Notes for contributors

Disclaimer
In the interests of professional and academic dialogue, *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 of the views expressed, but as an attempt to promote academic freedom.

Current findings
We would like to receive one or two brief articles under the heading of ‘Current findings’ in each issue of *RI*. If you have some recently completed research that you feel is important and likely to be of interest to BERA members, please summarise it in approximately 1000 words and send it to the Editor.

Article/s
Material should not exceed 2000 words.

Opinion
There will only be one ‘opinion’ piece per issue. Material should not exceed 2000 words.

From the SIGs
SIG convenors can use this part of *RI* to update all members of their activities or open up a particular issue for debate. Contributions to ‘From the SIGs’ should not exceed 1000 words and be sent to the Editor.

Open dialogue
The intention is for *RI* to publish continuing discussion of issues of interest to members. The process will be:
– Initial paper (not to exceed 2000 words)
– Response/s to initial paper
– Author’s reply.
Members wishing to respond to an existing piece or to suggest future topics for the ‘Open dialogue’ should contact the Editor.

Profiles
In this section we plan that in each issue one or two of the BERA Executive Council members will talk about their Council portfolio. Readers are encouraged to send comments or suggestions on any of the portfolios featured. See www.bera.ac.uk/welcome/portfolios.php for details of how to contact Council members.

Using research
In this part of *RI* (see *RI* 90 for an example) we would like to receive brief pieces relevant to agencies or individuals who use educational research. We would particularly welcome contributions sharing teacher education news in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. Material should not exceed 1000 words and be sent to the Editor.

Editor
The Editor encourages electronic submission of articles etc. Please send your contributions to Alis Oancea: alis.oancea@education.ox.ac.uk

*Notes for contributors*
John Gardner

RAE 2008
Improving teacher wellbeing
What does it mean to be an educational researcher?
Racism and Marxism

BERA/SAGE Research into practice awards

Getting them while they’re young

How do we contribute to an educational knowledge base?
from the President

BERA seems busier than ever. I won’t elaborate in detail here but please see the Council update in this issue to get a sense of some recent developments. Work on capacity building, new events, new resources and facilities for members and further engagement with issues both nationally and internationally mean that BERA is working hard to improve and extend what it does.

I would like to welcome Peter Twining onto Council and Zoe Fowler to the BERA team. They will both be focusing their energies and talents on the BERA website and its facilities.

Events
The next few weeks will see various activities. In a new initiative BERA has organised a meeting of UK Heads of Education Departments to address the question, “Post-RAE and Pre-REF – Where does Educational Research Stand?” Please see the Council update for an outline of this event. Then in mid-June the next Forum event of the Strategic Forum For Research on Education (SFRE) will take place building on this important work. My thanks to Andrew Pollard for pushing this forward as Chair of the SFRE and to Jeremy Hoad for his support as well as to those writing papers to be discussed at the Forum.

You will also have seen previous references to the joint BERA/TLRP Capacity Building events for research degree students and/or early career researchers. It has been decided to re-frame these events to provide wider access. Therefore BERA will now hold a series of five one-day events across the UK through late 2009 and 2010. This is an important development which demonstrates BERA’s commitment to capacity building and I am grateful to Pat Thomson and Andrew Pollard for developing these events.

Our major event is, of course, the BERA Annual Conference in early September. Full details are available via the BERA website and the conference will include a variety of training and development sessions and invited symposia. The Annual Conference is a great opportunity to network with scholars, to discuss and debate the latest research findings and ideas and to affirm ourselves as an educational research community. The main conference will, as usual, be preceded by the ever-popular Student Conference.

International
The World Educational Research Association (WERA) held a further meeting in April 2009 after the AERA 2009 Annual Conference in San Diego, USA, attended by myself and Jeremy Hoad. This was a crucial meeting as it was the culmination of detailed work and preparations to establish this new organisation. BERA had previously indicated its support and intention to become a founding member and I am pleased to report that WERA has now been formally established with a founding membership of 26 organisations. Please see the report in this issue for full details.

Also in San Diego BERA held an invited symposium during the AERA 2009 meeting which addressed issues of capacity building across the UK. A full report will be provided in the next issue of R1 but I would like to record my thanks to the participants for an illuminating series of presentations.

The formation of WERA provides a stimulus to re-think our contribution to major conferences overseas and I am keen to see colleagues in SIGs taking a lead in proposing international symposia for 2009-2010 and beyond. WERA needs to extend beyond those who have worked for its formation to the membership of the BERA association.
associations which constitute it, if it to
the success we hope for. There will be no
WERA congress as such. Rather, there
will be opportunities for WERA symposia
at national conferences of membership
associations and it would be good if BERA
were at the forefront of some of these.

National
BERA’s engagement nationally continues
with a number of meetings and responses
submitted to other organisations. We
provided a response to the draft GTC
England Code of Conduct and Practice for
Teaching, have written to HEFCE regarding
RAE 2008 funding outcomes and have
written to the ESRC regarding the Pathways
to excellence: proposals for the development of the
ESRC postgraduate training framework. This
was followed up with a productive and
useful meeting with Ian Diamond, ESRC
Chief Executive.

Publications and resources
At the time of writing submissions for the
new BERA Insights publications are being
reviewed. The first two (due for publication
in 2010) will address:
• Violence in mainstream primary
  and secondary schools
• Schools and social inequality
We received a significant number of
submissions of a high standard and look
forward to publication and dissemination
in 2010. As a new initiative for BERA
these publications are intended to combine
academic rigour with readability and will be
targeted at a wide readership to address key
topical issues.

The BERA Online Resources are now
progressing well and promise to build into
a significant resource. These materials are
drawn from a range of sources including
TLRP, AERS, NCRM and others and we
are developing the support and management
structures to maintain and develop the
resources in the future. As mentioned
above I am also pleased to welcome Zoe
Fowler to the BERA team. Zoe has been
contracted in the short term to manage
the resources and provide a range of other
support for the BERA website. We will be
advertising for a longer term position in the
near future.

See you soon
As we all engage with meeting deadlines
for marking, research tenders and various
writing projects – not least finalising papers
for our Annual Conference, I can hardly
believe that September will soon be upon
us and with it the end of my two years as
BERA president. Reflections on those two
years will be part of my last ‘From the
President.’ I look forward to seeing many
of you in Manchester and to continuing
to work with Professor John Gardner as
he takes over the Presidency of BERA.

“The Annual
Conference is a
great opportunity
to network with
scholars, to discuss
and debate the
latest research
findings and ideas
and to affirm
ourselves as an
educational research
community.”

Guest Editor for Research Intelligence

Ralf St.Clair, RI Co-Editor

Jeremy and I are very happy to announce that Alis Oancea
(alis.oancea@education.ox.ac.uk) will be stepping in as the editor of the
pre-conference August issue of RI. I am going to be on study leave frantically
trying to write a book on the outcomes and effects of adult literacy education
for NIACE, and Alis was very gracious in agreeing to step in.

If you would like to contribute to RI108 please contact Alis with your ideas.
We would also like to re-emphasise our interest in receiving letters on various
topics – you certainly don’t need to write a full length article to appear among
the star studded cast of RI!!

With best wishes for the summer,
Ralf
Work towards SFRE’s Forum II is progressing well. The event will be held on 17th and 18th June in Reading.

The meeting, second in the series of three, will focus on the contribution of different types of research, with particular attention to pure, applied, developmental, evaluative and practitioner forms. It will illustrate good practice in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales and explore areas where future strategic investment may be appropriate. It will also consider the challenges of interdisciplinary research and the factors which are considered in setting research priorities. The Forum will do this by bringing together representatives of practitioner organisations, policy-makers, academics and research mediators in roughly equal proportions and by providing a structured programme of group and plenary activities.

Material from each of the Forum events, and other work of the SFRE is collated on the website which will, over time, provide a good record and a useful resource for reviewing the structure and quality of UK education research in a holistic way.

A presentation on SFRE has been scheduled for the first day of the BERA Conference in Manchester.

The SFRE is a joint UK initiative supported by BERA, CfBT, DCSF and ESRC. Andrew Pollard (pictured left below) is leading on this initiative as Chair of the SFRE Planning Group. Sarah Tough, based at the IOE, London, provides administrative and research support with Jeremy Hoad as Project Manager.

**Strategic Forum for Research on Education (SFRE)**

**www.sfre.ac.uk**

Work towards SFRE’s Forum II is progressing well. The event will be held on 17th and 18th June in Reading.

The meeting, second in the series of three, will focus on the contribution of different types of research, with particular attention to pure, applied, developmental, evaluative and practitioner forms. It will illustrate good practice in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales and explore areas where future strategic investment may be appropriate. It will also consider the challenges of interdisciplinary research and the factors which are considered in setting research priorities. The Forum will do this by bringing together representatives of practitioner organisations, policy-makers, academics and research mediators in roughly equal proportions and by providing a structured programme of group and plenary activities.

Material from each of the Forum events, and other work of the SFRE is collated on the website which will, over time, provide a good record and a useful resource for reviewing the structure and quality of UK education research in a holistic way.

A presentation on SFRE has been scheduled for the first day of the BERA Conference in Manchester.

The SFRE is a joint UK initiative supported by BERA, CfBT, DCSF and ESRC. Andrew Pollard (pictured left below) is leading on this initiative as Chair of the SFRE Planning Group. Sarah Tough, based at the IOE, London, provides administrative and research support with Jeremy Hoad as Project Manager.

---

**Why not stand for BERA Council?**

**Pamela Munn**, BERA President

These are exciting and challenging times for educational research. BERA is rising to these challenges by improving and expanding its work for the benefit of its members and, we hope, all those involved or interested in educational research. Being part of BERA Council gives you a different perspective of what is happening in educational research than the normal institutional or departmental view.

Being on BERA Council is a rewarding and interesting experience. In recent years BERA has grown in both membership and profile and the range of work the Association is engaged in has increased significantly. Work reflects the broad themes of BERA’s Strategic Plan: Policy, Quality and Capacity but this gives only an overview of the range and diversity of what BERA does.

**BERA Council:**

- is the governing body of the Association;
- its members monitor and manage BERA’s work and are the Trustees of BERA as a registered charity;
- meets four times per year (typically February, May, September and December).

The first meeting in the calendar year is a residential awayday which provides an opportunity to concentrate on strategic developments and priorities.

All members of BERA Council have allocated portfolios and are responsible for managing a particular aspect of the work of the Association, working with colleagues and reporting to Council meetings. While people stand for election to general positions on the Council and portfolios are discussed with the President, it is helpful to have a wide range of skills and experience reflected in Council membership.

This year we would particularly welcome expertise in publications, in capacity building and in helping with our annual conference.

BERA is also supported by an office based in Macclesfield and a Chief Executive Officer who has responsibility for managing the Association and reporting to Officers of the Association and to Council.

If you are interested in joining BERA Council and standing for election and would like to know more please contact Jeremy Hoad, BERA Chief Executive, or myself, for an informal discussion and further information. On the other hand you may simply wish to fill in the nomination form. BERA relies on the interest and commitment of its members to take forward its work. Get nominated now!

Contact details:

**Pamela Munn**  
BERA President  
E: Pamela.Munn@ed.ac.uk

**Jeremy Hoad**  
BERA Chief Executive Officer  
E: jeremy.hoad@bera.ac.uk  
T: 01625 504062 (BERA Office)
BERA Elections Notice 2009

Jeremy Hoad, BERA Chief Executive and Election Returning Officer

BERA Executive Council positions available for election in 2009

3 positions on Executive Council.

The term of office for all elected positions starts immediately after the September AGM and runs for a period of three years.

BERA Executive Council

The BERA Executive Council is composed of:

- up to 12 elected members;
- up to six co-opted members;
- A number of observer positions are also included to ensure representation, participation and liaison with other organisations as agreed by Council.

The Executive Council is:

- the governing body of the Association and its members are the Trustees of BERA as a registered Charity (charity number 272754);
- responsible for administering the Association in accordance with the wishes of its members in order to achieve the aims of the Association.

All members of BERA Council have an identified portfolio responsibility. This is agreed through discussion with BERA Officers and Council.

Current membership of BERA Executive Council, portfolios and terms of office are indicated below for information.

Nominations

Any current individual member of BERA is eligible to be nominated for election to BERA Executive Council.

Nominations must be supported by two current individual members of BERA with the agreement of the nominee.

Nomination forms are available from the BERA Office and website.

Timetable for elections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 9th</td>
<td>Deadline for nominations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 14th</td>
<td>Voting papers distributed to members (if necessary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 3rd</td>
<td>Deadline for votes received in the BERA Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 7th</td>
<td>Results of elections notified to members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any queries should be addressed to:

Jeremy Hoad – Chief Executive Officer/Returning Officer,
BERA Office, Association House, South Park Road, Macclesfield,
Cheshire, SK11 6SH
E: jeremy.hoad@bera.ac.uk
T: 01625 504062
F: 01625 267879

BERA Executive Council Membership and Portfolios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>PORTFOLIO 2008-09</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>TERM ENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vivienne Baumfield</td>
<td>Conference Committee</td>
<td>Co-opted</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Bridges</td>
<td>EERA/Capacity Building</td>
<td>Co-opted</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Campbell</td>
<td>BERA/SAGE Award/Meeting of Minds</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Davies</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Durant</td>
<td>Conference Committee Chair</td>
<td>Co-opted</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Francis</td>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Co-opted</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine S Freedman</td>
<td>Research Staff Issues</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publications Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gardner</td>
<td>Vice Presidential duties</td>
<td>Vice President (2008-09)</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>President (2009-2011)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vice President (2011-12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorna Hamilton</td>
<td>Scotland/SERA liaison</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Hayes</td>
<td>Local Authority &amp; Children’s Services</td>
<td>Co-opted</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Leathwood</td>
<td>Conference Committee</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Letch</td>
<td>Northern Ireland/BERA SIGs</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uvanney Maylor</td>
<td>Membership Development</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olwen McNamara</td>
<td>Conference Committee/Teacher Education</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Menter</td>
<td>UCET liaison</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Munn</td>
<td>Presidential duties</td>
<td>President (2007-09)</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vice President (2009-10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Pollard</td>
<td>SFR liaison/TLRP liaison</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Rogers</td>
<td>Finances/Charity Commissioners</td>
<td>Treasurer &amp; Honorary Secretary</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralf St Clair</td>
<td>Research Intelligence</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Thomas</td>
<td>BERA</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Thomson</td>
<td>Training &amp; Development</td>
<td>Co-opted</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Twining</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Co-opted</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Twiselton</td>
<td>Conference Committee</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: BERA Council has the authority to co-opt individuals to fill any elected positions which remain vacant in addition to the six co-opted positions identified.
BERA Executive Council Update

Council membership
Please see the BERA 2009 elections notice and information in this issue.

Dr Peter Twining was co-opted onto BERA Executive Council at its meeting on 14th May 2009.

Peter is Co-Director of the Centre for Research in Education & Educational Technology and Associate Dean Research & ‘Knowledge Transfer’ in the Faculty of Education and Language Studies at The Open University. He joins Council with a portfolio for the BERA website and associated facilities.

Membership Review
Uvanney Maylor will be leading a review of BERA membership. This will consider:

a. membership categories
b. patterns of membership
c. fee levels (including organisational comparisons) and will make recommendations to BERA Council in September 2009.

The review will be managed via a small Working Group comprising:
1. Uvanney Maylor (Council member with portfolio for Membership Development)
2. Colin Rogers (BERA Treasurer)
3. Jeremy Hoad (BERA Chief Executive)

BERA Insights
At the time of writing submissions for the new BERA Insights publications are being reviewed. The first two (due for publication in 2010) will address:

• violence in mainstream primary and secondary schools;
• schools and social inequality.

BERA Website support
We are also pleased to confirm that Zoe Fowler has been appointed as the new BERA Web Mediator on a part-time basis until the end of 2009. Zoe will have a range of responsibilities but primarily will manage and coordinate the BERA website and associated facilities such as the new BERAVRE system (Virtual Research Environment) which significantly enhances BERA’s communications facilities and member services.

Heads of Department Meeting
BERA has organised a meeting of UK Heads of Education Departments (May 28th 2009): “Post-RAE and Pre-REF – Where does Educational Research Stand?” This will provide an opportunity for dialogue and discussion around four key questions:

1. Is educational research being adequately recognised and supported?
2. Should “centres of excellence” be cherished and supported as a way of ensuring international “competitiveness”?
3. Should education research be prized primarily for its impact upon local practice?
4. What should individual researchers and their departments best do to ensure better outcomes next time around?

Pamela Munn, BERA President will chair a panel including Margaret Brown, Chair of the RAE 2008 Education Sub-panel and David Bridges who was a member of the Sub-panel.

Ethical Guidelines and Research Contracts
A Working Group (Chair by David Bridges) has been established to report to BERA Council on the extent to which the terms on which selected agencies offer educational research contracts are consistent with BERA ethical guidelines – and especially those relating to freedom of enquiry and publication.

The main focus of the work will be on the text of the research contracts, but the group will also seek to discuss with some holders of these contracts issues which have arisen in practice and through the working of their Steering Committees. The group will report to BERA Council at the end of 2009.
At a productive and friendly meeting in San Diego, USA, in April 2009 participants agreed to formally establish the World Education Research Association (WERA). This was the culmination of detailed preparatory work over the last three years. Pamela Munn (BERA President) and Jeremy Hoad (BERA CEO) represented BERA at the meeting.

The proposed structure, constitution and three-year programme plan was adopted and processes started to elect Interim Officers. Key elements of the first three-year programme (see RI 106 for further details) have been agreed as:

1. WERA Web-Site as Interactive, Dynamic, World-Wide Home and Node for Information and Communication;
2. WERA Substantive Research Sessions Aligned Especially with Member Association Meetings;
3. Capacity Building Research Workshops for Advanced Graduate Students and Emerging Scholars;
4. Education Research Indicators Project;
5. Establish a Set of Research Topics for Research Working Groups with World-Wide Perspective.

The full list of founding members is included here but it is evident that WERA has support from across the globe from associations and organisations of different size, focus and age. This is important as WERA seeks to be an explicitly inclusive organisation which seeks to identify and address issues of common concern.

The first official meeting of WERA Council will be hosted by the European Educational Research Association (EERA) and will take place in Vienna in late September 2009 either immediately before or after the European Conference on Educational Research (ECER). John Gardner will represent BERA at this meeting. John is currently BERA Vice President and will be BERA President by the time of the meeting.

To start the process of establishing WERA an Interim President and Interim Secretary General will be elected by the founding members by 31st May 2009. The Interim President and Interim Secretary General have responsibility for implementing the initial stages of the three-year Project Plan and will, de facto, constitute the Interim WERA Executive Committee. The inaugural election process to form the first full WERA Executive Committee will take place by the end of 2009 and new officers will take up their roles on 5th May 2010, working with the Interim Officers from 1st January 2010.

Participants agreed that the formal/legal establishment of WERA in Washington DC, USA should be explored. This has no other import, political, practical or geographical, other than establishing WERA.

Founding members of WERA are listed below and others are expected to join through this year depending on the timeline of their meetings at which decisions may be made. For example, there has been interest and/or previous involvement from other organisations from South Africa, Canada, Taiwan, New Zealand, Africa and Europe.

BERA has been a strong supporter of this initiative throughout its development and it is exciting and rewarding to see this new organisation develop and now come into existence. It is our intention that WERA continues to be inclusive and add an extra dimension to our work in the UK and our existing engagement with international colleagues and organisations. It is also important that it provides new opportunities for BERA members, as noted in Pamela Munn’s introduction in this issue.

Thanks in particular should go to Pamela Munn and Geoff Whitty who have represented BERA in this process along with myself.

**Jeremy Hoad**, BERA Chief Executive

---

**FOUNDDING MEMBERS OF WERA:**

1. All India Association for Educational Research (AIAER)
2. American Educational Research Association (AERA)
3. Associação Brasileira de Pesquisadores Negros (ABPN)
4. Associação Nacional de Pesquisa e Pós-Graduação em Educação (ANPED)
5. Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE)
7. Consejo Mexicano de Investigación Educativa (COMIE)
8. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Erziehungswissenschaft (DGfE)
10. Educational Studies Association of Ireland (ESAI)
11. European Association for Research in Learning and Instruction (EARLI)
12. European Educational Research Association (EERA)
13. European Science Education Research Association (ESERA)
14. Hong Kong Education Research Association (HKERA)
15. Japanese Educational Research Association (JERA)
17. Malaysian Educational Research Association (MERA)
18. Nordic Educational Research Association (NERA)
19. Pakistan Association for Research in Education (PARE)
20. Scottish Educational Research Association (SERA)
21. Sociedad Española de Pedagogía (SEP)
22. Sociedad de Investigación Educativa Peruana (SIEP)
23. Turkish Educational Research Association (TERA)
24. Vereniging voor Onderwijsresearch (VOR)
The BERA/SAGE research into practice awards are designed to celebrate the work of practitioners who have demonstrated excellence in the application of research in practice. The awards were launched in 2007, with the inaugural presentations being made at the practitioner day at the BERA annual conference in London. The standard of submissions was very impressive, and Anne Campbell, the 2007 chair of judges, commented at the time: ‘The submissions for the BERA/SAGE award were all of a high quality indicating a healthy field of practice based research.’ We caught up with the 2007 winners, to find out how the awards had affected their lives and their practice over the last year.

Winner of the award for research in 16+ settings: Frances Tracy, Katy Jordan and Keith Johnstone, ‘Using Research evidence to Influence change in Teaching Practices at the Department of Plant Sciences, University of Cambridge’

Our BERA/SAGE award focused on the Plant Sciences Pedagogy Project as members of the Teaching for Learning Network. Subsequent to this project ending in April 2007, we have continued to be involved with participatory research in different settings. We have all contributed to the University of Cambridge Transskills Project for which Keith Johnstone has become the academic leader. This project, funded through the HIFCE Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund, is concerned with developing strategies and resources to support the transition of students from school into university education. We also all have roles within the Ensemble Project launched in October 2008, as a research project concerned with exploring the role of semantic web technologies in case based learning. This project is funded under the joint ESRC and EPSRC Technology Enhanced Learning Programme, as part of the broader Teaching and Learning Research Programme (TLRP). Within this complex interdisciplinary and participatory research project, our previous experience and the BERA/SAGE practitioner research award has been valuable for gaining funding and conducting this style of research. Frances Tracy said, ‘I plan to continue as a participatory researcher in my future career as I find it a highly rewarding, applied and interesting approach to educational research.’

Highly commended for the award for research in 16+ settings: Sue Kilminster and Shelley Fielden, ‘Learning Together: Research based approaches in interprofessional education at the University of Leeds’

We were very pleased to receive the award and it has had a number of additional benefits for us. First of all, we were very pleased to secure a contract with SAGE for a book ‘Interprofessional Education for Health and Social Care Students’ to be completed in July 2009. At the moment we are busy working on the book, to which a number of colleagues are contributing. The award also led us to think about the research we have done on IPE and our IPE projects — we realised we needed to publish more about it and so we have two papers in the pipeline!

Winner of the award for research in schools, early years and social care settings: Lindsey Winterton, for ‘Working in Partnership With Parents’

Apart from the pleasure of receiving the inaugural BERA/SAGE award in London in September 2007, winning the award has been a much longer lasting positive experience for me. I was thrilled to win and I felt very gratified that my doctorate research into partnership working with families of young children with disability was validated by the award. This gave me the confidence to consider and develop my own...
All the 2007 winners.

Frances Tracy, Katy Jordan and Keith Johnstone.

Lindsey Winterton.

Christine Bruce.

http://www.tfln.org/

http://www.ensemble.ac.uk/

The publicity from the award led to my research work being featured in differing publications with varied readership e.g. The Teacher, Nursery World, and the new information I’d contributed to this field reached a wide audience. Following the award I was delighted to accept the role of Honorary Post-Doctoral Research Fellow of the University of Cumbria. I have written some articles and I am considering a book proposal with SAGE following a very useful meeting with Jude Bowen, Senior Commissioning Editor.

I continue to work as Senior Specialist Advisory Teacher for Early Years in Cumbria, but have reduced this to a part time role so that I have time to deliver training and to carry out some writing and consultancy work.

Highly commended for the award for research in schools, early years and social care settings:
Christine Bruce ‘A Journey Towards an Emotionally Literate School: supporting the development of skills in Emotional Literacy’

Discovering that I was a winner and collecting the award was totally unexpected and an amazing boost to my self esteem, an experience I will treasure and look back on as a highlight of my career. The actual ceremony was on my father’s 95th birthday and I couldn’t have given him a better gift! Part of the prize was the unbelievable opportunity to discuss publishing a book - unfortunately this is still in the early stages but I’ll get there. I am still a full-time primary teacher and while I have been carrying out class-based action research on the benefits of Literacy Circles and feeding into a University of Edinburgh research project looking at the role of chartered teachers and the nature of research undertaken in schools, I have not taken on any large scale research work. Shortly after receiving the award I was offered the post of network leader for West Lothian Health & Wellbeing with a remit for organising cpd and networking meetings for all our nursery, special, primary and secondary schools, and including our partners in health promotion. This has kept me pretty busy! From 1st December the school and region have agreed to release me to take up a secondment as a teaching fellow at the University of Edinburgh, Moray House School of Education. This is an exciting opportunity which will widen my experience of education and I hope add fresh inspiration to my teaching role when I return to our school, Parkhead Primary in West Calder.

In 2008 the award for research in schools, early years and social care settings was presented to Dr Renée de Palma, on behalf of the No Outsiders teacher research team based at the University of Sunderland; and the award for research in 16+ settings was presented to Harriet Cookson, on behalf of Broadway Homelessness and Support, for their ‘I CAN’ project. SAGE and BERA would like to congratulate all the winners on their continued success. The 2009 awards will be launched in January 2009, and we look forward to receiving submissions. Visit the BERA website for more details.
Aims of the award:
• to support and encourage excellence in the application of research in practice;
• to disseminate the results of practitioner research and practice;
• to help practitioners to improve the quality of their work by example.

Awards will be presented in two categories:
1. an award for those working on research-based practice in 16+ settings, including higher education;
2. an award for schools, early years and social care or health settings, which employ research-based practice, where practitioners are working with the under-16s.

Winning entries will be awarded with a cheque for £500, and the opportunity to select books from the SAGE list to the value of £200. In the event that the judging panel chooses to present highly-commended awards in either category, these winners will receive their choice of SAGE books to the value of £200. SAGE will also offer publishing advice to winners in each category.

Eligibility
• The awards are open to practitioners who have used research to develop their practice in the UK within the past three years, and who are working in any sector of education.
• Entrants must clearly state on the submission form which category of award they are entering.
• The research is not restricted to any particular methodology, and entries can be submitted by an individual, a research or practitioner team, or by a researcher on behalf of an organisation or institution.
• Entrants do not have to be members of BERA.
• Entrants who are submitting research for which they have had funding or research for an award must clearly state this.

Conditions and submission process
The research-into-practice project should have been completed or written up within the last three years.

Entries must complete the BERASAGE awards 2009 entry form, which is available from:
• BERAs website (www.bera.ac.uk)
• SAGE website (www.sagepub.co.uk)
• BERA office (T: 01625 504062 E: admin@bera.ac.uk)

All entries must consist of 5 identical collated copies of material, which must include:
1. the entry form;
2. a commentary (1,000 words maximum);
3. the account of research-in-practice (5,000 words maximum); and
4. reports from two referees.

The research-into-practice accounts should not exceed 5,000 words. The submission can be in a variety of forms, for example, accounts of an action research project, or of the use of particular pedagogies, or of a programme of staff development, or of curriculum or assessment materials. The main criterion will be the clear link between research and practice by practitioners.

The commentary (not more than 1,000 words) should address specifically the following:
1. the focus of the submission;
2. what instigated the need for undertaking research or using the research findings;
3. the reason for the choice of a particular research approach;
4. the process of doing research or of putting the results from others’ research into practice;
5. an evaluation of impact/effectiveness;
6. any further developments which have ensued as a result of the work.

Each submission must be accompanied by reports from two referees, which should confirm the research focus of the submission, the need for the development, the manner in which it was carried out, impact, any professional learning which resulted, and any further developments.

Please note that all materials must be sent in hard copy format. Emailed entries will not be accepted.

Entries should be submitted to:
BERA/SAGE Awards 2009
BERA Office, Association House, South Park Road
Macclesfield, Cheshire SK11 6SH
Tel: 01625 504062

Deadline for submissions:
The deadline for submissions to be received by BERA is 17th July 2009.
My standard ‘biopic’ profile, if I was to offer it, would relate the usual background details. I attended a Belfast grammar school and then taught in another one. I am not sure whether these experiences influenced my deep concerns with Northern Ireland’s selective education system! From being a teacher I first became a research assistant, then lecturer, reader, professor, head of school and dean. Looking back all I can say is Phew! Now looking forward I am a lot older and a bit wiser. I see so much needing done, so many things still compromising education – and my reaction is still Phew!

When our esteemed editor, Ralf St Clair, asked me to contribute this profile he suggested that I cut loose, bare all and say it as it is. I confess to being momentarily excited but wondered if I could ever truly break out of those safer worlds of patience, tolerance and circumspection. Some who know me may well pause at this point for a reality check! Anyway, let me begin.

I am a learner. Everyday in my life brings me new learnings. What’s more, I seek them. I don’t mean additional knowledge data for my memory banks – they collapsed long ago! But I do mean improved understanding – whether it’s in the complex world of politics, the environment, music or our own neck of the academic woods, Education. Everyday, I understand a little bit more about the world in which I live, largely because I want to.

I am an educator. I have a strong desire to share any knowledge or understanding that I have accumulated through my learning. This affliction runs deep. I cannot even stand by while people struggle at supermarket self-checkouts without wanting to explain how they can avoid the machine’s seemingly random stoppages. I am affronted by the store worker who blithely presses touch-screens to fix the problem without explaining why the problem occurs and how it can be avoided. When I observe the same customer experiencing the same problem moments later, I am moved to ‘educate’ – and sometimes it is appreciated (sometimes not!). When it comes to academic contexts my urge to educate reaches a peak – and again, it is sometimes appreciated!

I am a researcher. Among the usual drivers that sponsor the need or wish to learn, such as ignorance, frustration and necessity, my curiosity and desire to understand feature highly. Addressing this desire almost inevitably requires a finding-out process or, put another way, a research process. Right from the days when I pored through musty old library books to chart the development of Mendeleev’s Periodic Table (an A-level project around about the centenary of his first published table in the 1960s) I have been an impassioned researcher.

Unlike some commentators in the 1990s, whose legacy of criticism still reverberates among our audiences, I am a big fan of educational research and the strides we have made over the years. The complexity of the education enterprise rarely reveals itself to the outside world yet we instinctively know what it is that a successful learner is doing or what a good teacher does. And when we as researchers unpick that complexity and make it more visible to everyone else, we move our system another little bit forward. To all researchers out there, I say Bravo!

That’s not to say, however, that everything about research holds me in its thrall. I can be guaranteed to glaze over as the (almost always) spurious divisions of the so-called ‘paradigm wars’ continue to confuse students all around me. Or as someone writes about ‘mixed methods’ as if it they constituted a ‘new’ approach or (help!) a ‘new orthodoxy’. Yes, I can hear the cries of ‘Philistine!’ but I think I will manage to cope with them. While I’m being a grump, I’ll reveal one more frustration – the seeming inability of our research community to accept a researcher’s capacity to think for themselves. It appears to be de rigueur now to require authors to appeal to authority (Chopinkzki, 2009, p1) most usually in long lists at the end of sentences (I was tempted to insert one – but will spare you!). If the authors do not comply, the work is in danger of being judged as not being informed by a sufficient grasp of the literature. That the lists of references have no elaborated meaning seems simply lost in a collective lack of reflection on this phenomenon. Oh, and before someone tells me, yes I have done it myself. Someday I may be brave enough to avoid it completely.

So there you are: part learner, part educator, part researcher and part grumpy old man...”
“I want to continue the work of my predecessors in making BERA more professional, more attractive and more useful to our members...”

John Gardner (part 2!)

―Could do better!‖ That’s what Ralf wrote at the bottom of my essay (Part 1). There were a few red ticks here and there and no shortage of exclamation marks but that was it, just three words. Thankfully there was no grade. As an avid assessment for learning person, I had to point out that a one-phrase comment was not very helpful as feedback. I needed to know what I was supposed to be aiming for, what criteria my work was being judged upon and how I could improve it. The response was pretty swift. “Well, for example‖, he said, “do you not think our readers might want to know more about our incoming President’s achievements?” Our esteemed editor he might be but I decided to go for some ‘peer assessment’. And what do you know, though they put it in different ways, the same issue came through from my friends. So here you have it, the conventional biopic that I had tried to avoid!

My PhD, briefly stated, involved the computer modelling of how crushed crab-shells (don’t ask) were so effective in removing heavy metals and other toxins from water. Prior to that, my MSc had involved the modelling of polymer extrusion processes (i.e. making plastic things) – all in the days when we had to programme in Fortran on punched cards. Naturalistic methods, so to speak, were not much in evidence in that kind of work yet I never needed R. A. Fisher or Lee J. Cronbach to remind me that, regardless of their analytic provenance, my results needed to be ‘interpreted’ to establish their meaning (sometimes qualitative researchers forget that the ‘scientific’ approach is squarely based on uncertainty, even if positivists have never managed to grasp the fact!). Perhaps unsurprisingly I went on to teach chemistry in a grammar school before switching full-time to educational research and teacher education at Queen’s.

Over time I have undertaken 30+ research projects funded to the tune of £2.3m, most of them as principal investigator. I have authored or co-authored five books with a sixth just now on the starting blocks with McGraw Hill. My main research areas are in assessment and ICT, though the latter has increasingly taken a back seat over the last ten years. I have 120+ publications over career and a long list of commissioned reports and reviews, conference presentations and international keynotes. Among the highlights of my career have undoubtedly been my 15 years with the Assessment Reform Group. Even though I say so myself, we have had considerable impact across the UK and further afield in applying research evidence to promote the use of assessment to support learning. Sure, many people may still see formative assessment (or assessment for learning) to be a set of tips-for-teachers or a type of assessment periodically to be lifted off a shelf, instead of being a process and purpose for which any type of assessment may be used, but I didn’t say our work was done!

During the last 10+ years, I have been pleased to be elected a Fellow of the British Computer Society, a Fellow of the Chartered Institute of Educational Assessors, and both a member of Council and chair of the Audit and Risk Management Committee of the Academy of Social Sciences. I was a member of the RAE Education panel (2004-08) and am currently a member of the steering committees of the ESRC’s programmes in Teaching and Learning Research (TLP) and Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL). Most recently I have been privileged to be appointed to a visiting professorship at Oxford’s Department of Education’s Centre for Educational Assessment (OCEA). And while I have had a previous spell of being a member of BERA’s council, it is truly an honour to be the Association’s incoming President.

And what will happen under my presidency? First, I want to continue the work of my predecessors in making BERA more professional, more attractive and more useful to our members, to the education research community more widely and to those practitioners and users who turn to us for the research expertise of our members. There will be major steps forward in developing the website and the resources made available through it (courtesy of TLP, AERS etc. and our own commissioning) and the facilities for our special interest groups (SIGs). The success of our annual conference will grow and more cross-UK activities will be encouraged. Research capacity-building is top of my agenda and a variety of avenues will continue to be pursued to secure funding and action. I specifically want to take a thorough look at doctorates (methods training, supervision, assessment etc – particularly from a student perspective), at consolidating the international excellence of our best research departments and at the challenging circumstances facing teaching-intensive departments. And no doubt there will be more.

To finish off I would like to acknowledge the support and collaboration of many colleagues down through the years, and to look forward to working with more new colleagues during my presidency. There are many challenges facing educational research today, political, economic and institutional, and I hope BERA will be one of the key players in helping to resolve them.
Getting them while they’re young

Alison Lawson, Editor of practical research for education, NFER

A colleague and I recently ran a session for a class of year 8 students as part of a day put aside by the school for students to ‘think outside the box’, do something different and learn about something new. We were invited as guests to set a task for the students, who would then spend the morning working on it in groups. Part of the task was to present the results of their task to the whole group – including us – in the afternoon. What a fantastic opportunity! With a love of research running in our veins, what else could we propose but a small research project?

Now, let me point out that we are not professional researchers. We each have some experience of research, and working at the National Foundation for Educational Research brings us into daily contact with research, but we’re not researchers. Neither are we teachers – I have some previous experience lecturing in FE, but apart from that, our experience is of learning rather than teaching. This didn’t matter for the group work we set – the idea was to stimulate thought and action, rather than to provide instruction. We were facilitators rather than educators.

“We need to get children interested in research at an early age”

The task we set was for each group to conduct a small research project that would be of interest and/or use to students or the school more generally. We prepared a short handout for the students, covering what is meant by ‘research’ and how they might go about it. We gave them some pointers about where to go for information and what sort of project they could do. Finally, we included some notes about what they should include in their presentation.

The students all seem to have a great time doing their research projects, which ranged from an investigation of how healthy the food was in the school tuck shop to whether greed was a useful emotion. Their presentations were engaging and lively, including results of questionnaires, interviews and desk research, and using a variety of media. In the short discussion that followed the presentations, it was clear that the students felt they had learned from the experience, too. On the face of it, the day had been a complete success.

But... we didn’t feel we had been as successful as we could have been. We were surprised how little the students understood about what research is, why people do it, why people are interested in research done by others and the role research plays in our society. Perhaps we expected too much of students aged only 12 or 13 and assumed too much prior knowledge. After all, learning about research and learning the skills to do research aren’t part of the national curriculum – at least, not as subjects in their own right. The awareness and understanding of research can be part of the teaching of many subjects, and can be used to help students learn in interesting and proactive ways, but it may not be identified at the time as ‘research’.

Research is all around us. Children are exposed to it all the time. In my day, we all knew that ‘eight out of ten cats preferred Whiskas’. That’s a research outcome. Today, children will pick up similar messages from the broadcast and print media but, like me aged 12, might not recognise that the messages come from research of varying robustness and validity. They won’t necessarily see how far-reaching research results can be, and what impact they can have on our lives. Or, in the case of Whiskas, on our cats’ lives.

We need to get children interested in research at an early age. If we can foster an interest in research, an appreciation for the importance of good quality research for making an impact on people’s lives, and get children involved in their own research projects, they’ll have knowledge and skills that will stand them in good stead for further study and in their lives more generally. Encouraging a questioning mind and an inquisitiveness, a desire to seek out the truth of matters, can only be a good thing. Instilling this at an age when children are naturally inquisitive might just build a trust in research that could extend into adult life. A whole new generation of researchers is out there – they just don’t know it yet.

The students we worked with for one day were so enthusiastic and fired up about doing more research that we came away hoping we’d made a small difference for them. If they know just a little more about what research is all about and how it can be useful to them, then maybe we had more success than we thought.

For further details of the project, see: Cravely, H. & Lawson, A. (2008) Thinking outside the box: learning from a school research project, practical research for education, 40, 41–5.

The handout prepared for students and copies of their reports on their projects are available for free download at www.pre-online.co.uk
This is an expanded and updated version of a presentation to UCET Research Committee on 5th February; it draws from the Subject Overview report available on http://www.rae.ac.uk, from information about the REF available on http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Research/ref/, and from information gathered by the Institute of Education on funding outcomes.

So now the RAE is all over, what can we say about what it told us? And what are likely to be the effects of the results on the future of educational research in the UK? Was the process fair and what changes are likely to happen next time in the REF (Research Excellence Framework)? This article will start with an overview and some reflections on the RAE results, and lead first onto funding and other implications, and finally to the likely shape of the REF.

The size of the field

Education remains a significant research field in UK universities. Education was equal fourth among Units of Assessment in terms of the number of submissions received. 82 institutions made submissions to Education (with 2 of these making a joint submission); this was exactly the same number as in 2001 although 17 of the 2008 institutions did not submit in 2001. The Unit of Assessment (UoA) with the largest number of submissions was Business and Management with 88, so no other field was represented by many more submissions.

In terms of numbers of active researchers within these submissions (measured by Category A FTE staff), Education was equal 7th in size with 1696. Business and Management had over 3000 researchers, but no other area had more than 2000. In relation to numbers of active researchers in Education entered in 2001, this was a fall of roughly 15%, but since most of the drop was from the Russell and 1994 group universities, it seems likely that this is partly due to the greater degree of selectivity of staff entered, especially in English universities. In Scotland there was a 63% increase to 267 staff (and much less selectivity).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Quality profile measures for UoA 45: Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest 4* 3* 2* 1* U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest 35 30 25 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th percentile 25 35 30 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper quartile 10 40 35 15 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median 5 25 40 25 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower quartile 0 25 30 40 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95th percentile 0 5 20 35 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest 0 0 15 55 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-adjusted mean 15 28 33 19 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Comparison of Education mean profile in relation to other UoAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff-adjusted mean 4* 3* 2* 1* U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education 15 28 33 19 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology 11 34 37 16 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports-Related Studies 11 21 38 28 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Panel K (weighted) 13 30 35 19 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All UoAs (weighted) 17 37 3 11 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in Northern Ireland (39 staff) little change, and in Wales a decrease to 41 staff (even after allowing for the fact that Cardiff submitted to Education in 2001 but not in 2008).

The overall numbers of staff per submission varied from 1 to 254, with a median of 13; 30% of submissions had less than 10 researchers and 70% less than 20. Of the four largest entries, three were from Scottish universities.

Quality profiles within Education

The sub-panel’s view was that the overall quality of the submissions was higher than in 2001. Over 70% were judged to contain some element of world class (4*) activity. Across the Unit of Assessment almost 75% of activity was judged as being of international standard (2*+) over 40% internationally excellent or better (3*+), and almost 15% world leading (4*). Table 1 shows the spread of profiles.

Table 1 relates to the institution profiles ordered according first to the percentage in the 4* category, then within each group according to the percentage in the 3* category, and so on. The profiles presented are those of institutions in different parts of the range.

The staff adjusted mean is the mean across all submissions, weighted according to the number of category A staff FTE in each submission. This is fairer than taking the simple average across all institutions, especially with large numbers of institutions with low entries and a few with large ones.

The first grade point average (GPA1) shown for each profile is the weighted average for that profile taking the weightings as 4:3:2:1:0 for quality categories 4*, 3*, 2*, 1* and U respectively. This is the method used in the Times Higher Education tables.

The second grade point average (GPA2) shown for each profile is the weighted average taking the weightings as 7:3:1:0:0 for the respective quality categories. These are the weightings used for distributing funding between institutions and also between the three UoAs within Main Panel K which were Psychology, Sports-Related Studies and Education. (More explanation of how the funding distribution works follows later.) GPA2 produces a wider spread than GPA1.

The relationship between the size of the submission, as measured by the number of Category A staff FTEs, and the quality of the profile, as measured by GPA1, is interestingly non-linear (see Figure 1). While large submissions had quality profiles above the median, the converse was not true in that some small submissions also were high in the GPA1 ranking.

Quality Profiles: Comparison with other UoAs

While it is clear that the Education Sub-Panel awarded low profiles in comparison with most other UoAs, it isn’t always easy to compare directly the results between two subpanels, partly because of the different composition of universities represented for each UoA. Thus while, for example, Education had the 64th lowest average GPA1 among 67 UoAs, it was 29th out of 67 in relation to the number of submissions judged to have 50% or more of their activity at 3* or above (Education had 18 submissions meeting this criterion).

In Figure 2 the GPA1 results for Education are displayed against the mean GPA1 result for each university as a whole. The line in the diagram joins all points where these two are equal (it is not a regression line). This means that only the universities with points shown above the line (14 out of the 81 which made Education submissions) had a better result for education than the average for that university. If Education had awarded similar results to all other UoAs, the expected number would be 40.5 out of 81.

As shown in Table 2 the overall results (and the careful moderation processes used) within Main Panel K suggest reasonable comparability between the three constituent subjects was achieved within this main panel.

However the overall comparisons shown in Figure 2 and Table 2 support the general recognition that the moderation processes across main panels were not sufficiently effective, with Main Panel K having the lowest results of all main panels for no clear reason. Indeed in the HEFCE paper on the REF website summarising the discussion of the round one expert advisory group, it is acknowledged in Key Point 4 that ‘There was no robust process intended to ensure consistency between main panels’.

It can be seen from Table 2 that in comparison to the mean across all UoAs, Education awarded just below the mean for the proportion of 4* activity but substantially below it for the proportion of 3* activity and well above it at 1* and U. As with the overall standard, it is not clear whether this represents a real difference between the quality of Education Departments and that of most other subject departments, or whether it again arises from a difference of grading pattern adopted between sub-panels. The fact that outputs that were cross-
“In terms of methodological changes, there was more applied work; more longitudinal studies; more, and more sophisticated, quantitative work; and more systematic reviews.”

referred to other sub-panels probably on average came back with lower quality grades than the Education panel were expecting suggests that there may be some real differences, and that while Education has a relatively strong top end it may have a longer tail than that for other subjects. This could be explained by the fact that in comparison to traditional academic subjects many fewer educational researchers have first degrees in either education or the social sciences, and probably more than average do not have doctorates. However this is likely to also be true of other professional UoAs, like nursing & midwifery and business & management, which awarded higher profiles than did Education.

In the next sections I will focus on two of the three sub-profiles which combined to form the overall quality profile, Outputs (weighted at 70%) and Environment (weighted at 20%). Full details of these for each submission are now given on the publications area of the RAE website (www.rae.ac.uk). The Esteem component of quality profiles was only weighted at 10% and in spite of our best efforts it was not always easy to be sure we had achieved comparability in assessment, especially where submissions had not complied with the suggested form of recording. Since this was a general problem, as noted in the final section, there seems unlikely to be a separate esteem component to the REF, which will succeed the RAE.

Outputs

The Sub-Panel noted a clear rise in quality of outputs since 2001, and as shown in Table 3 the proportion rated at 4* was over 10%, the proportion at 3* or higher was over 40%, and just under 80% were judged to be of international quality.

A full picture of the Education Sub-Panel’s view about the quality and distribution of the Outputs is given in the Subject Overview report on the RAE website. However a few trends will be described briefly here.

Sub-Panel members noted a broadening of the field of educational research, including more HE (policy, governance, pedagogy and ICT) more community/informal education (including children’s services), more psychology (including neuroscience); more language-based studies; and more global/citizenship education. Several of these trends reflect changes in schools and local authorities and in academic research more generally.

There were corresponding decreases in some previously more popular areas like leadership, teacher education, international/comparative education.

In terms of methodological changes, there was more applied work; more longitudinal studies; more, and more sophisticated, quantitative work; and more systematic reviews. Some of these probably result partially from targeted funding initiatives like TLRP, EPPI, and AERS in Scotland.

Expanding theoretical areas included postmodernism generally, socio-cultural and activity theory and psychotherapeutic theories.

Perhaps surprisingly some topics which were central to current policy and practice seemed relatively poorly served in terms of quantity of outputs; these included assessment; middle management; classroom teaching/learning in subject disciplines; further and adult education; creative/expansive aspects of learning; pastoral care; human rights and legal contexts; economics of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4*</th>
<th>3*</th>
<th>2*</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>GPA1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th percentile</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper quartile</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower quartile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95th percentile</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-adjusted mean</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In almost all fields of education the best outputs were world-leading and many were excellent, but at the lower end there were outputs that were neither significant in terms of furthering policy or practice nor did they contribute to existing knowledge in any important way.

One disturbing change we noted was one that we felt was at least partly due to the nature of the RAE itself: there seemed to be a tendency to report major research projects in a string of separate papers when a substantial and more coherent publication like a book would have been more appropriate and easier to digest and use.

Environment
The Sub-Panel felt that in most Education departments, many aspects of the research environment showed significant progress from 2001. The profiles awarded for environment were much more diverse than those for outputs. The best department had 75% of its environmental factors judged world-leading, and a further 4 had 50% or more at this level. Another 15 had 50% or more assessed at 3* or higher. However at the other end some submissions seemed to represent only a few individuals with little institutional coherence; of the 11 where the environment was judged not on average to reach national standard, 9 were being submitted to the RAE for the first time.

Progress was often visible in the clear descriptions of research strategies, structures and targets; capacity development in the form of support for staff and especially for new researchers, and effective provision of research training for doctoral students. Some departments had successfully invested in attracting research leaders, equally there a few instances where departments had suffered from a failure to replace key staff. Valuable overseas recruitment was noted, although where this was on a part-time basis there was some doubt whether it was sustainable.

Doctoral student numbers appeared healthy with a total of over 3000 registered at the end of the period and an average of over 440 doctorates awarded per year. This was a little higher than in the previous RAE period in spite of student numbers being a little lower, suggesting a welcome improvement in completion rate. Only 4% of research students were supported by research councils, 8% had overseas-based funding, 10% were supported by other UK sources, 16% received funding from HEIs, but over 60% of students, including both home and overseas students, were presumably self-funded.

Research income per researcher per year had on average doubled in money terms since 2001, with the median income per researcher over the whole assessment period reaching £101k. Government was the largest funder, providing more than 3 times as much as research councils and nearly five times as much as charities. However many departments, some with 4* outputs, received little or no large-scale funding.

There was the same kind of relationship between outputs and environment as was shown in Figure 1 between quality and size: generally speaking, high profiles for environment were sufficient but not necessary for high quality outputs.

Funding implications
In the 2001 RAE Education results were low with the result that Education departments lost a significant amount of funding to other UoAs. Luckily on this occasion, when Education results were again comparatively low, it was clearer that there were many apparently anomalous differences between the profiles from the 15 main panels. So HEFCE has wisely decided to avoid a funding mechanism for 2009/10 and beyond which relies centrally on assumptions of inter-main-panel comparability.

The detailed arrangements are on the HEFCE website, but a simplified description of the funding mechanism and its consequences for Education funding follows. For example there are complicating factors like the research costs of different subjects – Education is at the lowest of three rates – and additional costs in London; these are factored into the model where appropriate but the actual costs is not described here. This analysis is also only relevant to English universities; different funding arrangements have been or will be made for universities in the other territories.

“Doctoral student numbers appeared healthy with a total of over 3000 registered at the end of the period and an average of over 440 doctorates awarded per year. ”
“While there are some areas of educational research where lone scholars can flourish; other areas, like large-scale empirical research, demand a significant research group and appropriate research infrastructure and support.”

Taking all these steps together, the total effect is that within Education the QR allocation for research is cut by 13% since 2008/9 (£25.9m to £22.5m). The total available for all elements of research funding in universities was increased by 7.7%; the percentage rise for QR only is not given in the HEFCE document but on the assumption that it is similar, the overall drop in the Education share is equivalent to about 19%. However it has to be taken into account that the number of Education research staff submitted for the RAE in English Universities has also dropped by about 22% since 2001. As noted earlier this may be partly due to greater selectivity.

So although there is a significant cut in Education’s share and a lesser but still considerable cut in the funding since 2008/9, these reductions are both less than the fall in staff numbers. Education can therefore not claim to have been treated too badly overall, having seen a per capita increase which broadly matches the rate of inflation.

By far the largest change in the funding pattern since 2008/9 arises from the change from funding on the basis of a single grade to funding on the basis of a quality profile. All 64 English submissions had some element of 2*, and 46 of these had some element of 4*. This means that all submitting institutions in England will receive QR research funding whereas last time funding was restricted to the 25 institutions which were graded 4, 5 or 5*. This follows the HEFCE policy of funding research excellence wherever it is found; it is difficult to argue with this principle.

However the result of this wider distribution is a very significant cut of £7.1m for the 11 institutions in England graded 5 and the single one graded 5* last time. On average this amounts to an average funding cut of over £500,000 between 2008/9 and 2009/10. Most of these institutions remain in the top group. For example the top 5 institutions in the 2008 RAE have a provisional collective loss of £2.7m since 2008/9 even though their staff FTE submitted increased by 7%; this is equivalent to a drop in research funding per staff member of 27% (over £9000). The actual size of the reduction depends on the changes in funded numbers; the only institution in the top group to avoid a cut is one where the numbers submitted have increased by 70%.

In contrast, the five institutions placed lowest in the 2008 rankings have gained between them £125k; £2500 per staff FTE.

In some ways this new funding formula represents a fairer distribution of money, especially for those institutions which were in 2001 just outside the 25 funded. However the redistribution could well have catastrophic effects on our major centres of excellence, several of which will be forced to reduce staff numbers, while simultaneously institutions at the very bottom of the table may be able to recruit. It seems unlikely that this was the intention of the government.

While there are some areas of educational research where lone scholars can flourish; other areas, like large-scale empirical research, demand a significant research group and appropriate research infrastructure and support. There are real dangers of damaging such areas of specialist expertise. If major institutions are not to reduce the size of key research groups, they are likely to be forced to focus on a limited number of areas rather than trying to maintain research expertise across the board. They will also have to depend to a greater extent on external research income which is itself likely to fall in response to national economic circumstances.

Changes for the REF

In 2013, the next RAE is planned to take place, this time re-named as the Research Excellence Framework (REF). The original aim was that it would be much simpler than the RAE 2008, with significantly fewer UoAs, and much more of the assessment process based on metrics including citations and citation indices, with correspondingly less on peer review processes.

Now the RAE is over all chairs of subpanels have been invited to become ‘expert advisers’ to the REF, with a sequence of three meetings taking place in Spring and Summer of 2009. There is already a report on the HEFCE website of the discussions which took place at the first rounds of meetings and a report of the second is due. Some of the likely changes are now becoming clearer, and in particular there seems to be some clear convergence towards the RAE 2008 methodology.

First, there is likely to be a new component in the assessment, ‘Economic and social impact on policy and practice’, which will probably replace esteem (the assessment of esteem will be integrated with other components). It is suggested that this might be assessed using narrative, indicators and case-studies.
Coupled with this emphasis on impact there is likely to be much greater user involvement, in both the design and the assessment process. Here Education is ahead of the game as the Education Sub-Panel had significantly more user members than any other Sub-Panel (originally six but finally four as two resigned early on due to pressures of their other work). The user members influenced both the guidance and the assessment process in all three components, as their section of the subject overview report notes.

Second, the RA5 return containing information on environment is likely to be shorter and more structured to make the submission process easier for institutions and the assessment easier for panels.

Finally following the results of a pilot bibliometric exercise in subjects where it was feasible and using a sample of institutions, it is clear that peer review will still be the major mechanism for judgement of outcomes, but that this will be informed where appropriate by citation data, which will be provided in a variety of formats for outputs submitted. The use made of this data is likely to vary between UoAs.

There is not surprisingly concern at the burden of work undertaken by sub-panel members in 2008, and it is still under consideration whether at least some subjects might reduce the numbers of outputs per person to below four. There is also a proposal that there be no Category C entries.

The REF management are encouraging input to the debate – I would be very pleased to receive and to try to convey views that researchers form having read the relevant documents on the REF section of the HEFCE website (http://www.hefce.ac.uk/research/ref/)

Clearly the rules for, and the outcomes of, the RAE 2008 together with the procedures for REF 2013, have had and will have a considerable effect on Education departments, on educational researchers and on the nature of educational research. It is a matter of urgency that we ensure that the rules for REF do not threaten the quality and quantity of research in our field.

“Finally following the results of a pilot bibliometric exercise in subjects where it was feasible and using a sample of institutions, it is clear that peer review will still be the major mechanism for judgement of outcomes...”

---

**BERA Doctoral student workshop**

**Using meta-analysis and other forms of systematic review in your PhD literature review**

This session will consider the contribution that quantitative synthesis or meta-analysis can offer to the literature review section of a doctoral thesis in Education. The key issues are about summarising important literature in the field of study. The session will provide an overview of the concepts and techniques used in quantitative synthesis. These approaches to meta-analysis will be compared with other approaches to systematic (and non-systematic) reviews of educational literature. The session is offered as part of the ESRC-funded Researcher Development Initiative in Meta-analysis in Education Research based at Durham University. More information can be found at: [www.dur.ac.uk/education/meta-ed](http://www.dur.ac.uk/education/meta-ed)

**Date:**
Wednesday 2nd September 2009

**Venue:**
British Educational Research Association (BERA) Annual Conference Manchester University

**Workshop leader:**
Professor Steve Higgins, Durham University

His research interests lie mainly within the areas of effective use of information and communications technology (ICT) in schools, understanding how children’s thinking and reasoning develops, and how teachers can be supported in developing teaching and learning in their classrooms. He has a particular interest in the educational philosophy of Pragmatism and the work of John Dewey and C.S. Peirce.

His teaching areas include primary mathematics, ICT and supporting effective professional development of teachers, particularly using approaches which focus on the development of children’s thinking, reasoning and understanding. He supervises doctoral students in these fields. Steve teaches across a number of undergraduate and post-graduate programmes including PGCE, Masters and taught doctorate programmes.

**Booking:**
Attendance at this workshop is free, but all delegates must be registered for the main Conference. Places are limited and will be allocated on a 'first come, first served' basis.

Register at: [www.beraconference.co.uk](http://www.beraconference.co.uk)

**Links:**
BERA website: [www.bera.ac.uk](http://www.bera.ac.uk)
BERA Annual Conference: [www.beraconference.co.uk](http://www.beraconference.co.uk)

**Programme:**
13.30-15.00: Workshop session
15.00-16.30: Main Conference Parallel Session 1
To answer these questions we need strong evidence on teacher wellbeing. To nurture understanding and develop an evidence base, Teacher Support Network has embarked upon a research programme, starting with a critical review of the existing knowledge on teacher wellbeing. This review, undertaken by Pat Bricheno, with support from Sally Brown and Rebecca Lubansky, has evaluated the evidence available. It used documentary analysis of the literature and interviews with 31 stakeholders or experts to explore concepts and arguments about teacher wellbeing, conditions promoting or undermining it, effectiveness of different kinds of support and the influence of teacher wellbeing on student achievement. It also examined the how teachers’ work-related “wellbeing” has been construed. Teacher Support Network will use the review’s findings to identify knowledge gaps and inform decisions about the commissioning of further research. As Teacher Support Network’s research manager, it is exciting to see the charity placing the use of research-based evidence as a primary objective.

Our analytical framework examined evidence relating to nine elements as possible influences on, or effects of, wellbeing: demands on teachers, locus of control over their work, support for them, impact of change, complexity of role, demographic influences, comparisons with other groups, interventions and relationships of teacher wellbeing with student achievement. Although focused on UK teachers, the review included studies from elsewhere (primarily Europe, North America and Australia). This article concentrates on the research gaps that were identified.

Most studies of teacher wellbeing have focused on negative aspects of stress, mental health and burnout. Strong evidence about factors enhancing wellbeing is harder to find. Authors eschew succinct definitions of wellbeing and focus instead on concepts such as job satisfaction, self efficacy, stress, emotional demands or burnout. Stakeholder interviewees’ views were concerned with similar occupational features. What is to count as “wellbeing” has tended, therefore, to be a broad and mixed concept, but one paper provided a positive definition for teachers.

Well-being expresses a positive emotional state, which is the result of harmony between the sum of specific environmental factors on the one hand, and the personal needs and expectations of teachers on the other hand. (Aelterman et al, 2007)

Investigations of teacher wellbeing need clarity about how the term is used. We would also value greater emphasis on developing and evaluating the means of enhancing wellbeing rather than focusing on how it is damaged. A few studies from other countries have investigated direct influences of school and demographic factors on teacher wellbeing, and we could learn in the UK by replicating these rather than focusing on stress or job satisfaction.

The quality of evidence on conditions promoting or undermining teacher wellbeing has been mixed. There is quite strong evidence of the importance of workload and pupil behaviour, teachers’ control over their work, and supportive leadership and management, but little on how to promote or moderate these factors. Benefits could accrue from further investigations on (a) how to moderate the specific demands of workload and pupil misbehaviour, (b) the nature of teachers’ control over their work, (c) support that has a positive impact on teacher wellbeing, and (d) undertaking and evaluating action research to promote styles of leadership/management that enhance teacher wellbeing.

For other factors the evidence was limited or solely from non-UK studies, suggesting a need for more in-depth exploration and/or replication within the UK. This includes: investigating the impact of parental behaviour on teachers’ wellbeing and, if significant, exploring and evaluating how it may be moderated; replicating non-UK studies on the impact of emotional demands on teachers’ wellbeing and exploring and evaluating how this might be moderated; undertaking studies of teachers-in-schools to explore links between relationships-with-colleagues and individuals’ wellbeing; and investigating across the UK, within and outside the profession, the influence of rewards and respect accorded to teaching.
“Most studies of teacher wellbeing have focused on negative aspects of stress, mental health and burnout. Strong evidence about factors enhancing wellbeing is harder to find.”

Although some evidence suggests older, or more experienced, teachers have lower wellbeing, with males having lower job satisfaction and higher work stress, other evidence indicates possible gender/age interactions. The role of gender, age and experience in wellbeing seems complex and suggests further research on the interaction effects is needed.

Evidence on interventions for teacher wellbeing is largely focused on ill effects of stress and rehabilitating individuals for return to work; it suggests that organisational interventions are most effective for job-related stress reduction. Three large reports, not specific to teachers, have presented the business case for wellbeing interventions and suggested a clear case for ensuing benefits. However, no intervention has been unambiguously demonstrated as causing benefits such as reduced absenteeism, and no studies have undertaken cost-benefit analyses of services for teachers. There is a need for rigorous and systematic evaluations for all intervention programmes.

Evidence on whether teacher wellbeing influences pupil outcomes is limited. Different studies, a few in the UK, have identified positive relationships between aspects of teacher wellbeing and student learning, job performance or teaching effectiveness. However, clear causal links have not been demonstrated and some studies have significant methodological limitations. Only one provides clear and robust evidence. Nevertheless, without exception the interview respondents asserted that teacher wellbeing influences students’ learning, although few identified evidence to support this and some expressed concern about the difficulties of obtaining empirical findings to underpin their beliefs. New studies with validated wellbeing measures and designs that promise better causal findings are needed to understand the impact of teacher wellbeing on student learning.

Of these possible research areas, Teacher Support Network priorities are: investigating links between teacher wellbeing and pupil attainment, evaluating interventions’ effectiveness and exploring the promotion of supportive leadership and management in schools to enhance teacher wellbeing. We are looking for both research and/or funding partners for this work. Anyone interested in pursuing our research ideas or priorities, please contact me to discuss working together.

Notes:
For more information about Teacher Support Network and the services we provide, visit www.teachersupport.info or contact the author rebecca.lubansky@teachersupport.info
We also provide support for university and college staff through our sister charity, College and University Support Network, visit www.cusn.info or phone 08000 32 99 52

References:

What does it mean to be an Educational Researcher?

Harriet Dismore, University of Plymouth

‘If you get a chance before you leave Plymouth, go down to the Hoe and look at the view’. I had a good feeling about this interview and the responses to my presentation had all seemed very positive. I didn’t get a chance to see the view of the Hoe as my train left not long afterwards. But, when the telephone call came as the train snaked its way right up to and around the coast of south Devon, I had pretty much made up my mind to take the job. I was eager to take up the challenge of this new experience and all that it entailed.

The move would be a big one, not only because I was moving the breadth of the country from Kent to Devon, but because I was moving from a Centre of Physical Education Research to a Centre for Higher Education Learning Partnerships. This new role would be managing a programme of collaborative research and development projects across the nineteen University of Plymouth partner institutions delivering higher education. Most of these institutions are further education colleges that offer foundation degrees. The move would mean broadening my knowledge of educational research to include that of further and higher education and in particular, higher education in further education colleges. How difficult could this be? >>
Perhaps I should point out that I have not been averse to learning about different subjects and indeed disciplines in the past. My undergraduate degree was in History, I completed an MSc in Tourism and Environmental Management and then as soon as I had secured my first post as a Research Fellow, I was offered the opportunity to undertake a PhD investigating the attitudes of children towards Physical Education. So far so good and I have enjoyed myself immensely. But it is not how I had envisaged my working life. On the contrary, I envisaged studying one subject only and pursuing it for my entire career. I wonder whether my journey so far is an example of the chances that educational researchers have to take if they want to make their way up the career ladder.

It all started while I was temping as an administrative assistant for the Department of Health and Social Work, after completing my MSc. For several months I had felt frustrated about my situation and the lack of research opportunities. A chance meeting with the wife of a Professor of Education led me to telephone her husband and ask whether there was any work available. A few days later, I received a response inviting me to interview for a three month post as a researcher on a systematic review. This, I hoped, would be the break I needed. I worked particularly hard for those first weeks and was rewarded with an interview for a longer term contract, working for Professor Richard Bailey at the Centre of Physical Education Research. Five years later, I had gained a PhD and worked on numerous research projects. But perhaps more importantly, research and its principles had become an integral part of my identity. Indeed, I had developed a way of thinking and questioning that has transformed the way I view the world.

Now, as a relatively young researcher in my late twenties, I am well aware of the contractual issues facing researchers in higher education institutions, the continuing discussions about what is ‘real’ research and to what extent higher education institutions can be expected to resource research activities, especially in the current economic climate. All of these issues are influencing the choices of educational researchers, such as remaining flexible enough to move to find work and striving to publish work regularly to the highest standard. That, amongst other things, is what being an academic is about, isn’t it?

Working in my current post over the last year, I have begun to ask many questions about what it is to be an ‘academic’. Members of staff in further education colleges who teach higher education are caught between two very different worlds – the higher education one which views research as an integral (albeit sometimes small) part of academia and the further education one that views research as a luxury that simply can not be afforded. In a further education college, the opportunities to engage in any type of research are simply non-existent for most, despite delivering courses that are equivalent to the first and second year of an honours programme. Should not all staff delivering higher education be afforded the same opportunities to engage in research, in whatever form? Is this not only fair for the students who are studying higher education taught in a further education institution?

“The working in my current post over the last year, I have begun to ask many questions about what it is to be an ‘academic’.”

The answers to these questions cannot be answered by one person and thankfully, there is always access to an academic community of people with the same interests and helpful expertise. The BERA SIGs are particularly useful for meeting other like-minded researchers outside your institution and I have already received a great deal of support from the higher education community. Research into this area is also proliferating as more foundation degrees are introduced. Indeed, with further education colleges now allowed to apply for degree awarding powers, there will, no doubt, be many more changes over the coming years for higher education generally.

It is not absolutely clear yet what my next steps will be. For the moment, I am continuing my work in the area of physical education whilst fully immersed in the world of higher education in further education. But to remain up-to-date with both fields is not going to be easy. It will require carefully managing my time and making the most of contacts and networks. Yet, I consider myself lucky to have the options available to me and hope that they might also prove useful for obtaining future research posts. I perceive myself to be at the beginning of what I hope to be a very long and prosperous academic profession. Who knows what the future holds?
Racism and Marxism: a personal account*

Mike Cole, Bishop Grosseteste University College, Lincoln

Some people ask me how I first got involved in writing about racism. I think it all stems originally from my early childhood. Growing up in Bristol, a key pivot of the slave trade in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, my first recollection of the manifestations of racism was encapsulated in a childhood saying. The saying, obviously directed at girls, was that ‘if you step on the lines between the stones on the pavement, when you grow up you’ll marry a black man’. I also recall going for a walk with my grandmother, and her pointing out with surprise, ‘look there’s a black man!’.

A little later in my childhood, I think in the late 1950s as immigration was increasing, I remember being told (although I do not know whether it was true) that a well-known chain store had a policy of not employing black labour. As a young child, the racist norms of the society must already have affected me. Having seen black women working in Woolworths, I remember thinking that this other popular chain store must be in some way superior because of its operation of this ‘colour bar’. About the same time I remember one of my cousins remarking to me disapprovingly that ‘Jamaicans’ spent more money on their cars than on their homes. At the time it was commonly accepted that black people ate Kit E Kat (a popular cat food) because they knew no different.

At school, in the early 1960s if I recall correctly, I found myself being driven home from school by a medical doctor, who happened to be the father of a friend. As we passed near St. Pauls, an area with a long-standing black population, he told me that that of my cousins remarking to me disapprovingly that ‘Jamaicans’ spent more money on their cars than on their homes. At the time it was commonly accepted that black people ate Kit E Kat (a popular cat food) because they knew no different.

One of my best friends at college in London in the late 1960s (where I studied for and failed a sociology degree) was a Trinidadian of Asian heritage. Our friendship continued as I embarked on a teacher education course at another college. We used to meet up regularly to drink beer and eat curry in a couple of rooms in which I lived in Kew Gardens, in the southwest of London. I remember vividly the reaction of the landlady, on discovering his presence: ‘it’s not right having a black man in a white house’. When challenged, she responded by stating, ‘it’s not so bad him being in your kitchen, but I do object to cleaning the toilet after him’ (we had our own kitchen, but shared the toilet with the landlady).

By the 1970s, I was teaching in a primary school in Ladbroke Grove in west London, determined that I would use my role as a teacher to challenge racism, and all the other inequalities that, as a Marxist educator, I had decided was one of my main goals. The opening remarks about my final year primary class (ten- to eleven-year-olds) from the Deputy Head before my first meeting with the class was ‘you won’t get anything out of them’. Determined to prove her wrong, I decided to change the order of things somewhat. During morning assembly, the (overwhelmingly) African-Caribbean children were forced by the head teacher to sit cross-legged on the floor and to listen to western classical music, while the deputy head teacher moved around the hall and coerced them into order and silence.

I insisted that on the first day at the school (I was employed by the Inner London Education Authority on an enhanced salary to work temporarily in schools that were having difficulty retaining staff) that I would not teach the whole class, but would meet all the children, either individually or in pairs. At these meetings, several were surprised that we had a mutual interest in reggae music. I suggested to some of them that they bring in some records the following day. One of the first deals I negotiated with my class on that day was that, if we worked through the day, we could play some reggae in our classroom at the end of the afternoon.

Some months after I started teaching, six of the children’s poems were published in the popular and highly respected community newspaper, West Indian World. Some poems were about nostalgia for Dominica, the country of origin of most of the children; others were angry tirades against the racism and class exploitation in their lives. One of the many things that sticks in my mind is a girl of Dominican origin in my class telling me that there were too many rats in her flat, and about the white man who drove round every Friday in his Rolls Royce to collect the rent.

I first read Marx, starting with Capital Volume 1, over thirty years ago, while studying for an MA at Sussex University. Shortly afterwards, I became familiar with the work of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham. Headed at the time by Stuart Hall, the CCCS was publishing neo-Marxist analyses of popular culture at a breathtaking pace. Along with a number of Occasional Stenciled Papers, the Centre and its associates produced some major books. One of the Centre’s books, The Empire Strikes Back (CCCS, 1982) dealt specifically with racism. This book, along with other Marxist analyses of racism both emanating from the CCCS and elsewhere, made me think that perhaps Marxism had most purchase in understanding the multifaceted nature of racism, both historically and contemporaneously (to my disappointment, in more recent years, before CCCS’s closure, >>
“By the 1970s, I was teaching in a primary school in Ladbroke Grove in west London, determined that I would use my role as a teacher to challenge racism, and all the other inequalities...”

Hall and others have abandoned much of their Marxist thinking in favour of postmodernism. Getting a job at what was then Brighton Polytechnic gave me time to write, and a few years after having become acquainted with the work of the CCCS, I published my first Marxist critiques of racism, and have been using Marxist theory to try to understand racism ever since. Working in HE also provided me with the opportunity to do a PhD (which traced the continuity of racism in British society, from the days of the British Empire to the rise of the Radical Right). It further enabled me to visit a number of countries tainted by imperialism and colonialism. I have seen first-hand the dire poverty of India and Sri Lanka; the oppression of Native Canadians and Indigenous Australians; apartheid in the US and in post-Apartheid South Africa.

My most recent publications on racism have been Marxist critiques of Critical Race Theory. Long established in the US, CRT is relatively new to the UK. In November, 2006, the first ever international CRT seminar in the United Kingdom took place at the Education and Social Research Institute at Manchester Metropolitan University. CRT has, as yet, few adherents here. These few are mainly working in the field of education. Indeed, CRT’s main UK-based protagonists, David Gillborn, John Preston and Namita Chakrabarty, all educationists, presented papers at that conference.

At the British Education Research Association Annual Conference in September, 2007, at least six papers were CRT-focused, including a symposium, entitled, ‘Guess who’s coming to Bera? Has critical race theory arrived in UK education research?’ (BERA, 2007). At the 2008 BERA Conference, a minimum of four papers had a CRT theme, including one of the 3 BERA keynotes which was given, as readers will probably be aware, by Gloria Ladson-Billings, arguably the most prominent US Critical Race Theorist in Education. There are thus indications of a definitive presence of CRT in Education in the UK.

In my new book, Critical Race Theory and Education: a Marxist response, I argue against two of CRT’s central tenets, namely the primacy of ‘race’ over class; and ‘white supremacy’ as a descriptor of contemporary everyday practice in specified countries. In their place, I posit the Marxist concept of racialized capitalism which I believe has more explanatory purchase than does CRT in understanding racism, both historically and contemporaneously. I make the case that racialization, in connecting to modes of production, enables us to understand past and present anti-Asian and anti-black racism in the UK, from the days of the British Empire, through the experience of migrant workers and their children in the immediate post-war period, a time when Britain was in dire need of cheap labour power, to the present.

I also stress the need for a consideration of non-colour-coded racism (outside the remit of CRT) and long directed at, for example, Jewish, Irish and Gypsy Roma Traveller communities, and more recently at Eastern European migrant workers. With respect to these latter-day migrant workers, Sivanandan has described the racism they experience as xeno-racism, and I have coined the term, xeno-racialization to describe the processes by which these workers and their children are falsely categorised ‘racially’. Research on xeno-racism and the xeno-racialization of the children of Eastern European migrant workers in UK schools is urgent (3). I would be most interested to hear of any other research in this area in which members of BERA are involved.

Notes
1. The city had very few black inhabitants in the early 1950s. The estimated 5,000 slaves who had been kept as servants in the eighteenth century had long since merged into the general population.
2. During an impromptu feedback to the head teacher at the end of the day on how things went, I happened to mention that, after we had done some Maths and some English, we then played some reggae. The response of the head of this predominantly African-Caribbean multicultural school was, ‘oh, what’s that?’
3. One example is work by my colleague at Bishop Grosseteste University College Lincoln, Dr Richard Woolley, who is working on a pilot project to develop community cohesion with schools in the Boston area of south Lincolnshire. A project pack has been produced and is freely available to schools, community and not-for-profit organisations (www.bishopg.ac.uk/personalhistories). Its applications are being explored by other Local Authorities.


Mike Cole is Research Professor in Education and Equality, Head of Research, and Director of the Centre for Education for Social Justice at Bishop Grosseteste University College, Lincoln.
How do we contribute to an educational knowledge base?
A response to Whitehead and a challenge to BERJ

Marie Huxtable, Senior Educational Psychologist, Bath and North East Somerset

As an educator, my lived and living educational values form the explanatory principles of my practice and my living standards of judgment in appraising my work. They are at the core of my being, and are unconsciously expressed in what I do and the way I am. I do not exist in isolation and my values are relationally dynamic being held, formed and re-formed in that complex space between self and other/s. To communicate, those values and the educational influence I am having, requires a form of representation beyond the possibilities offered by traditional academic writing.

I agree with Whitehead (RI105) in responding to Bruce Ferguson (RI102), Laidlaw (RI104) and Adler-Colins (RI104) that enhanced by the diversity of global cultures, what counts as educational knowledge in the Western Academy is gradually transforming. I also agree that, ‘...the forms of representations used in BERJ are too limited to communicate the energy flowing, explanatory principles that can explain educational influences in learning’ (Whitehead, 2008a, p.29); new forms are needed which can help us to communicate our understandings and contribute to an educational knowledge base.

My work in an English local authority, coordinating and developing inclusive gifted and talented educational theory and practice, contributes to the realisation of the local authority’s inclusive values expressed in the statement, “We want all Children and Young People to do better in life than they ever thought they could. We will give children and young people the help that they need to do this”.

Education is concerned not with inanimate objects with predefined potentials and fixed relationships, but with emancipating a person, as learner, to improve her/his own wellbeing and wellbecoming and that of us all. My research, and that of the educators with whom I work, is therefore concerned with describing and explaining how we are improving educational contexts, spaces and relationships, which particularly relate to enhancing the educational experiences of each unique person in our school system.

BERJ in its present form cannot help develop the educational knowledge-base that we, and other educational researchers, are generating in terms of our energy-flowing and values-laden explanatory principles. As Eisner (2005) said:

Human beings are, after all, sentient beings whose lives are pervaded by complex and subtle forms of affect. To try to comprehend the ways in which people function and the meanings the events in their lives have for them and to neglect either seeing or portraying those events and meanings is to distort and limit what can be known about them. (p. 116)

I agree with Whitehead that the BERJ needs to grow into a form in which the representations of these very human qualities that educational research is concerned with can be communicated and understood.

Quinn (1997) talks of the need to decentre: ‘Decentring is a vital idea. It is the achievement whereby I learn what it is that you need to hear or experience in order to share what is in my mind, whether it be a question, an idea or a supportive anecdote.’ (p.86)

My living educational values are dynamic and relational and are not adequately communicated through ‘fixed’ forms of representation. For me to ‘decentre’ and communicate I ask you to read first the following text and see what sense you make of it. Then read again while engaging with the still image and recognising where your understanding is enabled as your focus moves between the people and the space and the text. Finally I ask you to engage with the text as you watch the video clip with an awareness of where you are pausing and scrutinising a still image, moving the cursor back and forth and replaying sections of the video, re-reading text, and moving between the text, stills and video. It’s complicated. How we make sense and create understandings is complicated. I find it helpful to use Rayner’s (2005) notion of inclusionality; a dynamic awareness of space and boundaries as receptive, responsive and co-creational.

“My living educational values are dynamic and relational and are not adequately communicated through ‘fixed’ forms of representation.”

What follows is part of a video narrative in which I try ostensively to clarify the meanings of my educational values of, a loving recognition, a respectful connectedness, and an educational responsibility, as an example.

The context is a day when children and teachers have come together for a day as co-learners, facilitated by a mathematician and an educator, to experience what it is to enquire as a mathematician.

So, to begin.

The video, for which ethical permissions were sought and given is on http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7Ck_ECxcxEc

I have watched this 6-minute video many times and each time there is something special about it, particularly in the relationship between Louise (teacher) and Louis (pupil in the foreground). If, using Jack Whitehead’s technique (Whitehead, 2008b), you run the cursor back and forward you may share with me a sense of the flow of a respectful connectedness between them. Each is respectful of the emotional, physical and personal boundaries of each other and the >>
other two children. There is sensitivity between adult and children not to impose but to offer and invite. The space between them changes in a flowing ‘dance’ as they move — back to invite, in to engage. Louise’s loving recognition of Louis, appreciating and valuing his intense desire to share, to inform, to engage the group and particularly Louise, in creating an understanding. I see her loving recognition of Louis as she enables him to express his educational responsibility towards her in his desire to bring her to a point of understanding that satisfies her. In that, Louise is expressing her educational responsibility towards Louis.

I believe that in allowing Louis to bring her to an understanding Louis deepens his own understanding of mathematics and of himself as valued knowledge co-creator. I see Louis expressing a loving recognition of Louise. He does not engage her as authority, teacher or adult, but as the person she is, inquisitive, keen to understand, to enjoy the learning that emerges from uncertainty and the pleasure of being the educator she wants to be sharing a creative and productive space. The space between Louise and Louis is energised by their shared commitment to extending the other’s understanding and the pleasure of being in good company.

I see in this brief clip Louise working to connect with the best intent of the other in mind, to help them understand, express and develop accordingly. (An expression of a person’s best intent may not always be in their best interest; for instance, Korczak’s (Lifton, 1989) best intent was expressed as he chose to accompany the children to the concentration camp and death.) The relationship requires trust, so the child can feel secure that the educator is trying to understand what their best intent might be and to learn, from and with them, as to how they might reach the point of determining their own path to live the life they want to live, mindful of their own best interests and that of others.

This is where I ask you to re-read the above engaging with the still image and text and then with the video and text. I ask you to consider as you do so whether the educational qualities, which I am researching, are communicated more fully as you engage interactively with the multimedia narrative rather than the traditional text alone.

I believe that I have communicated more of the relationally dynamic qualities of my educational research through inviting you to engage with me in this brief interactive, multimedia narrative, than would otherwise have been possible. I may be wrong but I cannot test my claim in the current form of the BERJ. The e-version of RI, as Whitehead illustrated, is taking advantage of 21st technology, which will influence the educational epistemological transformations going on around the world. Can BERJ evolve a form that can build on this lead? As a contribution to answering this question I do hope that you find it possible to participate in the keynote symposium at the BERA 09 Conference on Explicating A New Epistemology For Educational Knowledge With Educational Responsibility (Huxtable, 2009).

“Education is concerned not with inanimate objects with predefined potentials and fixed relationships, but with emancipating a person, as learner, to improve her/his own wellbeing and wellbecoming and that of us all.”
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BERA Risk Assessment and Audit Committee
Call for expressions of interest

Jeremy Hoad, BERA Chief Executive Officer

BERA Council has approved the establishment of a new Risk Assessment and Audit Committee and applications are invited for membership from current BERA members.

The Committee will have a remit to provide oversight and advice to BERA Council on the effective functioning of the Association in relation to:
1. risk management;
2. financial processes;
3. legal requirements;
4. whistleblowing.

The Committee will provide a report to the first meeting of the Executive Council in a calendar year highlighting any issues of interest or concern and making recommendations for action if appropriate. It will also present an annual report to the Association’s Annual General Meeting.

The Committee will aim to make its work as transparent as possible to all BERA Members and other interested parties, but will conduct its business in a confidential manner at all times.

The Committee will be comprised of:

a. Chair (member of BERA Council, appointed by BERA Executive Council);
b. up to four members of BERA;
c. BERA Chief Executive Officer (in attendance, non-voting).

The Committee will meet at least twice in each financial year:
1. one full meeting (likely to coincide with BERA Annual Conference);
2. one meeting between the Chair of the Committee, the Chief Executive Officer and the BERA President.

Terms of office will normally be for a period of three years commencing at the BERA Annual General Meeting.

Applications
If you are interested in joining the BERA Risk Assessment and Audit Committee then please send the following information to Jeremy Hoad, BERA Chief Executive Officer, copied to the BERA Office (details below):

1. name;
2. BERA membership number;
3. contact telephone number and/or email address;
4. a statement outlining your interest and experience in the areas of responsibility of the Committee (250 words maximum).

Applications - by post or email (email preferred) - must be received before 12.00 midday on 9th July 2009. If sending by email please copy to both the BERA office and to the BERA CEO addresses.

Acknowledgements will be emailed on or before 10th July as proof of receipt. You should contact the BERA Office to verify receipt if you do not receive an emailed acknowledgement, or if you send information by post. If you do not receive an acknowledgement then this indicates BERA has not received your application.

If necessary an election will be held. In this case the names of candidates and the statements provided will be distributed to BERA members.

Further information:
Full terms of reference are available from the BERA Office and on the BERA website:

BERA, Association House, South Park Road, Macclesfield, SK11 6SH
T: 01625 504062
E: admin@bera.ac.uk
W: www.bera.ac.uk

If you are considering applying for membership of the Committee you may also contact Jeremy Hoad, BERA Chief Executive Officer, for an informal discussion:

Jeremy Hoad
BERA Chief Executive Officer
E: jeremy.hoad@bera.ac.uk