

Boyd, Pete ORCID logoORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2234-3595 (2016) Editorial: Practitioner Research in Higher Education, 10 (2). Practitioner Research in Higher Education, 10 (2). p. 1.

Downloaded from: http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/2566/

Usage of any items from the University of Cumbria's institutional repository 'Insight' must conform to the following fair usage guidelines.

Any item and its associated metadata held in the University of Cumbria's institutional repository Insight (unless stated otherwise on the metadata record) may be copied, displayed or performed, and stored in line with the JISC fair dealing guidelines (available here) for educational and not-for-profit activities

provided that

- the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
 - a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
- the content is not changed in any way
- all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

You may not

- sell any part of an item
- refer to any part of an item without citation
- amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator's reputation
- remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

The full policy can be found here.

Alternatively contact the University of Cumbria Repository Editor by emailing $\underline{insight@cumbria.ac.uk}$.

Practitioner Research in Higher Education Journal

Copyright © 2016 University of Cumbria Volume 10 Issue 2 December 2016

Editorial

This issue of the journal presents studies that give insight into both student learning and tutor learning. This is a key feature of practitioner research in higher education, that it contributes to the professional learning of academics and to the enhancement of student learning.

The first paper by Torres and Anguiano uses a framework of student identify formation with regard to the written tutor feedback on a piece of assessed coursework, an essay. In addition to the usual expectation of correction in relation to some kind of expected norm the feedback the analysis revealed two interesting features. First, the students saw the essay as a product of their creation and an extension of themselves whereas the tutors often preferred a metaphor of 'essay is the writer'. Second, the tutors tended to position themselves as more knowledgeable and the students fell into a defensive position of 'listener' to the feedback. The researchers suggest that tutors should be more sensitive to the identity formation influence of their written feedback and position it as a personalised conversation.

In the second paper James evaluates an intervention to the participation of students in classroom activity and discussion. She begins with a challenge for all academics arising from previous studies – that the vast majority of student participation is by a mere handful of students. The key challenges for students include confidence (or lack of it) and the sheer size of many classes. The issue of forcing participation is raised and the possibility is discussed that this might do more harm than good.

In paper three Brown explores the ambition of a professional education programme to challenge societal ageism and influence the beliefs and self-awareness of students on a programme focused on working with older adults. In this sense the module being explored was an attempt to bring about transformative learning in the students in relation to their views towards older adults. Brown argues that the analysis reveals some degree of transformation of perspective by the three student participants and suggests practical activities that would help students to more explicitly reflect on their developing beliefs and stance.

In paper four Thanaraj investigates the experiences of three academics who move from face to face teaching to facilitation of online learning. She uses Archer's modes of reflexivity to consider how the tutors move towards a more autonomous stance in handling this change in practice. Thanaraj emphasises the need to support identity formation in addition to technical training for academics making the shift to facilitation of online learning.

In the fifth paper Davis, Wright and Holly provide a useful and engaging review of the literature on academic writing or research retreats before reflecting on their own retreat designed to support doctoral students in their writing by developing skills but also beliefs and identities. The authors consider the pedagogical tensions faced by facilitators of academic retreats in providing structured activities, timed writing slots, formal tutor support or relying on expectations and informal peer support. They mention the possible higher level of participation in academic retreats by women and it might be interesting for future inquiry to consider who chooses to attend retreats and why but also who stays away.

The papers in this issue reveal the ambition of teachers in higher education. They are going beyond the question 'what is my impact on learning?' to ask the more challenging question: 'what is my impact on learning and on learners?' These academics are considering the impact of higher education on the beliefs, dispositions and skills of students.

Pete Boyd Editor