public Engagement and Impact Award for their work on making education fairer.

Our key focus is on identifying long-term disadvantage in education and its implications for school intakes and performance measures. We evaluate and sift programmes intended to improve learning outcomes for disadvantaged students or to widen access to educational opportunities, and consider how best to engineer good research evidence into the most usable forms.

A common theme in our work is the assessment of poverty/disadvantage as a potential determinant of lower attainment and participation in education, and how best to intervene to improve outcomes for the poorest children. This work is supported through grant funding from the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), the Educational Endowment Foundation (EEF), the Nuffield Foundation and the Department for Education. We have created new means of assessing disadvantage using official data, based on the ‘trajectory’ of individual indicators, that take missing data seriously.

These improved measures have shown that the perceived ‘failure’ of secondary schools in the north east of England (and in the West Midlands and elsewhere) is an illusion. There is simply more long-term disadvantage in the north east, and so more of the learning challenges associated with this for some pupils. The same illusion arises with respect to different school types in England. None are more or less effective with equivalent pupils. As one example, we have published our trajectory-based analysis of the intakes to, and outcomes of, grammar schools (Gorard & Siddiqui, 2018). Our conclusion, that increasing the use of selection to schools is dangerous for social equality, was topical and relevant to the 2017 election, and made national TV and press headlines. Policymakers including Lucy Powell MP and Peter Kyle MP have taken notice, sharing and discussing the research results online. The findings were raised by Lord Storey in the ‘Schools that Work for Everyone’ consultation, and by Lyn Brown MP in a debate on ‘Social Mobility and the Economy’ in Westminster Hall. Our evidence forms a substantial part of the Full Fact reports on the topic in 2016 and 2017 (see for example Browning & Sippitt, 2017), and provided an empirical basis for the Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology’s briefing on methodologically robust studies of state selective schooling (Kitchen & Hobbs, 2016).

Long-term disadvantaged pupils are heavily clustered in particular geographical areas and types of schools, and this clustering has lifelong consequences (Gorard, 2018). Pupil premium (England) and pupil equity funding (PEF) (Scotland) policies depend upon successfully identifying those pupils needing extra help (Gorard, 2017) – as do attempts to widen participation to subsequent education (Gorard, Boliver, Siddiqui, & Banerjee, 2019). This issue is international, and we are involved in equivalent work with DECE colleagues from Brazil, Columbia, Pakistan, Portugal and Spain.
We have given evidence to the 2018 Scottish parliament’s Education and Skills Committee on the attainment of school-aged children experiencing poverty, and were invited to the Royal Society of Edinburgh to give advice on the implementation of PEF. Evidence was also provided to enquiries by the House of Commons Education Committee into underachievement among white working-class children, Ofsted, the purpose and quality of education, special educational needs and disabilities, and the conversion of ‘coasting’ schools into academies. The greatest contemporary risk, we have argued, is that greater diversity of provision will increase segregation between schools while producing no gains in attainment (NUT, 2015, p.8). Nick Dakin MP referred to our evidence in supporting amendments to the proposed academies conversion bill. As a result of research and pressure, the government reversed an announcement that all schools in England would become academies.

Our research has helped to strengthen the evidence base for a contextualised approach to university admissions. It has supported policy in Scotland to introduce significantly lower academic entry requirements for contextually disadvantaged applicants to Scottish universities, and helped to kick-start a more rapid equalisation of rates of entry to Scottish universities for those from Scotland’s most deprived neighbourhoods. The research has been used by the Scottish government to support the recommendations of the Commission on Widening Access, that all Scottish universities should introduce lower academic entry requirements for contextually disadvantaged applicants. In England, the Office for Students has used our research in its Insight Briefs to propose rethinking merit in higher education admissions (OfS 2019).

We also know that schools are using our research to make pedagogical and spending decisions specifically aimed at tackling disadvantage. Six of the 16 interventions included on the EEF’s list of ‘promising projects’ are our evaluations: Accelerated Reader, Switch On Reading, Fresh Start, Philosophy for Children, Children’s University and Youth United. Since pupil premium funding and catch-up premium funding were introduced, maintained schools have been required to publish justifications of how they choose to spend these funds, and evaluations of their impact; it is also recommended that academies do this. Our research is frequently referenced in this documentation as a rationale for using particular interventions. For example, Ark Boulton Academy (2017) cite our Fresh Start evaluation as justification of its effectiveness, and report that the programme led to an improvement in reading age of over nine months for the majority of pupils accessing it.

Our work has been published widely – including via the 2018 Caroline Benn Memorial Lecture, researchED, the Higher Education Policy Institute and Schools of Tomorrow – and covered regularly in the media including the BBC, Sky News, Washington Post, Economist, Guardian, Financial Times, Times Higher Education and Times Educational Supplement. The team were also funded as part of the ESRC Festival of Social Science to discuss our findings and their implications with the general public.

REFERENCES
2019 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND IMPACT AWARD

This award recognises the important impact of research and practice in the education community and celebrates significant educational research and its activities that have demonstrably engaged the public.

ELIGIBILITY

- Individuals or teams whose educational research work has shown demonstrable public engagement and/or impact
- Practitioner(s) or policy-maker(s) whose activities are well grounded in educational research and have led to demonstrable public engagement and/or impact
- Persons whose activities have boosted public engagement with educational research and/or its impact, or whose efforts have increased recognition and support for education research in public policy

PRIZES

- £500 in cash
- Featured article in BERA’s magazine Research Intelligence
- Your research presented as a BERA Blog

CRITERIA

- Relevance (e.g. to BERA’s strategic aims)
- Clarity (e.g. of the case as set out)
- Quality (e.g. of the work undertaken to achieve public engagement and/or impact)
- Significance (e.g. of the public engagement and/or impact itself)

PAST WINNERS

2018: The ASPIRES / ASPIRES 2 and Enterprising Science team (UCL Institute of Education) won the 2018 award for their research on science capital and educational inequalities.

2017: Dr Sue Santance (King’s College London) won the 2017 award for her sustained and wide-ranging contribution to the advancement of computing education.

2016: Dr Alice Bradbury and Dr Guy Roberts-Holmes (UCL Institute of Education) won the 2016 award for their work in challenging the goals set out for Baseline Assessment for assessing and tracking the progress of four-five year olds within the primary system. The research led to the subsequent withdrawal of the policy as announced by the Department for Education (DfE) in April 2016.
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APPLY BY 27 SEPTEMBER, 2019
Welcome to this special issue of *Research Intelligence*. As convenors of BERA’s Comparative and International Education special interest group we are delighted to present contributions from authors who draw on current theoretical and empirical research to provide new perspectives on international, intercultural and global education. These articles highlight the impact of globalisation on internationalisation, particularly within and across the education sector, and also in terms of education policy, discourse and research methodology. The authors focus on contexts of change and transition, noting the need to move beyond boundaries and binaries (including national/global, formal/informal, structured/unstructured, public/private and insider/outside) and pointing to key challenges, contrasts and contradictions in current and future educational landscapes.

In the first article, Nicola Savvides considers the challenges of internationalising the curriculum in higher education, noting that having a university-level international strategy does not automatically translate into internationalised curricula and classrooms. She provides suggestions for how to move forward, highlighting the need for an organised and intentional effort at faculty and departmental levels.

Janet Harvell and Alison Prowle offer an insightful account of the lived experiences of refugee children at a French refugee camp. They suggest the need for educational initiatives that support the mental health and wellbeing of refugee children and facilitate their transition from the unstructured nature of the camp to formal schooling. This article provokes us to think about a very different face of international education – one that perhaps needs to have a higher profile.

In his piece, Andreas Püllmann raises a series of important questions about empirical manifestations of intercultural capital in schools, which internationally collaborative educational research projects should investigate and provide answers to.

Focusing on the Global South, Prachi Srivastava argues that Unesco’s (2015) reconceptualisation of education as a ‘common good’ has not sufficiently addressed issues within current global education policy responses in relation to education and unemployment, mobility and learning, citizenship education and the global governance of education policymaking. She calls for further analysis to determine the macro- and micro-processes enabling or inhibiting this reconceptualisation.

In reflecting on the internationalisation of education, Miri Yemini explores several apparent contradictions, including the fact that while internationalisation is a marker of privilege, it might in fact also be a means of tackling inequality. She calls for further research on school agency to reveal how internationalisation processes can benefit schools.

Simona Szakács-Behling highlights the importance of a *beyond-the-national* perspective in educational research, reflecting on shifting methodological trends and approaches. She challenges educational researchers to take methodological risks to move towards transnational research, rather than remaining anchored in familiar national frameworks.

Focusing on the promotion of global citizenship education (GCE), Jenny Hatley raises concerns that Unesco’s focus on ‘universal values’ is counterproductive, and provides suggestions for how Unesco might reconsider its values to better enable the aims of GCE to be achieved.

The special issue concludes with a contribution from Seán Bracken and Jáima Pinheiro de Oliveira, who report on using ‘lesson study’ as a collaborative research tool to shed light on how students from diverse backgrounds experience learning, and how to enhance inclusive pedagogy in higher education.

The new perspectives on international, intercultural and global education offered by the contributors to this special issue provide a broad starting point for further debate and development, provoking us to think about how we can work to ensure better outcomes in education on a global scale.
In the UK, approaches to internationalisation in the higher education (HE) sector have been dominated by neoliberal economic objectives and instrumentalist goals and practices (Stier, 2006). Universities have focussed on raising their academic prestige in order to generate income by attracting increasing numbers of students – particularly international students, who pay higher fees. This has created a culture of consumerism, marketisation and competition, which is likely to intensify given recent government threats of further funding cuts and the potentially negative consequences of Brexit.

There is increasing recognition of the need for internationalisation to focus more on social and educational values and practices that address intercultural dialogue (Stier, 2006). This would involve developing self-understanding, learning to see things from others’ perspectives, and developing intercultural competence for effective and appropriate communication in intercultural situations (Deardorff, 2006). In line with this, there have been calls to rethink pedagogy and course content by ‘internationalising the curriculum’ (Bourn, 2011), a process defined as ‘the incorporation of international, intercultural and/or global dimensions into the content of the curriculum as well as the learning outcomes, assessment tasks, teaching methods and support services of a program of study’ (Leask, 2015, p. 9).

Although much research has focussed on the internationalisation of the curriculum (IoC), there is still confusion around what it means and how it can be implemented (Clifford & Montgomery, 2011, p. 14). I received funding from the British Association for International and Comparative Education (BAICE) to investigate academics’ understandings, perspectives and experiences of implementing IoC at a diverse Russell Group university in London (see Savvides, in press, for a fuller account of this research). Semi-structured interviews were held with three senior staff members involved in education and internationalisation strategies, and six academics working within the field of education, in which intercultural learning is generally valued (Clifford, 2009).
The study revealed that academics experience a range of challenges to IoC. A key challenge was a lack of allocated time within academics’ heavy workloads to reflect on, and plan with colleagues, how to more effectively incorporate international and intercultural dimensions into the curriculum. They also expressed a desire for further support and training in this area.

In thinking about internationalising curriculum content and pedagogy, academics mentioned difficulties in choosing what to include or exclude in terms of theory, literature, perspectives, regions or countries, as well as how to ‘get the depth as well as the breadth that comes with internationalisation’. There was concern about the ‘danger of it being watered down’, and about the challenge of ‘keeping up-to-date [and keeping] pace with international trends’. Lecturers were unsure how far they should internationalise and how dependent this might be on the balance between home and international students. One lecturer said, ‘I don’t think you can say “let’s internationalise everything” […] you could have a class of all home students so would it be entirely relevant to have something which is done from a broader perspective?’

Another key challenge is that some staff feel they lack knowledge and experience of their topic area from a variety of international perspectives. One lecturer viewed the teaching body as being overly white and western, noting a need to diversify by recruiting staff with experience from other countries. Indeed, an important aspect of internationalisation is that an institution’s teaching body should be diverse and reflect the diversity of its student body (Blaney, 1991).

There is also a perceived lack of quality research and materials to draw on from non-western contexts and lower-income countries available in English. Relatedly, another barrier to IoC is that academics’ own foreign language limitations mean they are unable to access research and resources produced in other countries and in other languages.

My study reveals that despite the development of an internationalisation strategy at the university level, academics within that university believe there have not been sufficient organised efforts to consider how internationalisation should be enacted through the curriculum. They also expressed a desire for further support and training in this area.

To move forward, it would be helpful for teams of academics to be given time and support to work together to develop, implement and evaluate concrete strategies for IoC. Leask’s five-stage process of IoC (2015, p.142) is useful as it enables staff to review, revise and evaluate internationalisation plans and goals. Other frameworks, such as those of Castro, Lundgren and Woodin (2019), Deardorff (2006) and Byram (1997), focus more specifically on developing intercultural competence among both students and staff – indeed, Turner and Robson (2008) remind us of the need to internationalise the self. This could involve enabling academics to learn languages and form teams of researchers who can share knowledge and resources from different linguistic and cultural contexts. The Mapping Educational Specialist knowHow (MESH) initiative offers a good example of the latter, as it focusses on building a professional knowledge base of research summaries, known as MESHGuides, to support evidence-informed teaching (see meshguides.org).

REFERENCES
During two visits to a French refugee camp in 2017 as part of a university project, we had the opportunity to talk to volunteers, children and their families. This gave us an insight into refugee children’s lives and experiences.

Most families arrived at the camp with few if any possessions and, on arrival, were allocated a basic one-room wooden hut to house all family members. Provided with a basic welcome kit and sleeping bags, this was home for the short term. With many of the adult refugees having held well-paid professional jobs and lived in comfortable homes, it is hard to imagine the confusion experienced by the children and their families. At the same time, the treacherous journeys had impacted on their health, with health-centre staff identifying some of the most common illnesses as scabies, whooping cough and respiratory diseases. Furthermore, there were direct injuries sustained during their journeys, such as broken ankles (the result of jumping from moving lorries), barbed wire cuts, burns from engine motors and head wounds from batons used during police raids. It was noticeable that residents were very uncomfortable whenever there was any police presence in the camp, and children were distrustful of authority figures.

However, of key concern to staff was the mental health of the families that came to them. Although most residents had experienced loss, grief, post-traumatic stress, anxiety and depression, there were few resources available to support or begin to treat these. Addressing issues arising from such traumatic events takes time; they cannot be resolved in a few days or weeks. However, most families did not have time: instead, they were focussed on reaching their country of refuge. This included nightly attempts to board lorries destined for the UK which, if unsuccessful, ended in a return to camp in the early hours of the morning. We became aware that children were often given alcohol as a sedative, and young babies given drugs, to keep them quiet during the escape attempts.
Within the bleakness of the camp, the children’s centre provided an oasis of some normality. It was open to all children up to school-age, and also as an after-school play space. This was a purpose-built structure consisting of two rooms: one room for more physical play activities, and another for more adult-led play experiences. An enclosed outdoor area provided space for children to play in safety while having the opportunity to develop large motor skills. It was not unusual for babies and toddlers to be significantly behind in some of the key areas of physical, cognitive, social and emotional development as a result of a lack of stimulation and opportunities for play. For example, some babies/toddlers were unable to support themselves when sitting, or had not learned to crawl – a result of being carried by parents during their journeys, compounded by the lack of space in the huts for babies to experiment with moving and crawling. Safety within the camp was also an ongoing concern, with internal conflicts between residents resulting in fights. Consequently, many parents were reluctant to allow their children the opportunities for independent choice and exploration that form the building blocks for children’s personal growth and development. At the other end of the spectrum, parents were unable to manage some children who exhibited feral behaviour and a lack of awareness of personal safety, as they climbed onto the roofs of buildings and huts during unsupervised play.

In this context, the children’s centre provided a welcoming, child-centred base; a constant for children and their families. Providing morning and afternoon sessions, including a cooked lunch, it gave children the opportunity to play using a variety of resources, and allowed them to experience some form of routine and a sense of normality. Activities such as role-play provided them with an opportunity to make sense of what they had seen and been part of – they re-enacted police raids, for example. Art therapists also supported older children to work through some of these distressing incidents and experiences, encouraging them to draw pictures of them.

One key fact that arose from our discussions with parents was their rationale for deciding to leave their homes: the safety of their family and the overriding desire to provide a secure future for their children. During our initial visit an experienced headteacher had set up an English school for children to attend, helping them to develop basic English language and reading skills, preparing them for transitioning to formal schooling in the UK. Shortly afterwards, the local authority shut this down and began bussing children from the camp to local schools for a few hours each day. This tended to be unsatisfactory, with children being placed into traditional classes with little support. Most children had no French language skills, and many had been out of formal education for months, if not years, which presented a challenge in itself. Unable to understand the teachers or talk to their French peers, and not used to having to concentrate and remain seated for long periods of time, this was an unsuccessful reintroduction to school, and many children subsequently avoided school transport. Furthermore, parents – who were focussed on reaching England – were not supportive of their children attending French schools. Many of the refugees we met had family already working and living in the UK and, for most, English was their second language, providing a strong ‘pull’ towards the UK.

Our reflections give a glimpse into the struggles and traumas refugee children experience and the issues they face. Many have seen loved ones die in war, left behind or lost during the perilous journeys they have undertaken. They have had to leave behind precious belongings as they undertook journeys lasting for weeks, months or years in order to reach a safe haven. Above all, our experiences convinced us of the need for policies and trauma-informed strategies to be developed by schools, and other institutions and communities, to support refugee children. This is even more crucial given the current limitations on the support that is available in the UK, due to widespread funding cuts within the education and health services.
Over a decade ago, an anonymous reviewer – who evidently was little amused by my attempt at proposing yet another Bourdieusian type of capital in the form of ‘intercultural capital’ – urgently recommended that I let the prolific French sociologist’s intellectual legacy rest in peace. For better or worse, this unflattering advice had the unintended consequence of triggering in me what turned out to become an enduring fascination with Bourdieu’s conceptual toolbox and its relevance to the study of fields of formal education in today’s globally interconnected multicultural societies. This article attempts to highlight that relevance, with the aim of stimulating internationally collaborative educational research on the realisation of intercultural capital in schools.

To date, empirical research that draws on a Bourdieusian notion of intercultural capital has tended to focus on its embodied state. My own work is no exception, as two selected examples shall illustrate. Back in 2005, I conducted a mail survey of Berlin and London state secondary school headteachers on their feelings of attachment to their country and Europe. In my statistical analysis, embodied intercultural capital – operationalised as a combination of foreign language skills, intercultural friendships and overseas living experiences – proved a potent explanatory variable (Pöllmann, 2010). Nine years later, I designed and evaluated a nationally representative interview-based survey of 1,200 Mexicans aged 15 and older, covering a wide range of questions pertaining to the realms of culture, reading and sport. The survey also contained a number of heuristically intriguing empirical indicators of embodied intercultural capital, including basic competencies in one or more of Mexico’s indigenous languages (Pöllmann & Sánchez, 2015; Pöllmann, 2017).

Examples of intercultural capital in the objectified state include products of art, writing, science and architecture that carry intercultural meanings or connotations in durable and tangible ways. The institutionalisation of intercultural capital – for instance, in the form of officially issued and recognised guidelines, international exchange programmes, curricula and academic titles with a more or less explicit intercultural outlook – ‘guarantees the permanence and cumulativity of [the respective] material and symbolic acquisitions which can then subsist without the agents having to recreate them continuously and in their entirety by deliberate action’ (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 130). Consequently, context-sensitive investigations into empirical manifestations of intercultural capital are likely to benefit from taking processes of objectification and institutionalisation into account.

The notion of intercultural capital realisation in terms of awareness, acquisition and application is central to my approach to developing Bourdieusian tools for (internationally comparative) educational research. This analytical distinction implies that different individuals can acquire and apply intercultural capital knowingly or unknowingly in the context of different cultures – conceived as ‘pervious, evolving, more or less consciously learned, and more or less closely “shared” frames of perception, thought, and (inter)action that are both shaped by and shape their (histories of) objectification and institutionalization’ (Pöllmann, 2013, p. 1). In contrast to cultural capital – which according to Bourdieu (1984, p. 113) ‘only exists and only produces its effects in the field in which it is produced and reproduced’ – intercultural capital ‘functions as a potent marker of sociocultural distinction within a wider range of contexts of (re)production and is likely to retain, or indeed enhance, its exchange value when “moved” across more distant fields’ (Pöllmann, 2013, p.2).
Such movements across distant or previously unknown fields can challenge an individual’s habitus – defined as ‘structured psychosomatic structures that emerge from [...] [his or her] (more or less conscious) experiences in pertinent fields as well as structuring psychosomatic structures that form the “operational basis” of his or her (inter)actions’ (Pöllmann, 2016, p. 3, original emphasis). Notwithstanding its dispositional workings, an individual’s habitus remains open to modifications. Constituting ‘a product of history, that is of social experience and education, it may be changed by history, that is by new experiences, education or training’ (Bourdieu, 2005, p. 45, original emphasis).

Exploring the formative and transformative potential of realising intercultural capital in schools promises to provide answers to a range of intriguing questions – some of which might be posed along the following lines.

- Which forms of objectified and institutionalised intercultural capital exist within a particular school?
- In what ways does the embodiment of intercultural capital occur among the students, teachers, administrators and school managers?
- How diverse are those embodiments in terms of different contexts of habitus-dislocation, degrees of field-transcendence and modes of acquisition/application (for example, mediated/unmediated, reflexive/intuitive or harmonious/conflictive)?
- To what extent are the involved agents aware of the existence (and possible implications) of embodied, objectified, and institutionalised forms of intercultural capital?
- Which intra- and extra-institutional conditions influence a student’s, teacher’s, administrator’s or school manager’s chances of intercultural capital realisation in terms of acquisition and application?
- Whose (and what kind of) informal intercultural capital acquisitions are valued – and thus rendered applicable – within and beyond a particular institutional context?

While it is far from an exhaustive list of all theoretically and practically relevant issues, the above selection serves to illustrate some of the ways in which (internationally collaborative) educational research projects might investigate the quantities and qualities of empirical manifestations of intercultural capital in schools, as well as their prospects of realisation.
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This contribution focusses on Unesco’s (2015) framework of education as a ‘common good’ with reference to the Global South. That framework is built on the premise that dominant conceptions of education are utilitarian and have not actively incorporated voices of the marginalised. Thus, integrating a humanistic approach to education that counters dominant development discourse is paramount. This means viewing education not merely as the sum of skills acquired, but as a broader social endeavour towards human wellbeing that enables people to live meaningful and dignified lives, approximating Sen’s (1999) alternative view of development.

The urgency of such a reorientation is heightened by the framing context for global policy action in/for education: increasingly blurred boundaries between the public and private spheres, and increased private-sector engagement (see Ball, 1998; Srivastava, 2010; Verger, Novelli, & Altinyelkin, 2018). At the heart of Unesco’s framework are calls for greater transparency and accountability, as slices of education decision- and policy-making fall outside formal or democratic governance structures; for assessment of the potential impacts of privatisation on the right to education; and for the recontextualisation of the right to education within such framing contexts.

In line with its reconceptualisation, Unesco (2015) proposes the following changes.

1. Inserting marginalised voices into local and global education governance processes and structures.
2. Incorporating alternatives to dominant models of knowledge into education systems.
3. Recognising that the ‘right to quality education is the right to meaningful and relevant learning’ (Unesco, 2015, p. 32; original emphasis).

To effect these changes, the Unesco framework proposes reorienting education as a common good. Notably, it extends this conceptual application to knowledge and learning:

“The common good may be defined as ‘constituted by goods that humans share intrinsically in common and they communicate to each other, such as values, civic virtues and a sense of justice’ (Deneulin & Townsend, 2007. [...] Goods of this kind are therefore inherently common in their “production” as well as in their benefits.’”

(Unesco, 2015, pp. 77–78)

There are issues that have not been addressed by current global education policy responses, which may be amenable to the application of education as a common good. These gaps have been identified in the Unesco framework as education and unemployment, mobility and learning, citizenship education and the global governance of education policymaking.

**EDUCATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT**

In the quest to mobilise resources for global education, the link between education and employment has been stressed at the expense of others. By this logic, more education equals more labour market participation, which equals higher economic returns (private and public). This is meant to spur national development, yielding positive social and economic returns. Education is therefore a ‘good investment’ for the individual and in the aggregate. This conceptualisation is fuelled by a narrow interpretation of development that ties national economic competitiveness to tactical advantage in global labour markets (see Ball, 1998). However, emerging evidence shows that education, thus narrowly interpreted, is not a panacea. There is a critical skills gap that has not kept pace with rapidly evolving labour markets and important ‘21st century skills’, beyond technical skills, are overlooked.
Furthermore, not all groups access labour market opportunities equally. There are normative and structural institutional barriers for historically disadvantaged groups – girls and women in particular – that are not addressed by simply ‘adding’ education without addressing the underlying institutional barriers hindering participation.

**MOBILITY AND LEARNING**

Increased global flows of people (Appadurai’s [1990] ‘ethnoscapes’) necessitate formal recognition of education, skills and training acquired in different systems. These apply to systems in all countries actively seeking to enrich their human capital pool. Furthermore, mobility affected by contemporary conflicts, whereby people may spend significant amounts of time in camps for refugees or internally displaced persons before (re)settling, also presents challenges. There is a tension between the need for standardised systems for skills accreditation, equivalency and assessment and the need to ensure that such systems are flexible, context-specific and relevant to accessing new opportunities. In short, ‘standardisation’ may not be a ‘dirty word’, and may be necessary to ensure that an increasingly mobile global citizenry can capitalise on life chances. The difficulty is in developing systems that are not overly prescriptive and that do not devalue or discount the significant wealth of experience, education, training and skills that people bring.

**CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION**

Normative goals and purposes of education in relation to fostering values of citizenship have, at a time in which diversity and ‘global mindednesses’ are crucial, taken a backseat in favour of more utilitarian approaches. This is particularly true when examining international discourses framing global education policy action for the Global South. This prevents values of inclusion from fully penetrating education systems.

**GLOBAL GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION POLICYMAKING**

The Unesco framework (2015) highlights data and monitoring systems, education financing systems and international and domestic legal and administrative structures as the key areas in the global governance of education policymaking. Some of these may shift key governance processes outside the national purview, with fewer opportunities for broad-based citizen engagement.

Despite its normative value, conceiving of education as a common good has gained little traction as a means of addressing these gaps. I have argued elsewhere that acts of framing policy discourse and action are not haphazard: they are deliberate and strategic exercises that aim to coalesce policy action around a specified (often limited) set of policy options, sometimes with contested logics, and which are conducted by actors who may have multiple or conflicting motives (Srivastava, 2010). More concerted analysis is required to determine the macro- and micro-processes enabling or inhibiting the reconceptualisation of education as a common good.
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Internationalisation in Schools
Possible agency within the neoliberal landscape

By Miri Yemini, Tel Aviv University

Internationalisation – or in other words, purposeful attempts to link with the broader world mainly through connections with other countries, languages, cultures, religions and traditions – has become more widespread in state schools worldwide. Schools are pressured by parents, governments and higher education (HE) institutions to prepare globalised graduates who are ready to engage with the globalised spheres of HE and the workplace. Moreover, increasing migration and certain counter-responses to globalisation also create the impetus for change: schools must find a way to serve a heterogeneous population while also seeking to develop empathy and mutual understanding as a sense of global citizenship or cosmopolitanism.

The origins of internationalisation processes within schools lie both in the HE sphere and in international schooling, where internationalisation attained prominence over several decades before trickling into compulsory education. However, internationalisation is mainly understood and practiced as an additional marker of privilege, or as part of the broader transformations of education systems in light of the hegemonic neoliberal mindset. Recent attempts by the OECD to measure the outcomes of internationalisation in terms of global competencies or similar terms (such as ‘global citizenship’ or ‘cosmopolitanism’) may cause further curricular changes and system-level adjustments towards conformance with demands for the internationalisation of schooling, thus causing greater inequality.

Critiques of internationalisation in schools have taken various forms. Examples include my own work on the benefits of such processes to those who are better off, as reflected in teachers’ views (Goren & Yemini, 2017), and Andreotti’s (2011) study on the dominance of western, Anglo-Saxon linguistic and cultural groundings over other cultures and traditions. In this article, I argue that the trickling down of internationalisation into local schools might actually offer some practical means to tackle inequality. Moreover, I suggest that in addition to the mounting critiques of the structural injustice that might be apparent from schools’ engagement in internationalisation, some attention should also be devoted to the school agency that might be (explicitly or implicitly) enacted, thus making possible some outcomes other than those that often expected. Such agency may be expressed by teachers, headteachers, parents, community members and students, among others. Therefore, research into such agentic practices, and telling the story of resilience, within internationalised schooling might forge a path towards...
a more nuanced understanding and practice of internationalisation in various contexts.

In that connection, I would like to point out some contradictions in the assumptions and starting points common within this field of research. Firstly, in practice, internationalisation appears more commonly than is usually acknowledged in communities of lower socioeconomic status, and the schools that serve them. Such processes become apparent in these settings due to the relatively high cultural, ethnic and political heterogeneity of the population in these localities. At such schools, pupils encounter ‘the other’ (in terms of migrant and marginalised minorities) more often than their peers in more privileged and sometimes more isolated settings. If internationalisation at the individual level is about interactions with ‘the other’, then such encounters are more likely to happen spontaneously in less privileged school settings. Efforts to better understand and conceptualise these processes of ‘internationalisation from below’ might bring a much-needed fresh theoretical base into the field and, consequently, into policies informed by these agentic processes.

If internationalisation at the individual level is about interactions with ‘the other’, then such encounters are more likely to happen spontaneously in less privileged school settings.

Moreover, it seems that recent measures related to a surging nationalism (such as ‘fundamental British values’ in the UK and the new citizenship curriculum in Israel) are coupled with countries’ even more urgent desire to lead internationally, which in turn contributes to increasing demand for globally oriented curriculum content. Future research may address these two goals less as contradictory or sovereign, and more as interwoven and even synergic as governments pursue both of them. This conceptualisation adds greater complexity to the field of internationalisation research (for one example concerning internationalisation at Russian schools, see Pevzner, Rakhkochkine, Shirin, & Shaydorova, 2019).

The internationalisation discourse usually involves market-based notions stemming from the HE industry, including university rankings, students’ levels of mobility and the race for dominance within the field. Internationalisation in HE seems to be driven by economic considerations, alongside several local interpretations of the role of the state (as in Israel, Cuba and China; see Bamberger, Morris, & Yemini, 2019). If state schools are imitating universities and exclusive elite international schools in their efforts to internationalise (Engel, Maxwell, & Yemini, 2019 forthcoming), then accordingly the latter may look for other positional advantages to differentiate them – including, perhaps, becoming more nationally oriented. Indeed, Brooks and Waters (2015) documented such a development at elite British schools, which advertise their facilities to international pupils by stressing the local English space they offer. In another study, we showed that globally mobile professionals succeed in cultivation strategies (in terms of national belonging, for example) through parenting oriented towards certain forms of nationalism (Maxwell & Yemini, 2019).

Having said that, we do see sincere attempts by some schools, educational leaders, teachers and parents to address this new landscape with agency, challenging the existing schemes of internationalisation. For example, a school serving mainly refugee families in Israel developed pedagogies of care to address the needs and life circumstances of these children, leading to some real successes (Dvir, Aloni, & Harari, 2015). I call for more research into these practices of agency, to better understand and thus employ internationalisation processes for the benefit of schools.
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As young people around the world take to the streets marching for global climate action, and as the latest European Parliament elections reveal the highest turnout in years, it is clearer than ever that engagement beyond (national) borders matters. It is our task, as researchers, to understand how and why it matters for schools, young people and educators, and how to best approach these questions from a methodological point of view.

Neither policymakers nor academics are strangers to cross-border stakes on education. States have been passing policies assumedly to prepare ‘their’ future workforce to compete in labour markets marked by increasing interconnectedness. Higher education institutions – especially in affluent Western countries – have long been promoting themselves as spearheads of internationalisation to attract the ‘best brains’ (and tap into the ‘richest pockets’) from elsewhere. Scholars in various disciplines have been investigating globalisation in education for some time, and internationalisation across groups, educational institutions, countries or governance structures have been closely examined.

Educational researchers have also started to critically observe beyond-the-national phenomena, to theorise them anew, to critique and revisit concepts deemed unfit for the task. There were repeated calls to overcome methodological nationalism and bounded thinking some time ago (Dale & Robertson, 2009), and these calls have slowly started to be answered empirically. However, before we can truly claim to have made the shift to a fresh, beyond-the-national perspective, two more simultaneous movements should happen.

1. THE MOVE FROM WORDS TO ACTION

Anthropologists and sociologists have long understood the social world in unbounded ways and changed their ways of doing research accordingly (see for example Glaeser, 2007). Drawing inspiration from these disciplines, new prefixes in international and comparative education (such as trans-, multi- and pluri-) have started to replace inter-; at the same time, innovative methodological approaches have problematised traditional (read: container-like) notions of culture, context and space (Beech & Larsen, 2014; Piattoeva, Klutas, & Suominen, 2019). These approaches better capture processes stretching beyond (nation-)state structures and across regional, non-governmental, material, infra-structural or individual-subject positions; they problematise borders, uncover their constructedness and reveal assemblages that are difficult to envisage when using more traditional conceptual tools.

However, there is still little in the way of ‘living’ these transgressions to their full potential in the way we are doing research. The new vocabulary often serves to signal ‘keeping up with the Joneses’ rather than to advance a fundamental shift in research practice. Research designs all too often remain anchored in familiar (read: national) frames, and confusions between empirical, methodological and theoretical nationalisms persist or are used to justify why a transnational approach should be treated as another suspicious ‘-ism’. One reason is the difficulty of enacting what has been called ‘methodological transnationalism’ (Levitt & Khagram, 2007): designing comparisons beyond traditional ways of thinking about ‘units’, ‘cases’ and ‘timeframes’, focussing instead on a complex web of actors, artefacts and interactions that are hard to pin down, let alone place on a neatly compartmentalised grid. Behind the catchy terms hides a paradoxical imperative of bounded unboundedness whereby one is urged to think ‘outside the (national) box’, yet asked to provide clearly defined limits to the object of study. The solution promoted by Bartlett and Varvus (2017), to avoid ‘bounding’ the case before the research is conducted, seems unpalatable to many comparativists – as well as to funders, who tend to appreciate predictability and feasibility over openness and flexibility.
2. THE MOVE FROM RESEARCHING THE TRANSNATIONAL TO TRANSNATIONALISING THE RESEARCH

Self-reflexive and cross-border collaborative work should take the place of individual endeavours juxtaposed under international ‘umbrellas’. Despite their noble intentions, the very structures underpinning research practice are often an impediment. Funding lines, especially in Europe, require participation from several countries. However, the logic of these structures remains inherently national because of two problematic assumptions: that inter-country co-operation automatically yields an ‘international’ perspective; and tokenism – the idea that a researcher represents a country, and a single one at that.

Despite myriad programmes encouraging researcher mobility, the border-transgressing reality of today’s academic condition is little acknowledged. Mobility is understood in static ways, as a (singular) move from country A to country B. The paradigm of research co-operation has not yet made the move from ‘inter-’ to ‘trans-’. Scholars engaged in the internationalisation of research often become the products and producers of the processes they investigate by transgressing the very national and educational borders they aim to explain. The reflexivity that is vital to qualitative research – for instance, in relation to one’s liminality and ‘insider/outsider status’ as researcher (Savvides, Al-Youssef, Colin, & Garrido, 2014) – is lost if our ways of planning, funding and doing research do not take such non-linear movements into account. So are the power relations structuring our academic landscape, which tend to privilege scholars who have crossed boundaries already, following well-known patterns of mobility: from east to west, south to north. A truly transnational design to capture transnational phenomena would require more than including researchers from different countries: the transnational trajectories of researchers, their positionality in the global opportunity structures and the politics of research funding should be equally accounted for. What we need in order to better understand transnational matters in education empirically are, thus, reflexivity, interdisciplinarity and a true transnationalisation of research practices.
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Global citizenship education (GCE) sits as target 4.7 of the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals. Unesco promotes GCE as a vehicle for developing the skills, values and attitudes of learners so that they can work towards the resolution of the many interconnected challenges facing the world.

Unesco’s version notwithstanding, GCE remains a contested concept. The global community has largely agreed that a global citizen embodies three main elements: a sense of acting for peace and justice; a pluralism that is open to diverse perspectives or a common humanity; and knowledge and action for global problems such as climate change. These elements are underpinned by values. Unesco’s values are ‘universal values’ said to apply to all people, everywhere, on the basis of a common humanity.

Universal values are ideals that are normatively considered a common good. Unesco positions universal values as helping to achieve an imagined future in which the human situation is improved. On the one hand, they are aspirational: they give us something to aim for. Some of these aims, set out and repeated in much of Unesco’s literature promoting GCE, are global peace, sustainability, justice, tolerance, inclusion, security, the resolution of challenges, international co-operation and social transformation (see for example Unesco 2015). However, on the other hand, universal ideals are abstract and divorced from context, so when international organisations try to implement projects on the ground there is a danger that local communities may view both the projects and their universal ideals as imposed rather than chosen, and consequently resist them – as has been the case with international efforts to develop citizenship education in Fiji (Koya, 2010).

I was interested in how Unesco texts communicate values, because this has implications for whether one can be considered to be a ‘successful’ global citizen.
or, by implication, not. There is a risk that those who are ‘not’ are excluded from being global citizens: their own values and motivations, which may differ from Unesco’s, may not be afforded equal respect, making them less likely to participate in efforts to realise some of the aspirations set out by Unesco. Furthermore, presenting successful ways to be a global citizen may come at the expense of forms of global citizenship better suited to local contexts, which by implication are considered inferior and in need of bringing up to that one ‘successful’ standard.

Values are important because values motivate action, and they form the basis of how we evaluate the actions and choices of others. This is particularly important when we consider the role of education. Education transmits, amplifies and promotes values. Welzel (2013) asserts that the more education there is in a society, the more values will be communicated through social interaction. Consequently, those who are more highly educated feel that their values are affirmed by society and so assert them more freely. In turn, those who are less educated adapt their values to keep up with changes in their societies: this is called the ‘elevator effect’ (Welzel, 2013, p.110). Given that a particular set of universal values promotes only certain motivations and actions as successful, and given the potential influence this has on individuals and society, an examination of which values are taught in education and whose agenda these serve becomes vital.

To analyse the place of Unesco’s universal values, I conducted a multimodal critical discourse analysis of the word ‘values’ in eight Unesco documents that I identified as central to their approach to GCE. Critical discourse analysis has traditionally focussed only on language, so I adopted a multimodal approach in order to also take account of the visual elements of texts and what they contribute to meaning. This included bullet points, lists and tables (Ledin & Machin, 2015), and texts ‘visual grammar’ – the placing and appearance of elements on a page (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 2006). I analysed how meaning is ‘fixed’ within texts, which is important as it influences what people see as being possible and influences their thoughts and actions (Fairclough, 2003).

My analysis (Hatley, 2019) found that Unesco has positioned its values as the only values that make successful global citizens, thereby implying that other values and consequent ways of acting as global citizens are inferior. With Unesco critiqued as a vehicle for western ideals, this carries echoes of empire (Biccum, 2010). Furthermore, universal values become self-defeating because, being abstract and disconnected from social reality, their aims arguably cannot be achieved in practice. As mentioned, this disconnect has caused resistance in some communities who perceive such international efforts as irrelevant to their contexts – imposed rather than chosen. My analysis raises the concern that universal values are counterproductive to the achievement of GCE.

If we accept that global citizenship is worthy of aspiration, and pragmatically acknowledge that Unesco will continue to play a leading role in GCE, how can Unesco reconsider its values to better enable the aims of GCE to be achieved in ways more suited to local contexts? Emancipative values (Welzel, 2013) may prove fruitful: these include choice, voice, equality and autonomy. Making emancipative values part of the ‘fixed meaning’ within textual discourse would broaden the possibilities for constructing the meaning of GCE. They may enable us to consider how universal ideals can be interpreted in light of individual and local contexts. This may enable us to start considering how GCE can be used within and across cultures for the genuine promotion of mutual human wellbeing.
Access to higher education (HE) has increased dramatically over the past 20 or so years: some 50 per cent of the population in high-to-middle-income countries now attend either further or higher education for two years or more (Marginson, 2016). This upward trend is also evident in developing countries, where efforts to extend the participation of marginalised groups in HE have been incorporated into legislation.

Discussing HE in Brazil, Costa-Renders (2019, p. 163) identified a seven-fold increase, from 5,078 to 35,891, in the number of students identified as having a disability between 2005 and 2015. According to Brazil’s 2015 ‘inclusion law’ (law N.13.146), a specific percentage of places in HE must now be reserved for students identified as having a disability, as well as for students of indigenous or Afro-Brazilian heritage (Costa-Renders, 2019).

Similarly, in the UK, Layer (2019) has found that the effects of educational massification, along with the affordances of technological innovations, have impacted significantly on the nature of student learning requirements. These have, in turn, informed policies and practices aimed at extending accessibility within HE.

Within this fast-changing context, in which there are shared global initiatives to extend flexible modes of learning and develop options for ‘universal HE’, there is a social justice imperative to identify shared understandings of how students from more diverse sociocultural and (dis)ability backgrounds – who constitute a new norm – experience their learning, and how university personnel can learn from these insights. There are currently a limited number of studies elucidating how learning spaces typified by student diversities are experienced from a number of complementary perspectives, including: the incorporation of student voice; insights from specialist support services; the views of library and information staff; and the research reflections of academics within the discipline of education studies and teacher training.

In both the UK and in Brazil, intersections of poverty and disability proved particularly challenging for some students.

In identifying how best to capture the dynamic nature of ongoing learning, a research project, which was funded by the British Academy, enabled researchers in Brazil and the UK to draw insights from universal design for learning (see Bracken & Novak, 2019) and lesson study (see Dudley, 2011). This provided a pragmatic, process-oriented research strategy while responding to ‘wicked problems’ requiring solutions from a diversity of institutional stakeholders (Johansson-Sköldberg, Woodilla, & Çetinkaya, 2013). The lesson study format followed the model outlined by Dudley (2011, p. 5).

The research included a professional development dimension, whereby experts in the field of lesson study shared their research and insights with practitioners and researchers at workshops held in the UK and Brazil. Following this capacity-building exercise, the small-scale research was carried out in one university in each jurisdiction throughout the 2018/19 academic year.
In the Brazilian institution this involved four undergraduate students enrolled in the same course, who differed in terms of socioeconomic status, ethnic background and (dis)ability; one student was deaf. The three participating researching academics ranged from novice to experienced. In the UK university, two groups of three students (n=6) were recruited: one group from an education studies course, and another from a teacher training course. The socioeconomic backgrounds of these students varied: four were ‘first-generation’ university attendees, and one was a mature student and was of minority ethnic heritage. All three students in one group had a declared cognitive disability. Six researchers were involved in the UK research, including four academics with varied HE experience as well as a representative from student services and a researcher from library and information services.

The reflective cycle of joint planning, action and reflection prompted awareness-raising among all of those involved about how individual learners responded to potential gaps in the ways in which knowledge was generated and how this knowledge was disseminated within and beyond real and virtual learning environments.

A common finding in both jurisdictions highlighted the importance of students’ autonomous agency in their use of social media apps to scaffold their learning, and revealed how these apps were used to provide peer-learning support. However, some presumptions about the use of technological devices were also uncovered. Researchers took for granted that all students would have access to computers or learning devices. In both the UK and in Brazil, individual students revealed that they couldn’t use certain devices because they were too expensive. Intersections of poverty and disability proved particularly challenging for some students. From a moral perspective, it is incumbent upon universities to resource access beyond simply welcoming students onto campus.

During post-observation discussions students consistently voiced a need for lecturers to make clear how content was related to assessment processes. As the research progressed, lecturers became increasingly mindful of the need to extend the range of enabling strategies to ensure that, with a growing diversity of students, assessment items and scaffolding of learning were more overt.

Following completion of the research, researchers and students in both jurisdictions engaged in a meta-analytic reflection on how involvement in the research had impacted on their learning as students or as professionals. Researchers believed that the use of lesson study had helped them to see beyond cultural differences and recognise shared global challenges concerning increased student diversity. For support services researchers in the UK, lesson study brought to light what ‘excellence’ might look like and how it could be refined in light of shared professional conversations (Phillips, 2006). The project demonstrated the real potential for classroom-based studies to impact on the development and monitoring of localised educational policies and practices in HE. For example, following a knowledge-sharing event, the technology team at one of the universities developed a webpage for academics on how best to develop inclusive courses using online tools. The open-ended nature of questions enabled the free expression of participants’ views on learning and teaching, as well as facilitating preparatory and reflective meetings.

Ultimately, the opportunities to learn from local and transnational collaboration strengthened research links while enhancing active learning and positive interpersonal relationship-building among all of the research participants.
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In this symposium, children, teachers, researchers and artists reflect together on what it is to ‘feel odd’ in school. The papers emerge from a three-year AHRC project situated in a primary school in central Manchester, entitled ‘Odd: Feeling different in the world of education’. Bringing together perspectives from art, anthropology and education, the team is exploring ways of anchoring co-produced research in the lived, sensory and embodied experiences of school life, to evoke richer and more located understandings of difference. The project involves research co-produced with children and young people as well as artist-led work. The voices of the children as filmmakers and researchers mingle with those of artists and researchers, in partnership with the staff from the school.
SENSE THE SCHOOL
BECKY SHAW & RACHEL HOLMES
A strand of work within the project involved groups of children working with an artist to see, smell, taste, feel or hear 'oddness' in the school building. Groups of nine-year-old children, all from one class, were invited to show us 'oddness' in school, constituting the phenomena as separate to them in space, but locatable only through their own experiencing of it. As tour-guides and researchers in a space they know, they used stethoscopes, cameras with endoscopes, prisms, magnifying lenses, coloured gels, mirrors and tuning forks to contend with the school space.

ODD COMPANIONS
AMANDA RAVETZ & CHRISTINA MACRAE
Amanda Ravetz has taken up Position of Child in nursery, and then reception classes, on a weekly basis. Joining in as a class member, her aim is to approach and share children’s senses of time and companionship, experiences of difference, ritual qualities of teaching and learning, and the poetics of play. In this paper she explores this space with early-years researcher Christina MacRae.

PASTRY CUTTERS, PAPER AND PROJECTORS: RE-TURNING IN AN ‘ODD LAB’
JO RAY
The 'odd labs' were spaces in which the research team came together in an exploratory, practice-led space of enquiry. This included the reactivation of images, words, sounds and impressions drawn from their research in school through installation and making. Jo, as research assistant on the project, was interested in the processes of play and relationship to materials as a mode of thinking and being together that can arise in the school and the lab.

RESEARCH CREATION IN THE COLLABORATIVE EXPLORATION OF WHAT IT IS TO FEEL ODD IN SCHOOL
KATE PAHL, STEVE POOL, YEAR 5 TEACHERS & CHILDREN
The children will present their perspectives as researchers on the ‘Odd’ project, and will describe a co-produced project about researching what it was to feel 'odd' in school. They have made a series of films, which will be shown in the presentation, about what it means to feel odd, and they will reflect on that process. This shifts the distinction between data and theory that is drawn in traditional research contexts, as the children, as researchers, present the data.
In higher education we reside in a world of fragmentary conversations driven by established interactional asymmetries of power and status. Coming to it from professional practice is akin to landing in L. Frank Baum’s Oz through a tornado. In this opaque world, our recognised identity becomes challenged: I am a teacher, but I am told that I am no longer a teacher, I am an academic. We identify as Dorothy, looking for a home. We bring with us our up-to-date professional practice knowledge and approaches, which fall like a house on the established academic colleague, crushed by our very arrival. We ask for help but are bewildered by the answer(s), which are delivered (often intentionally) at the edge of understandability and designed only to mystify and restrict access to the Emerald City. However, the beginning of our journey along the yellow brick road is also the initiation of our Deleuzean assemblage (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/2013) of this illusionary reality; it defines our actions and (re)conceptualises our professional identity.

First we encounter the Scarecrow who, riddled with insecurity, feels he is in post fraudulently and relies on past practice-based successes – thus masking his self-perceived shortfall of the intelligence necessary to establish himself.

Next we are led to the Tin Man, who approaches responsibilities with competence, presence and efficacy. However, he is disheartened by the emerging disconnect and cognitive dissonance evident between the (established) academic and himself.

Finally we encounter the Lion, who lacks the strength of conviction, or the courage, required to master this game, thus further impairing the above dynamic and resulting in the passivity of recipient response to the perceived expert (Gavruseva, 1995; MacClure, 2003).

Although these axiomatic archetypes will accompany us on our journey, for Dotorthys to succeed we must sidestep those archetypes’ stifled ambition, and ‘actually do the thing: therefore... only pretend[ing] to pretend’ (Derrida, 2016). But does a Dorothy’s vision, drive and commitment determine her ultimate success in gaining entry to Oz, or is she unable to influence this outcome? Is Oz merely an imaginary concept? Why, in essence, is everything green?

The academic, speaking to a different rhythm, responds ambiguously to this complexity (Gavruseva,
1995, as cited in MacClure, 2003): ‘no more than in any other city... but when you wear green spectacles, why of course everything you see looks green to you’ (Baum, 1900, as cited in Sounsanis, 2015, p. 36).

This compounds disillusionment among determined Dorothys, who begin to identify themselves as professionally deskilled, finding the aspirational practice change necessary to succeed in Oz’s #IMPACT #REF2021 world to be something – like Oz the great and powerful himself – ultimately impossible, floating away, out of reach. Having ‘returned here to Flatland’, our challenge remains to try ‘to... escape the confines of [such] limited dimensionality’ (Sounsanis, 2015, p. 23) to acknowledge Vidal’s (2003, as cited in Baum, 2003) reflection upon Baum as the true educator, enabling those to become what they were not: imaginative, tolerant and alert to wonder.

We should recognise that there is not always parity between experience(s), and that ‘there’s more than one story here’ (Hewson, 2016, p. 110). Meanwhile, *this* Dorothy is still awaiting the secret handshake and initiation ceremony that will secure entry to this Machiavellian world (Creemers, 2017). But... in waving goodbye to the yellow brick road, we know that somewhere over the rainbow, there’s no place like home (Baum, 1900/2003).
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Mental health and wellbeing have historically received limited attention in higher education settings. However, this has changed in recent years: the need to provide psychological support has gained greater attention as a consequence of, firstly, consumerist trends within the sector which mean that universities have to sell themselves as more than just a course and, secondly, recent tragedies that have seen a number of young adults take their own lives while studying for degrees. These two factors have the potential to pull universities in very different ways, and institutions appear to have been struggling to understand their role in meeting these new expectations and providing more holistic support to students.

As mental health and wellbeing is increasingly focussed upon, it is notable that a clinical or medicalised discourse often comes to the fore. The focus often shifts away from everyday experiences and moves towards the language of psychopathology and of the professionals, or techniques, that will ‘cure’ those affected. Labels of ‘disorders’ (eating disorders, obsessive compulsive disorders and so on) are often used liberally, yet such terms are reductive and often misused, abused and overused. They provide a shorthand title for a series of related behaviours, but can fail to capture the complexity inherent in much of the distress that individuals encounter in their real-world lives. As a consequence, one-size-fits-all ‘treatments’ are commonly advocated that cannot fully account for the nuances and needs of a diverse student population.

In contrast to that more medicalised focus, the symposium that we will present at the 2019 BERA Conference brings together four projects that take a different view. Instead of top-down approaches to support directed by particular diagnoses, the projects examine more inductive/bottom-up perspectives guided by student experiences or behaviours.

The first two papers of the symposium explicitly consider what students think of the support available
to them. ‘Improving Postgraduate Researcher (PGR) Wellbeing: Stakeholder contribution to the PGR Well Bee-ing Project’ (Rebecca Crook) outlines the benefits and challenges associated with adopting a collaborative research design for an ongoing project on developing services for postgraduate students, while ‘South Asian international students perceptions of mental health provision in UK Universities’ (Soha Daru) outlines the findings from a project looking at South Asian students’ perceptions of mental health services in the UK.

The final two presentations specifically look at how universities are responding to the trend of students seeking support online. ‘The use of computer mediated technology to support students’ mental health and wellbeing in Higher Education settings’ (Terry Hanley and Soha Daru) provides a summary of an audit of the types of online resources that UK universities offer (such as information sheets, self-help programmes, online therapy, staff training, and emergency contacts). The final paper – ‘Examining the therapeutic goals set by university students whilst attending online counselling’ (Aaron Sefi, Terry Hanley, and Claire Wyatt) – explores the types of therapeutic goals that individuals set within the online therapy service Kooth Student. The latter summarises 210 therapeutic goals that have been set by 65 students within one university’s online service, and highlights the wide variety of needs for which students seek support.

These four projects do not claim to provide an alternative framework for universities to adopt. However, they highlight the need for a pluralistic understanding of mental health and wellbeing support (Hanley, Williams, & Sefi, 2013) in order to ensure that services can be appropriately responsive to the wide variety of needs and wants among student populations.

REFERENCE

We now offer even more bursaries to attend the BERA Conference if your abstract is accepted:

Access Bursaries
Students, practitioners / teachers or independent researchers can apply for assistance towards travel and accommodation

Student Bursaries
Full and part time students can apply for complimentary attendance

Teacher / Practitioners / Independent Researchers can apply for complimentary attendance

Refugee Bursaries
Applicants can apply for complimentary attendance and assistance towards travel and accommodation

International Bursaries
Applicants can apply for complimentary attendance and assistance towards travel and accommodation

International Collaboration Bursaries
Applicants can apply for complimentary attendance and assistance towards travel and accommodation

SAVE THE DATE!

Abstract submission deadline:
31st January 2020

Bursary application deadline:
26th February 2020

Authors notified of outcome of submission:
17th March 2020

Early bird deadline for registration:
1st May 2020

All presenting authors to be registered:
1st May 2020

Authors notified of date and time of presentation:
23rd May 2020

For more information visit:
Website: www.bera.ac.uk/beraconference-2020
Email: conference@bera.ac.uk
Exactly 100 years ago the public school system was established in the Weimar Republic. The intent was to create an environment in which all pupils were given the chance to realise their potential, regardless of socioeconomic status (Weimar Constitution, 1919, art. 146).

Today, 100 years later, the German school system is yet to fully establish the conditions that would compensate for a disadvantaged background. Indeed, schools are recognised as a key vehicle for reproducing social inequality (Davoli & Entorf, 2018).

So, how can we finally create a school for all – a space where all pupils’ development is best supported?

In Germany, ‘inclusion’ has been in everyone’s mouths for over a decade now. In this context it implies a paradigm-shift in the relationship between institutions and citizens, with the latter being increasingly valued as unique individuals. From this new perspective, schools should become flexible systems in which teachers facilitate learning processes and the students become the real protagonists, welcomed and supported in their rich diversity (Maschke, 2018, p. 496). Yet despite repeated recommendations and resolutions by the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder and the German Rectors’ Conference, most teacher training programmes are only in the early stages of reform.

In nearby Erfurt, the idea of ‘school for all’ is being reinterpreted and embraced. Rather than streaming students into separate grammar, comprehensive and special-needs schools, as is the norm in Germany, the community school Am Roten Berg is testing inclusive pedagogy – an inspiring pilot project that is proving highly successful. In bimodal, bilingual classes, a group of hearing-impaired pupils learn together with hearing pupils, all of whom are learning sign language as an official second language. Team-teaching ensures that sign language is a fundamental channel through which all children express themselves, guaranteeing that all children can participate equally and shape the learning process.

In my interview with her, the teacher responsible for the pilot project pointed out that the use of sign language often made information more explicit and gave clearer context than spoken German. Non-native German speakers were therefore able to actively join the inclusive process more quickly than in monolingual German environments. Pupils from families with less access to education also benefited from the use of context-rich sign language.

This case study shows that diversity can be an opportunity for everyone, provided that the opportunity to rethink processes and structures is taken. The limited resources available to embrace inclusion, and the snail’s pace at which it is developing, suggest that the ingrained view of school as a space for homogeneity holds strong. Fear of losing one’s privileged position is a fast-growing trend at the moment, and one with a strong political wind accompanying it.
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+ Constitution of the German Reich (Weimar Constitution) (1919, August 11).
Publications are pivotal within academia, and getting to grips with them can be challenging for early-career researchers (ECRs). Here, we highlight the ECR Network’s annual Writing for Publications workshop and provide an overview of what this year’s event entailed, before sharing a reflection from Dr Kelly Johnston on publishing post-PhD.

THE WRITING FOR PUBLICATIONS WORKSHOP

The second of the BERA ECR Network’s highly successful annual Writing for Publications workshops was held on 12 June 2019 at the UCL Institute of Education, in partnership with the Chinese Educational Research Association. It featured contributions from many experienced academics within the field including Professor Dominic Wyse (UCL Institute of Education), Professor Ming Cheng (Edge Hill University), Dr Helen Hanna (East China Normal University), History of Education Journal co-editors Dr Mark Freeman and Dr Tom Woodin (UCL Institute of Education), and Children & Society co-editor Dr Wendy Sims-Schouten (University of Portsmouth). Over 40 ECRs from institutions across the UK attended the event, and were joined by colleagues from China and the US.

Professor Wyse commenced the workshop with a presentation on ‘how writing works’. He guided the audience through the processes of writing, and drew on his own experiences as an author and editor, and of engaging with various audiences (such as researchers, practitioners and policymakers). He also highlighted the struggles that non-native-English-speaking scholars can face within academic publishing – an issue addressed first-hand in the following presentation by Professor Ming Cheng, who shared her experiences of and strategies for getting published in peer-reviewed journals. Dr Helen Hanna then shared an honest account of her experiences of academic publishing as an ECR, noting both successes and ‘failures’ and considering how these had influenced her career to date. The first part of the workshop concluded with a panel discussion during which attendees were able to ask questions of the morning’s speakers.

During the afternoon, participants elected to attend two of six parallel sessions, each delivered by one of the experienced academics involved in the workshop. These sessions covered topics ranging from publishing in peer-reviewed journals to writing monographs and publishing through ‘non-traditional’ media. There were also more...
practically inclined sessions on editing journal articles, responding to reviewer comments and peer reviewing. The ECRs in attendance were able to tailor their experience and seek out further support with the particular aspects of their academic writing they were keen to develop.

The Writing for Publications workshop has seemingly become a ‘flagship’ event for the BERA ECR Network, and one which its members are keen to have continue – we received a huge amount of positive feedback this year! The Network recognises the importance of publishing to the lives of academics, and ECRs especially, so over the coming months we will be considering how we can better support ECRs to publish. We’ll also start to make plans for the Writing for Publications workshop that will take place in 2020. We hope to see you there!

**Reflections from an ECR**

**CRITICAL BUT FAIR: REFLECTIONS ON PUBLISHING POST-PHD**

By Dr Kelly Johnston,
Department of Educational Studies, Macquarie University, Australia

So many words and so much time goes in to writing a thesis but, unlike published articles, only a handful of people ever read it. Beginning to write post-thesis was, for me, accompanied by a self-imposed sense of intimidation – perhaps the lingering imposter syndrome that you can feel at the end of writing a PhD, when you are so close to your data and findings that you find it hard to distance yourself from it.

I had not published any articles during my PhD studies – mainly due to time constraints, though I also found I didn’t have the confidence to write as an authority on my topic until after my degree had been awarded. My final year as a PhD student consisted purely of writing and being critiqued but, after completion, the uncertainty and stress subsided, and I saw my thesis and my research in a whole new light. My PhD reviewers gave valuable feedback that encouraged me to write more boldly and reassured me that my findings were relevant and significant in the contemporary spaces that we teach.

I quickly learned that writing for publication post-PhD is very different to writing a thesis and involved learning a different ‘formula’. Perhaps I was lucky with my first article – my reviewers were critical, thorough, professional and raised a number of pertinent issues that helped to shape my ideas into a more refined, articulate and robust article. However, a subsequent publication attempt brought contradictory and scathing feedback. One reviewer in particular did not understand the context of my research, and directed me to rewrite with a different educational focus. The tone and content of the review would have been quite demoralising had it been my first experience. However, after receiving such professional and constructive feedback on my first article, I was confident in my ability to objectively consider critical reviews. I was also confident enough to acknowledge that my research did not align with the focus of that journal. I withdrew and redeveloped.

My first experience of academic publishing highlighted the power of reviewers who are critical but fair. Academia can be hard when you are new to the process and trying to find your way and become established. Two key factors helped me to successfully manage the early stages of writing post-PhD. The first was drawing on the expertise within my department and asking for more experienced academics to provide feedback on my initial ideas and draft articles. The second was to be confident in my research findings, but to also embrace the critique provided at review and consider it without bias or ego. My early experiences of peer-review taught me that critical feedback is important, but it needs to be fair, and that such feedback does not reduce the quality of the work – if anything, it can support people to create better work and to consider alternative ideas and perspectives that only enhance their articles.
The Research Commission aims to analyse how current policy agendas impact upon practice in the four different early childhood education and care policy jurisdictions of Wales, Northern Ireland, Scotland and England.

During the course of the commission’s work, four one day seminars will bring together established academics, early career researchers and local practitioners in each of the four countries. Through a mixture of invited presentations and structured discussions, each seminar will explore a particular aspect of the research-policy-practice nexus to produce a critical discussion on that particular issue, synthesized from both existing research and practitioners’ perspectives emerging during the seminar.

The seminars will critically explore local issues with national and international significance for early childhood education and care:

- **Collaborative Agency: policy enactment or resistance?** (Scotland: 28 August 2019)
- **A Curriculum for Early Years?** (Swansea: October 2019)
- **Professionalisation and the ECEC workforce** (Northern Ireland: February 2020)

The seminars will include participatory workshops so that the Research Commission can analyse participants’ responses, understandings and alternatives. The core research team from UCL, Institute of Education and University of Plymouth will work with the local teams to produce a summary report which draws together themes from the four seminars. Key messages will also be disseminated through insight cards for each topic.

**Bursaries available. For more information and to register:**

[www.bera.ac.uk/events](http://www.bera.ac.uk/events)
CALL FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO FUTURE ISSUES OF RESEARCH INTELLIGENCE

We are looking for suggestions for future themes and guest editors for those themes. If you have an idea you would like to discuss with our Publications Committee, please contact publications@bera.ac.uk.

RI (Research Intelligence) is BERA’s primary record of members’ contributions to the field. Each issue is dedicated to a holistic investigation of a topical theme of interest to the field of educational researchers, and those with an interest in the impact of educational research on policy and practice. We regularly invite contributions from researchers at different stages in their career to demonstrate the Association’s commitment to engagement, capacity and dissemination.

OPINION AND GENERAL CONTRIBUTIONS – THE BERA BLOG

The BERA Blog has been established to provide research informed content on key educational issues. Members wishing to respond to a published RI article should consider the BERA Blog as the best means of doing so.

The Blog editorial team welcome articles of 500-750 words (including any references) that are:

- short reports or summaries of research;
- opinion pieces;
- responses to policies;
- experiences as an educational researcher;
- experiences using research.

Prospective contributors should ensure their contributions:

- are research informed;
- avoid jargon, dense language and excessive references;
- provide links to sources where possible;
- use inclusive and non-discriminatory language;
- do not include obscene or rude content, or content that belittles or attacks persons or groups;
- do not link to profane, obscene, rude, or illegal material or to sites that knowingly violate intellectual property rights.

Please see www.bera.ac.uk/blog for more.

All BERA Blog submissions should be sent to: publications@bera.ac.uk.

NOTES DISCLAIMER FOR RESEARCH INTELLIGENCE CONTRIBUTORS

DISCLAIMER

The British Educational Research Association (BERA) make every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the “Content”) contained in our publications. However, BERA make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. BERA shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content. In the interests of professional and academic dialogue, Research Intelligence (RI) will occasionally publish articles that deal with controversial topics. Publication of any article by RI should not be seen as an endorsement by BERA or by the RI editorial team of the quality or value of the advertised products or services, or of the claims made for them by their advertisers. Authors are required to secure permission to reproduce any proprietary text, illustration, table, or other material, including data, audio, video, film stills, and screenshots, and any supplemental material that authors propose to submit. This applies to direct reproduction as well as “derivative reproduction” (where authors have created a new figure or table which derives substantially from a copyrighted source). The reproduction of short extracts of text, excluding poetry and song lyrics, for the purposes of criticism may be possible without formal permission on the basis that the quotation is reproduced accurately and full attribution is given.
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UPCOMING SIG EVENTS

BERA will be hosting a number of topical Special Interest Group (SIG) events at colleges, universities and schools across the country.

COLLABORATIVE AGENCY: POLICY ENACTMENT OR RESISTANCE?
28 August 2019
10am - 3pm
The University of West Scotland, Paisley Campus, PA1 2BE

BERA ECR NETWORK SYMPOSIUM SERIES 2019
6 September 2019
10am - 4pm
Staffordshire University, Stoke-on-Trent, ST4 2DE

USING VISUAL METHODS IN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH: WORKSHOP
9 September 2019
2pm - 5pm
University of Manchester, Oxford Road, M13 9PL

WALK AND TALK: EXPLORING MY RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES
18 October 2019
10am - 4pm
The Open University, Walton Hall, MK7 6AA

BURSARY INFORMATION

The BERA Early Career Researcher Network offers a limited amount of bursaries to the value of £75 towards travel for BERA Student Members only. To apply for one of these bursaries, please complete the form online with a statement on why you want to attend this event and why you need the financial assistance. To apply for a bursary, please check the event page at www.bera.ac.uk/events

FOR MORE INFORMATION AND TO REGISTER VISIT: WWW.BERA.AC.UK/EVENTS

Telephone: 020 7612 6087 | Email: events@bera.ac.uk | Twitter: @BERANews
British Educational Research Association, 9–11 Endsleigh Gardens, London WC1H 0EH