

Enacting Inclusion and Citizenship through Pedagogical Staff Development

LUISA BUNESCU



The way academics teach is of critical importance for any reform intended to open up universities to displaced students, and more generally to any disadvantaged and under-represented groups of learners. Pedagogical staff development needs to accompany all academic and non-academic support measures meant to enhance access and participation of learners in higher education.

Background of the Initiative

Enhancing pedagogical staff development (i.e. teacher training) in higher education in Europe was one of the main objectives of the European Forum for Enhanced Collaboration in Teaching (EFFECT, 2015–19) project,¹ co-funded by the European Commission, under the Erasmus + programme. EFFECT was led by the European University Association (EUA), and brought together twelve partners from ten different countries, including national rectors' conferences, higher education institutions, networks and associations active in the field of learning and teaching. Within the EFFECT project, the author of this chapter coordinated the implementation of the pedagogical staff development workshops on inclusion and citizenship skills.

These themes (inclusion and citizenship) were chosen by the project consortium as two of the grand challenges experienced in our societies, and which universities together with other actors should address. Inclusion and equity appear as desiderata in several international, high-level communications. They are reflected in the Agenda 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), and notably in SDG4 which promotes inclusive, quality and equitable education, with specific reference to vulnerable groups. For more than a decade, national and European

agendas, both under the EU and the Bologna Process, have also emphasised equity and inclusion. In 2007, the Council of Europe defined the different missions of higher education as preparation for sustainable employment, *preparation for life as active citizens in democratic societies* (author's italics), personal development, and the development and maintenance, through teaching, learning and research, of a broad, advanced knowledge base (Council of Europe 2007).

And yet higher education in Europe falls short of being truly inclusive and equitable. Students from disadvantaged, under-represented or at-risk groups still find it hard to participate in higher education, especially without targeted support (both academic and non-academic). More recently, financial support (for instance through scholarships, exemption from tuition fees, etc.) has been provided by national authorities and higher education institutions to those in need, but curriculum design, and more importantly the teaching practice, have not changed much. There seems to be a lack of understanding that the way academics teach is of critical importance for any reform intended to enhance inclusion in higher education.

The discourse around inclusion inevitably informs that around citizenship. How do societies, higher education institutions and teaching staff include students from disadvantaged or under-represented groups such as third country nationals, refugees, stateless people and so on within their systems, while empowering them to enact their own acts of citizenship? This was the overarching question that the pedagogical staff development workshops on inclusion and citizenship skills that formed part of the EFFECT project tried to address.

Another important question then arises, namely how well teachers are prepared to consider the societal mission of higher education in learning goals and teaching practice. Interestingly, while the majority of higher education institutions agree on the increasing importance of inclusion and citizenship, they seem not to be priorities for teaching enhancement (European University Association, Trends 2018).² Hence, the EFFECT consortium considered it valuable to work on the connection between teaching enhancement and the promotion of values-based higher education (inclusion and citizenship skills).

Reflecting on the Challenges

Even if teaching performance is part of academic staff evaluation, in most European Higher Education Area (EHEA) systems good teaching plays only a small role in teachers' career progression, while research

performance remains the most important factor for promotion (Sursock 2015: 80; European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice 2018: 89). The disparity of esteem between research and teaching not only weakens the nexus between the two, but most importantly it drives academic staff to focus more on their research output, rather than paying equal and considerable attention to their teaching activities and pedagogical development. This finding is supported by recent research (Bunesco and Gaebel 2018: 19) confirming that only in a minority (32 per cent) of higher education systems in Europe is participation in teaching enhancement courses considered for career progression. Moreover, even in these systems, financial incentives or rewards for academic staff participating in teaching enhancement are very uncommon. Recognition for teaching enhancement would, therefore, be the first layer of the challenge at stake.

Secondly, even when promoted and implemented, teaching enhancement activities continue to be carried out against a background that lacks consensus on what makes quality teaching in education, how teacher training should be delivered and at what level (individual, departmental, within a specific discipline or interdisciplinary, at the level of the higher education institution or national, etc.). What is perhaps even more challenging is carrying out teaching enhancement activities based on a reflective approach, which has the potential to criticise the tacit understandings that practitioners have developed, and which, at times, prevents them from arriving at new understandings and practice.

Beyond anecdotal evidence, highlighting and measuring the impact of teacher training also remains challenging. This is, of course, not to say that teaching enhancement schemes are not impactful. Quite the contrary. A series of annual reports by Advance HE shows that the introduction of teaching enhancement schemes in UK universities has been having a significant impact on the higher education culture within these institutions, with teachers from the respective institutions stating that pedagogical staff development encouraged them to critically reflect on their practice and helped them to improve their teaching in the longer term (Advance HE 2018: 7).

Undervaluing teaching leaves one wondering about the capacity of our higher education systems to address student diversity and learners' success, which lies not only in funding or legal frameworks, but equally in the capacity of teachers to include all students, and enable, not despite but because of diversity, a richer learning experience.

Promoting inclusion in the classroom means encouraging and facilitating discussions, challenging stereotypes and working with unconscious

biases within the learning and teaching process.³ This is particularly evident when working to address inclusion and citizenship in diverse classrooms, where some students tend to be subjected to forms of marginalisation.

Refugee students are a particularly vulnerable group, given their forced displacement and obstacles to accessing and graduating from higher education in the host countries. The needs of students with a refugee background go beyond pragmatic requirements of educational programmes, and involve complex social, cultural, psychological and economic needs. This is why, especially in such cases, pedagogical staff development with a focus on inclusion is of particular relevance.

Inclusion and Citizenship in Higher Education Teaching

The discourse around inclusion and citizenship skills can be framed within the capability approach pioneered by the economist-philosopher Amartya Sen and philosopher Martha Nussbaum, and which, in the past decades, has emerged as a new conceptual framework about development, justice and well-being.

The approach places at its forefront people's capabilities, meaning their genuine opportunities to achieve well-being: 'seeing opportunity in terms of capability allows us to distinguish appropriately between (i) whether a person is actually able to do things she would value *doing*, and (ii) whether she possesses the *means or instruments or permissions* to pursue what she would like to do (her actual ability to do that pursuing may depend on many contingent circumstances)' (Sen 2005: 153).

For Sen, capabilities are available options or alternatives that do not exist only on paper (formally, legally), but are also effectively available to a person. The opportunity to be educated, the ability to travel and study abroad, or to actively take part in the political and civic life of a community could be thought of as capabilities. Importantly, it should be acknowledged that not every person has the same real opportunities. For instance, citizenship rights and benefits are not accessible to all groups in our societies. The right to education and access to social benefits still depend, in many countries, on being a citizen. As Engin Isin puts it, 'in political life, when you are deprived of a nationality status, being just "human" doesn't help' (Pullano 2013).

If we are to transpose Sen's understanding of capabilities to people seeking asylum or to refugees, their capabilities are much more limited than those of country citizens. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates that globally only 1 per cent of ref-

ugees have been able to enrol in higher education, compared with a global average of 36 per cent of young people (UNHCR 2018), even though several international conventions (such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights) stipulate that access to higher education is a human right. In most higher education systems, refugees and asylum seekers are considered as third country nationals (i.e. international students), which automatically qualifies them for much higher, often unaffordable, tuition fees. Thus, although higher education might very well be a formal, legal option for everyone, in reality higher education is not effectively available to specific groups, such as those with refugee status, due to additional and at times invisible obstacles and barriers that such specific groups face. Hence, discussions on access and real opportunities should be the starting point for meaningful conversations around both inclusion and citizenship. Who should be included in higher education, in addition to traditional learners? Who gets to benefit from citizenship rights and to what extent?

Citizenship, understood in its formal, legal sense (the state of being a member of a particular country and having rights because of it), is in fact restrictive, leaving certain groups out: citizens can have rights, but also duties that are denied or only partly extended to other noncitizens residing in a country or to those who are citizens but institutionally marginalised (e.g. Roma populations in certain European countries). Usually, citizenship is a prerequisite for full political rights, such as the right to vote or to hold public office. In its formal, legal interpretation, therefore, citizenship is exclusive, not necessarily being reserved for all residents of a country.

In the context of the EFFECT pedagogical staff development workshops on inclusion and citizenship skills, citizenship was not framed in its formal, legal meaning, but formulated in broader terms and understood as ‘participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterised by mutual respect and non-violence in accordance with human rights and democracy’ (Hoskins 2006: 4). This approach to citizenship mirrors Engin Isin’s argument that people who are not formal citizens can also ‘act out’ or enact citizenship: ‘Acts of citizenship may be cultivated by or may transgress practices and formal entitlement, as they emerge from the paradox between universal inclusion in the language of rights and cosmopolitanism, on the one hand, and inevitable exclusion in the language of community and particularity on the other’ (Isin and Nielsen 2008: 11).

Citizenship thus becomes a dynamic process, where the question ‘Who is a citizen?’ gets replaced by ‘What makes citizens?’. Precisely in

this last question lies the bridge between inclusion and citizenship, so that the two concepts have the potential to be brought together.

Inclusion and citizenship were addressed jointly as topics for pedagogical staff development also because neither is currently treated as a priority in terms of teaching enhancement, although several political systems in Europe have been marred by waves of populism and nationalism in the past years, and in particular since the beginning of what is usually labelled as the ‘refugee crisis’.

This leaves the question of how well teachers in higher education institutions across Europe are equipped to address grand challenges such as inclusivity and citizenship. Did teachers have the opportunity to follow pedagogical staff development, particularly around such challenges? Did they have the occasion to engage in meaningful conversations on inclusion and citizenship within their institutions? This is vital for providing a learning experience that would enable the development of students as critical thinkers, responsible citizens in a changing world and adults who can address their own and the world’s grand challenges.

The Methodology of the Inclusion and Citizenship Skills Workshops

If pedagogical staff development is to achieve psychosocial change among the academic teaching staff, then reflective learning needs to be considered. Reflection is not an end in itself, but rather an important tool which enables teachers to be more intentional and deliberate in their teaching.

However, conservative pedagogical training models, promoting a ‘how to’ and hands-on training approach, do not sufficiently exploit the potential that critical reflection and personal agency (i.e. the role of teachers as practitioners and individuals) have in the classroom, although both are central in conveying values-based education. This is why the EFFECT consortium undertook an extensive literature review in order to identify a methodology that would encourage critical reflection in pedagogical staff development. The Change Laboratory methodology⁴ was chosen, as it offered an opportunity to reconcile formal teacher training and critical reflection, while emphasising personal agency in values-based teaching enhancement.

Change Laboratory intends to reconceptualise activity, by first provoking authentic reactions, responses and disagreements among the participants. Confrontation, authenticity and courage to utter what one

really thinks are all elicited from the participants, as ‘good teaching requires courage – the courage to expose one’s ignorance as well as insight, to invite contradiction as well as consent’ (Palmer 1990: 15).

In order to elicit authentic and powerful reactions within the workshops, stimulus material was developed, consisting of original student and teacher testimonials on concrete situations related to inclusion and citizenship in higher education.

There is no diversity in my programme. I am a final-year PhD candidate and I have never felt culturally or ethnically included. The fact that I am one of two black persons in my programme and that I do not have friends is not my fault. Everything is white and Euro-centric.

Figure 11.1. Example of stimulus material. Image by the author.

A small library of all stimulus material used in the pedagogical staff development workshops on inclusion and citizenship skills was prepared by the project team and is available for public use.⁵

After the disagreement and confrontation surface based on the stimulus material proposed by the workshop facilitator, participants are encouraged to work together to reimagine their teaching activity and identify solutions that would address their practice. As applied in the workshops, the methodology stimulated meaningful conversations and reflection among the participants and brought together different perspectives to a shared challenge.

Implementation of the Workshops

Over 130 academic staff from ten European countries attended the pedagogical staff development workshops on inclusion and citizenship skills organised as part of the EFFECT project. Most of the participants were academic teaching staff, but students, institutional leadership and technical and administrative staff also attended.

Normally, the Change Laboratory methodology presupposes that the same group of participants meets several times over a 9–12-month period, with tasks in between the sessions. The EFFECT team, nevertheless, wanted to test the adaptability of this methodology in different higher education systems around Europe, as well as in a virtual learning environment, so the methodology itself had to be slightly adapted. For the four face-to-face workshops, the implementation team worked each time with a different group of participants, in different national

and international contexts. For online workshops, the same pilot group of ten participants followed a series of three webinars following the model of the face-to-face workshops adapted to online delivery.

In the online meetings, the conversations were steered by an experienced facilitator with additional technical support. To make best use of their time online, participants were given home assignments based on issues arising in the sessions, for instance completing a self-assessment questionnaire on unconscious bias⁶ or applying the Change Laboratory model to their own teaching practice.

In the face-to-face workshops, participants were split into smaller discussion groups, configured to reflect a diversity of stakeholders around the table: teachers, students, technical, library and support staff as well as institutional leadership. On average, there were about six participants per table. It was thought, and later confirmed, that smaller discussion tables would encourage participants to get more engaged in the conversations, whereas larger tables would lead to the disengagement of some attendees. The discussions, based on stimulus material, were facilitated by well-briefed table scribes, who not only gently steered the conversations, but also captured the main ideas in writing.

A set of open reflective questions built around stimulus material were advanced by the table scribes, to provoke conversations on what teachers face in their own learning and teaching contexts. The following reflective questions were suggested: What are the artefacts, rules and organisational structures at play in your institution and which directly affect your teaching practice? What is your motivation for seeking change? What could be different? What difference will it make? What can you personally do about it? How disruptive are you prepared to be? These questions were mainly designed to challenge the assumptions and status quo by asking participants to reflect both on their individual practice and institutional culture. They were also meant to trigger conversations on how pedagogical reflection can introduce different (refugee) narratives in the classroom and how such narratives can be reframed in all aspects of teaching (reading questions, the courses' thematic focus, lecture materials and class discussions), as Erin Goheen Glanville also describes in her chapter in this volume.

The institutional culture should not be forgotten in such conversations, given the impact that department, discipline colleagues and supervisors have on the outcomes of individual teacher training. In fact, although the role of champions in inclusion and citizenship education was widely acknowledged, it was believed that individual teacher training alone would not be sufficient to change powerful and well-

established institutional cultures. Discussions with the teaching staff made it clear that senior encouragement made a difference, not only by creating a sense of obligation, but also by sending a signal that the institutional leadership is committed to the inclusivity agenda.

More detailed information on how the face-to-face and online workshops on inclusion and citizenship skills were implemented can be found in the Appendix to the feasibility study of the EFFECT project.⁷

Lessons Learnt from the Workshops on Inclusion and Citizenship Skills

Since only a few workshops with a relatively small number of participants have been organised, results from this work have to be taken with caution.

The implementation team conducted two rounds of follow-up surveys with the participants of these workshops, one immediately following the event, and the second four to seven months later, the latter mostly in order to inquire about any follow-up activities and impact on teaching practice. The participants credited the workshops for raising awareness and interest in cultural adaptation among the teaching staff, showing more care towards students from under-represented backgrounds, awareness in conveying inclusivity through the academic practice and development of methods and tools to better integrate migrants into local and higher education communities. One workshop table scribe noted: ‘The participants appreciated the opportunity to be heard and valued reflection spaces like this one’. Interestingly, a majority of the respondents wrote that they had not attended similar teaching enhancement workshops or initiatives before.

The Change Laboratory methodology was perceived as innovative by the attendees and, in general, the experience of workshops showed that meaningful conversations but also disagreements enable reflections, which allow better understanding of the challenge, before advancing towards solutions. As Schön (1983: 61) wrote: ‘Through reflection, he [i.e. the practitioner] can surface and criticize tacit understandings that have grown up around the repetitive experiences of a specialized practice, and can make new sense of the situations of uncertainty or uniqueness which he may allow himself to practice’.

After the pedagogical staff development workshops, some of the participants implemented follow-up initiatives, such as organising workshops for their own students using the Change Laboratory methodology to enhance the inclusion of learners with disabilities or working on

developing a boardgame that would help students and teaching staff to improve their cultural understanding. A majority of the participants in the pedagogical staff development workshops said that the discussions raised during the workshops influenced their teaching practice afterwards. They mentioned being more aware of their own unconscious bias or developing more interactive and dynamic activities in the classroom to promote collaboration among students.

One of the lessons learnt is that stimulus material should be carefully prepared, as this is the main element that steers the conversations within the workshops. There should be no reluctance or fear in proposing provocative stimulus material, as the Change Laboratory methodology is intended to be contentious. Moreover, the workshops themselves should provide a safe space for saying what might otherwise remain unspoken. It is likewise important to contextualise the stimulus material, based on the cultural and social issues where the workshop is taking place, but also on the local higher education culture, so that the participants identify themselves with the challenges proposed.

The composition of the smaller breakout/discussion groups should also be carefully considered. There is the risk that a self-selecting group of inclusivity experts will move fast to find solutions to the challenges, rather than systematically unpacking them in order to find novel and sustainable approaches. The discussions were felt to be more meaningful and inclusive with a combination of teachers, students and support staff around the table. A homogenous group (e.g. only teachers) tended to identify solutions outside their scope of influence, rather than recognising their own agency and responsibility in addressing inclusivity and citizenship in the classroom. The implementation team also felt that discussion groups that included attendees from different cultural and disciplinary backgrounds worked better, as peer learning took place in an intercultural and interdisciplinary setting. Participation of institutional leadership did not appear to inhibit the discussions; on the contrary, it enhanced the credibility and importance of the initiative.

The power of these pedagogical staff development workshops rested also on acknowledging that not all students in higher education have the same capabilities (i.e. genuine opportunities), and that, especially in the case of students from under-represented backgrounds, contingent circumstances matter a lot. For higher education institutions and for teachers alike, addressing larger and more diverse student bodies would mean acknowledging that in order to succeed, students have different needs, based on their real and not formal opportunities.

Although access to higher education is a human right, the workshops enabled the participants to reflect critically on what this really presupposes. Invisible barriers, sometimes in the form of unconscious bias from teachers and colleagues, emotional trauma, but also more visible obstacles (e.g. language, financial capacity) were discussed. This transposed into practice Sen's understanding of capabilities which are 'characteristics of individual advantages, [which] fall short of telling us enough about the fairness or equity of the process involved, or about the freedom of citizens to invoke and utilise procedures that are equitable' (Sen 2005: 156).

The initiative to have such pedagogical staff development workshops can also be an impetus for teachers to think more closely about how students can enact citizenship, irrespective of their formal citizenship status. This approach to citizenship leads to an argument in favour of diversity and inclusion, and in broader terms to a humanising agenda that transcends higher education.

Recommendations and Concluding Remarks

Behavioural change requires time and presupposes a reassessment of one's conceptions and attitude. For this to happen, teaching enhancement should have a certain duration and its impact might not become visible immediately. Due to time constraints under the EFFECT project, the Change Laboratory methodology was not implemented in a typical way, in the sense that the implementation team did not work with the same group of participants over a period of nine to twelve months. However, there were early indications of changing attitudes, especially in the online version of the workshops where the same group engaged several times. It is therefore recommended to have a systematic approach to teaching enhancement, rather than one-time and disconnected interventions.

Given their complexity and importance, conveying inclusion and citizenship skills in an academic and pedagogic context should also become a systematic effort at the level of higher education institutions. In this respect, the institutional culture, which is 'not something an organization has, but rather what it is' (Mats Alvesson, cited in Roxa and Martensson 2012: 4), plays a central role. For the institutional culture to change, the effects of pedagogical staff development need to go beyond the individual level, and resonate with departments, disciplines and institutional leadership. All major stakeholders should contribute towards such a shift in the institutional culture.

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, teaching as a professional activity, compared to research, is poorly recognised and rewarded in most European higher education systems. This becomes a disincentive for teachers to engage in pedagogical staff development opportunities, and more importantly gives the wrong signal that the personal agency of the teachers is of little importance for student success. Recognition for such teaching enhancement workshops (for example through open badges, career progression) could play an important role in raising the profile of teaching and encouraging more academic staff to enrol for initial and continuous teacher training. Finally, the model of these workshops asks that reflection is harnessed, biases called into question and real commitments to action made.

Luisa Bunescu is a Policy Analyst at the European University Association (EUA) in Brussels (Belgium). Prior to joining EUA, Luisa worked as a Research Assistant in Macroeconomics at the Berlin School of Economics and Law and as Assistant to the Director at the Centre International de Formation Européenne (CIFE) in Nice, France. Her research interests are in the macroeconomics of higher education, as well as in learning and teaching practices to address equity and inclusion in the academic world.

Notes

1. See <https://www.eua.eu/101-projects/560-effect.html>.
2. In the context of this chapter, I refer to ‘teaching enhancement’ for any type of formal pedagogical development or training provided to teachers, in various ways and formats, such as initial teacher training and continuous professional development (CPD).
3. This is in line with the tenets of critical pedagogy, as theorised, for instance, by Henry Giroux. According to the latter, critical pedagogy is a moral and political practice that helps to unsettle recurrent assumptions, involving, among other things, a struggle for a more socially just world, and which enables students to focus on the suffering of others (Giroux 2011).
4. The EFFECT project team drew heavily on Bligh and Flood (2015).
5. See Appendix 2, ‘The EFFECT Pedagogical Staff Development Workshops: A Repository of Stimulus Material’, https://www.eua.eu/downloads/publications/eua%20brochure%202_appendix%202_fin_single%20page.pdf (accessed 9 October 2019).
6. See <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/> and <https://secure.understandingprejudice.org/iat/>.
7. See Appendix 1, ‘The EFFECT Pedagogical Staff Development Workshops: Methodology, Assessment, and Lessons Learnt’, <https://www.eua.eu/down>

loads/publications/eua%20brochure%20appendix%201_fin_single%20page.pdf (accessed 9 October 2019).

References

- Advance HE. 2018. *Annual Review of HEA Accredited CPD Schemes 2016–2017*. <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/downloads/Annual%20Review%20of%20HEA%20accredited%20CPD%20schemes%202016-17.pdf>.
- Beatty, B.R. 2000. 'The Emotions of Educational Leadership: Breaking the Silence', *International Journal in Education* 3(4): 331–57.
- Bligh, B., and M. Flood. 2015. 'The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory', in J. Huisman and M. Tight (eds), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research*, Vol. 1. http://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/74672/1/Volume_3_Bligh_Flood.pdf.
- Bunescu, L., and M. Gaebel. 2018. *National Initiatives in Learning and Teaching in Europe: A Report from the European Forum for Enhanced Collaboration in Teaching (EFFECT) Project*. <https://www.eua.eu/resources/publications/799:national-initiatives-in-learning-and-teaching-in-europe.html>.
- Council of Europe. 2007. *Recommendation CM/Rec(2007)6 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the Public Responsibility for Higher Education and Research*. Council of Europe. https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=09000016805d5dae.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice. 2018. *The European Higher Education Area in 2018: Bologna Process Implementation Report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European University Association, Trends. 2018. *Learning and Teaching in the European Higher Education Area*. Brussels. <https://eua.eu/downloads/publications/trends-2018-learning-and-teaching-in-the-european-higher-education-area.pdf>.
- Giroux, A.H. 2011. *On Critical Pedagogy*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Hoskins, B. 2006. *Draft Framework on Indicators for Active Citizenship*. Ispra: CRELL. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.132.1723&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
- Isin, E.F., and G.M. Nielsen. 2008. *Acts of Citizenship*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Palmer, P.J. 1990. 'Good Teaching', *Change* 22(1): 10–16.
- Pullano, T. 2013. 'Rethinking Citizenship beyond the Nation State. Interview to Engin Isin'. *European Alternatives*, 26 February. <https://euroalter.com/2013/rethinking-citizenship-beyond-the-nation-state-interview-to-engin-isin>.
- Roxa, T., and K. Mårtensson. 2012. 'How Effects from Teacher-Training of Academic Teachers Propagate into the Meso Level and Beyond', in E. Simon and G. Plešchova (eds), *Teacher Development in Higher Education: Existing Programs, Program Impact and Future Trends*. London: Routledge.
- Schön, D.A. 1983. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books.

- Sen, A. 2005. 'Human Rights and Capabilities', *Journal of Human Development* 6(2): 151–66.
- Sursock, A. 2015. *Trends 2015: Learning and Teaching in European Universities*. Brussels. <https://eua.eu/downloads/publications/trends%202015%20learning%20and%20teaching%20in%20european%20universities.pdf>.
- UNHCR. 2018. *The Other One Per Cent – Refugee Students in Higher Education*. DAFI Annual Report 2017.
- Wright, C. 2013. 'Authenticity in Teaching and Leadership', *Journal of Accounting and Finance* 13(2). http://www.na-businesspress.com/JAF/WrightC_Web13_2_.pdf.