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Abstract

This paper will describe and evaluate a University of Southampton funded project called PAIRS, (Participatory Approaches to Inclusion Related Staff Development) which aimed to:

- Capture “student voices” regarding their learning experiences within the School of Education at the University of Southampton: Use these “voices” to explore whether and how the School of Education programmes include or exclude students with a wide range of learning needs from experiencing positive or high quality learning opportunities.
- Involve students in the analysis and exploration of these “student voices”: Develop a collaborative partnership whereby students help to develop materials and methods that can be used to help staff in the work towards meeting learning needs and reducing barriers to inclusion.

The motivation for the project was derived from the University of Southampton Disability Equality Scheme in which one action listed in the plan was to: involve students in the design and delivery of staff development and CPD opportunities in relation to developing inclusive teaching practices. However, the project expanded its focus to include a broader range of students including those entering Higher Education from non-traditional backgrounds and those who are studying part-time with family and caring commitments.

The underlying principles for involving students as users/evaluators in this project have their origins in two related fields: Participatory Design and Participatory Research. For the PAIRS project, there were two different types or phases of participation. In Phase One the students were asked to contribute descriptions of their learning experiences and how their learning needs had/or had not been met. Students were able to choose the method or media for their contributions. In Phase two students formed an advisory group that worked together to analyse the learning experiences gained through phase one, and decide how we will use the information about student learning experiences to design staff development initiatives in the School.

A close inspection of the twenty stories reveals some powerful narratives of inclusion and exclusion that fall into three main themes or categories:

1. Access Issues: access to resources and learning opportunities
2. Group Issues: promoting a sense of belonging and shared learning opportunities
3. Communication Issues: Helping students to find their “voice” and be heard and helping students understand and speak the language of education

Initial reflections on the process of the project suggest that:

- Some students were motivated to take part because they had a "bee in their bonnet" about particular issues
- Some students were motivated to take part because they were curious about the methods and wanted to learn more about them, sometimes with a view to using them in their own research or practice
- Some students were motivated to take part because they wanted to have a "voice".

Initial reflections on the outcomes of the project suggest that the methods used were successful in revealing meaningful insights into experiences of inclusion and exclusion across a range of students with varying backgrounds.

The overall conclusions of the PAIRS project are that the participatory methods used in PAIRS were generally successful in revealing useful, rich and in-depth information about the
student learning experience which have the potential to meaningfully inform inclusion related staff development initiatives.

2. Introduction

2.1 Inclusion at the University of Southampton

The PAIRS project has been conducted within a context of an increasing recognition of the importance of developing inclusive learning and teaching at the University of Southampton. In 2006 the University of Southampton Inclusion Task Force, chaired by Jane Seale, produced a report for the Education Policy Committee\(^1\) which defined inclusive learning and teaching as:

- Recognising, accommodating and meeting the learning needs of all students;
- Recognising that students may reach their goals and realise their potential in different ways – and that this is true particularly for students who have an additional learning need or a disability;
- Recognising that students have valuable skills and expertise that they can bring to the learning experience;
- Acknowledging that students have a range of individual learning needs and are members of diverse communities;
- Avoiding pigeonholing students into specific groups with predictable and fixed approaches to learning.

The Inclusion Task Force made a number of recommendations to the university including:

LATEU in collaboration with Inclusion Task Force and Disability Services explore ways of involving students with disabilities in the design and delivery of curricula as well as staff development and CPD materials/activities [Recommendation 9].

This recommendation was taken forward by the University and included as an action point in the Disability Equality Scheme\(^2\). In order to explore how to progress this action point further, in 2007, LATEU (Learning and Teaching Enhancement Unit) funded the PAIRS project. Whilst the motivation for the project was initially derived from the Disability Equality Scheme, the PAIRS project expanded its focus beyond disability to include a broader range of students including those entering Higher Education from non-traditional backgrounds and those who are studying part-time with family and caring commitments. The main aims of the PAIRS project therefore, were to:

- Capture “student voices” regarding their learning experiences within the School of Education at the University of Southampton: Use these “voices” to explore whether and how the School of Education programmes include or exclude students with a wide range of learning needs from experiencing positive or high quality learning opportunities.
- Involve students in the analysis and exploration of these “student voices”: Develop a collaborative partnership whereby students help to develop materials and methods that can be used to help staff in the work towards meeting learning needs and reducing barriers to inclusion.

---

\(^1\) See \url{http://www.southampton.ac.uk/lateu/docs/inclusion_task_force_report_2006.doc}

\(^2\) See \url{http://www.southampton.ac.uk/about/disability/disability.html}
2.2 Involving learners in research

The underlying principles for involving learners in the PAIRS project have their origins in two related fields: Participatory Design and Participatory Research.

**Participatory Design**

Participatory design is commonly used in the fields of Human Computer Interaction, computer science and engineering design. One example relevant to disability is the design of assistive technologies (Wu et al. 2005). Participatory Design incorporates the related fields of inclusive design (Dewsbury et al. 2004); co-design (Druin, 2007) and user-centred design (Newell et al. 2007). Participatory design can be defined as active involvement of users throughout the entire research and development process (Hanson et al. 2007) and is generally understood to involve: working directly with users; early and continual participation of users; engaging with real users in their real contexts; iterative cycles of development and evaluation until an agreed solution is reached and collaborative partnerships between users and designers. Participatory design methods are varied but have a strong ethnographic tradition with regards to conducting intensive observations of the user and how they use technologies in their everyday lives (Davies et al. 2004). The strong narrative and in-depth insights offered by such methods would appear to be highly applicable to research that is focusing on hearing the “student voice”.

**Participatory Research**

Participatory research methods are used with a range of participants ranging from children (e.g. Hill, 1997); older people (e.g. Ross et al. 2005) and social/health service users (e.g. Wright et al. 2006). It is also commonly used in disability studies research, particularly learning disability research. At the heart of participatory research is the principle that it is research with rather than on people (French & Swain, 2004)). Participants are encouraged to own the outcome of the research by setting the goals and sharing in decisions about processes (Everitt et al. 1992). Like participatory design, participatory research attempts to engage participants in the whole research process from design through to evaluation. There is a particular emphasis on disabled people, as participants, identifying the research problems and questions to ensure that disabled people consider the research “worthy of investigation” (Chappell, 2000). Just like participatory design, participatory research emphasises collaborative partnerships, but it goes beyond this to emphasise non-hierarchical relationships (Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995) where researcher and participant have equal status and power. Cocks and Cockram (1995: 32) however, stress that any alliances between researcher and participant must be “under the control and primarily in the interests” of disabled people.

Drawing from these fields, for the purposes of this project, student participation has been defined as reflecting the principle of “Nothing About Me, Without Me”(Nightingale, 2006) and involving:

- Working directly with students in the evaluation of their learning experiences and development of staff development materials;
- Early and continual participation of students to produce improved teaching practices;
- Engaging students in the design, conduct and analysis of “research” with the construction of non-hierarchical research relations;
- Encouraging students to own the outcome by setting the goals and sharing in decisions about processes.

The use of participatory methods in Higher Education is an emergent field of activity. For example, ESCALATE, the Education Subject Centre (funded by The Higher Education
Academy) has funded a “Hearing the Student Voice” project which aims to promote and encourage the effective use of the student voice to enhance professional development in learning, teaching and assessment within higher education\(^3\). Another example is the LEXDIS project, also based at the University of Southampton, which is exploring the e-learning experiences of disabled learners (Seale et al. 2008) At the heart of these projects and the PAIRS project is a commitment to enabling students to have their voice heard, in a way (medium) that they feel comfortable with and with the intention of responding genuinely, with improved insight, to the issues raised by students.

3. PAIRS participants

Ethical approval was obtained from the School of Education ethics committee. Students were recruited to the project, with the help of Programme Directors, either through email, a Blackboard notice, or a brief presentation within a lecture. More discussion of ethical and recruitment issues can be found in the PAIRS project report (Seale, 2008)

3.1 Description of Participants

In Phase One, there were 5 male and 15 female participants, spread across five programmes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation degrees</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate degrees</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE (Primary and Secondary)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Taught Programmes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Research Degrees</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning background and needs of these 20 participants were varied but broadly reflected the nature of the programmes that are run in the School of Education (part-time courses; vocational work-based courses and full-time undergraduate and post-graduate courses):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of learning need/background</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Caring commitments</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional route to university</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non traditional route</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time student</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) See http://www2.napier.ac.uk/studentvoices/
In Phase two there were five participants (two male and three female), all of which had also taken part in phase one.

3.2 Learning journeys

Some of the students had been studying a long time with the School, progressing through a range of courses:

I have six years of learning experience at the School. I started with the Certificate in Education (PECT), then did the BA (PCET) and then moved to do the Masters. I have now applied for PhD (Participant Five).

Some students were coming back to education after gaining a range of employment experience:

I had a year out before I went to university to study my first degree and a year out before I started the PGCE. In my first year out I worked for the Royal Bank of Scotland and then I did Camp America in the summer. For my second year out I started off working as a recruitment consultant. (Participant Seven)

Some students were coming relatively straight into the School from other courses:

I came to university straight after finishing my A-levels without a gap year (Participant Thirteen).

4. Methods

4.1 Phase One

In order to address the first aim of the project: capturing "student voices", students were recruited into a first phase which involved recounting their learning experiences. Participants were given the opportunity to choose one of the following methods to tell their stories:

- Write or audio-record a one-two page letter to an “imaginary” friend who has similar learning needs to you and is thinking of enrolling on the same course; telling them about your own personal learning experiences on your course and whether and how your particular learning needs have been met. (If English is not your first language, translation can be arranged if you want it);
- Write a diary describing your learning experiences on your course, over the period of a “typical” week;
- Write a reflective journal that describes a “critical incident”- something in particular that you have experienced on your course that was really positive or negative in terms of your learning experience and how your particular learning needs were met or not met;
- Produce a piece of creative writing or art (e.g. poem, picture, sculpture, song) that expresses your feelings and experiences in relation to the quality of your learning experience and whether or not your particular learning needs were met or considered;
- Alternatively, you can opt to be interviewed face-to-face, by phone or by webcam by the project leader.

The most popular method(s) that participants chose to relay their experiences was the letter to a friend and a face-to-face interview. The preference for being interviewed was not anticipated at the start of the project. At least two participants who chose this method explained was that it was because they were overburdened with writing in their studies and wanted a break from having to write and structure their thoughts. Some participants
incorporated work from their course into their writing e.g. reflective elements from assessed assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of contribution</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter to a friend</td>
<td>One, Eight, Nine, Twelve, Eighteen, Nineteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective journal</td>
<td>Three, Four, Fourteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diary</td>
<td>Fifteen, Sixteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face interview</td>
<td>Two, Five, Seven, Ten, Eleven, Seventeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone interview</td>
<td>Six, Thirteen, Twenty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Phase Two

In order to address the second aim of the project: involving students in the analysis and exploration of “student voices”, five participants were recruited to phase two of the project. Two students were part-time students, two were full-time and one had since graduated from the university. The original intention was to convene one or two focus groups where all phase two participants got together to discuss the twenty examples obtained in phase one. The nature of the group however, made this difficult to achieve. Therefore, after a period of consultation with the group via email the following method was agreed:

- The project leader emailed each participant two to three examples from phase one and invited them to identify key themes (as many or as few as they liked) that they thought were central or important in terms of understanding the positive or negative learning experiences of the student concerned.
- The examples were sent to participants as word documents via email and participants were given the option of using the insert/comment or format/shade options within Word to highlight text extracts that would best illustrate the themes they had identified.
- Based on the examples they had analysed, participants were then asked to respond to the following questions:
  - What advice should we be giving to staff in the School about how to improve their practices?
  - In what form should this advice be given (e.g. workshop, video, leaflets etc)?
- When all the participants had submitted their analysis of the themes contained within their examples, the project leader collated all the themes and dissemination ideas and sent an email summary back to all the participants, seeking final approval.

5. Results

5.1 Factors that helped and hindered student learning

The students identified a range of factors that helped and hindered their learning. Four factors emerged across the majority of participant experiences and programmes as helping learning:

- Supportive tutors
- Knowledgeable and expert tutors
- Flexibility
- Sharing and communicating with peers.
Four factors emerged across the majority of participant experiences and programmes:

- Workload issues;
- Lack of information;
- Poor communication;
- Issues around essay writing skills.

See the main project report (Seale, 2008) for more detail analysis and discussion of these results and how they might be used to influence staff development initiatives.

5.2 Narratives of inclusion and exclusion

A close inspection of the twenty stories reveals some powerful narratives of inclusion and exclusion that fall into three main themes or categories:

4. Access Issues: access to resources and learning opportunities
5. Group Issues: promoting a sense of belonging and shared learning opportunities
6. Communication Issues: Helping students to find their “voice” and be heard and helping students understand and speak the language of education

Access to resources

Illustrative quotes:

Participant One: an undergraduate student: Textbooks can often be a problem as the library holds a very small amount of the relevant textbooks for the course I am studying, you need to organise yourself as soon as the coursework is set and check-out the course texts in the library or put holds on the books you need, often I have had to buy the relevant books as they have already been checked out or the library has failed to stock them.

Participant Fourteen: an international PhD student: Taking into account my special needs at that particular moment, I missed a lot the blackboard. I strongly believe that if there was a weakness in this unit was the non-use of Blackboard, which I now think should be more consistent among tutors.

Participant Seventeen: an international PhD student: In the first year, I had a quiet place to work and just sit and write. When the school moved to the new building I found it difficult to work there. I also found it difficult to work at home, because I have a family. We were not happy with the facilities. Although we had a new computer, the shared space meant it was not as quiet as I would like. I also didn’t have enough space to put all my books and articles. I need a space with no noise, and enough room. Now it’s too noisy, there are too many students in the same place and too many people moving around all the time…

Access to learning opportunities

Illustrative quotes:

Participant Ten: part-time PhD student: I struggled to get to the training sessions because they were always on Tuesdays. They were always at a time that I had to find additional child care, out of nursery hours. The ones that were during the day were when my personal teaching load was heavy, so I could never make them.
Participant Eight: Masters student: When we joined the other students for the general units I did feel as though I did not have access to the lecturer as with the specific subjects on the MSc EPI course and found it difficult to gain further information such as hand in dates.

Participant Thirteen: undergraduate student: One of my tutors, had a lot of students, and so it was difficult to arrange tutorials with them. You had to book a week in advance and there were not enough tutorial slots or the slots were cancelled.

Reducing isolation and developing a sense of belonging

Illustrative quotes:

Participant Three: PGCE student: All my tutors were all incredibly supportive, often stopping to chat with me and finding out how I was getting on with things. This made a huge difference as I felt that I was not on my own and that other people were there with me helping me through.

Participant Ten: part-time PhD student: Because I didn’t go often enough to the training sessions, I didn’t get to know anyone. I didn’t feel part of the group that was there. People on the taught programmes knew each other, they regularly worked together, whereas I was coming in, listening to what was happening and going away. I can honestly say I don’t know any other student in the School…..Despite my physical isolation, I do feel I belong to the School of Education, because the email contact tells me about seminars and things. I do feel that I am on the end of the computer getting information.

Participant Twelve: a part-time EdDoc student: The atmosphere on the EdD programme is such that you cannot help but feel a part of the EdD family and the distance physically that we live from the University becomes irrelevant.

Participant Eighteen: PGCE student: I found that this placement was made harder by the fact that I had never met my Link Tutor before she first came in to observe me. I would have benefited enormously from having one of the familiar faces from University supporting me through what were a very tough six weeks rather than a stranger.

Participant Nineteen: an international PhD student: It is nothing like the professors in our old university. From my point of view they did not try to help us evolve and learn. They were just doing their work and nothing else. Here the things are totally different. You can feel that they care about your progress, they care about your problems and of course they are continuously trying to make things better. They organised a series of events to minimise our isolation and possible negative feelings that we may have during the year. When I first heard the reason, I could not believe my ears. I said “this is unbelievable. It can’t be true”. But it is true here.

Mediating group work and collaboration between students to promote shared learning

Illustrative quotes:

Participant Five: Masters student: We finished the course, and we’d done it for two years and we still could not put names to faces. There were 17 to 18 people in our group, and a colleague of mine who is in the later cohort, says she still doesn’t know who is who. It’s a real pain, because you don’t feel like you are part of the group. But how much time can you give to “bonding” in a two to two and a half hour session? However, with a group of 20 people, it would be nice to know if they are from the NHS or whatever, so you know if you are likely to be looking for the same material. Then you can share, and help each other out a bit more.
Participant Fourteen: International PhD student: Some of the struggles that I experienced could be dealt with some degree of collaborative work with my peers. Obviously I am free to ask for help, but it is also obvious that it could be easier if some mediation was provided. I think that the School of Education could develop specific communication channels to encourage knowledge constructing and sharing among students, with the mediation/participation of unit tutors.

**Helping students to find their “voice” and be heard**

*Illustrative quote:*

Participant Fourteen: International PhD student: I felt a need to be authorised to think and express my thoughts in English. Furthermore, to be legitimated to contribute to a context that I don’t belong to and that don’t belong to me. At the same time that I was stuck in terms of ability to read and write, I was struggling to find my voice. It was necessary not only starting to write, it was crucial to write/speak my own voice. In this situation as in all other difficulties, my supervisor played an essential role.

**Helping students understand and speak the language of education**

*Illustrative quotes:*

Participant Ten: a part-time PhD student with a non-education background: I’ve had to learn a new language, a new terminology, and all the different approaches to study. I’ve had to catch up on it. This is how my students must feel then they first come to our department to study. I didn’t understand things like “ethnography” which now I can use in my every day language and in talking to people.

Participant Thirteen: an undergraduate student: Because I had not studied the subject before, I found the first module difficult. I struggled with the basics, like the terminology. When I asked the lecturer to explain the words used, they just said “it’s on the slides”, which I did not find very sympathetic. I had already looked at the slides and they had not helped. I wanted to be offered an alternative source of information or explanation that simplified things so that I could get the jist. I needed it in a format that suited my learning style.

6. **Reflections on the processes of the PAIRS project**

The PAIRS project aimed to develop a collaborative partnership whereby students helped to develop materials and methods that can be used to help staff work towards meeting learning needs and reducing barriers to inclusion. In order to draw conclusions about the success of the participatory methods and whether they should be implemented on a wider scale, across the School of Education and the University, it may be useful to consider the following questions:

- What motivated the students to take part?
- What motivated colleagues (Programme Directors) to facilitate access to students?
- How easy and time-consuming was it to use participatory methods?
- How should participatory methods be used?

6.1 **What motivated the students to take part?**

Some students appear to have been motivated to take part because they had “bees in their bonnet” about particular issues (good and bad). Issues included having supportive tutors in a crisis; a placement not enabling learning outcomes to be met or some students appearing to
get away with missing deadlines. For others the motivation appears to have been a curiosity about the methods of project and wanting to learn from the way it was done:

I was genuinely impressed with the project methodology that you used for this research. Would it be at all possible for me to reference your work officially within my own EdD work? I would sincerely appreciate being able to reflect on your methodology within my thesis as many aspects of it fit brilliantly with the ideas that I have so far myself. Would this be possible? …I believe it is important to not ask participants in research to do anything that I would not feel comfortable doing myself. I particularly enjoyed being a part of your project and this taught me many things about carrying out my own research upon/with others.

Although my schedule is quite busy as you know, I am really interested in taking part of the second phase. It is the kind of experiences and skills that I want to have. I did not come here just to get a PhD and then go back. I want to be involved in any research or courses that might help to improve my educational and research skills. It is my pleasure to help you in this project. It opens my mind to many things that may help to improve the organization that I will return to, when I finish my PhD.

For some students, particularly International students, the project was a chance to have their voice heard. For example, one participant in a joint presentation about the project shared her frustrations that students who were not English native speakers were frequently deemed ineligible to participate in university based research projects. She was frustrated at being excluded from contributing to research, but also from learning from the experience of being a research participant.

6.2 What motivated colleagues to facilitate the project?

Most colleagues who facilitated access to students, seemed to see the PAIRS project as an opportunity to collect information that they could use for a variety of QA and QE purposes in order to illustrate authoritatively the “student voice”. One colleague used the information sheets that were handed out during the project as an example of good practice in their research methods teaching. Some colleagues responded positively, but due to time and work pressures were not able to facilitate access during the time scale of the project. Other colleagues did not respond at all. Whilst it would be possible to guess at the reasons why this might be, it would seem more useful to conduct some follow up interviews with colleagues in order to gain some more information on this issue.

6.3 How easy and time-consuming was it to use participatory methods?

The PAIRS project was time-consuming. Getting ethical approval, transcribing interviews, negotiating anonymity, arranging for student payments to be made, were all tasks that took several weeks to complete. This was partly because there was just one member of staff working on the project (Jane Seale) and partly because patience and time was needed to communicate with students at each stage of the project. Even with the use of email, it could take 1-2 weeks to gain informed consent, for example. If others were to adopt a participatory approach the advice would be to ensure a team of staff were working on the project; don’t under-estimate the ethical considerations and if you would like to involve participants in the analysis of student experiences. Experience also suggests it is important to build in time to induct and train participants in analysis methods (phase two). I assumed the phase two participants would be able to cope with thematically coding the phase one data and pulling out key themes and issues, but their responses were highly variable, particularly with regards

---

4 See: http://janekseale.blogspot.com/2008/07/participatory-approaches-to-inclusion.html
to adopting a more distanced approach to the analysis as opposed to imposing too much of
own ideas and experiences onto the ideas and experiences of others.

6. Reflections on the outcomes of the PAIRS project

6.1 The meaning of inclusion or exclusion to participants

Inclusion and exclusion are terms that are generally well understood by educators in Higher
Education, but for the PAIRS project it was felt that these terms may be less well understood
by students, particularly those students who are not disabled and perhaps have not been
exposed to inclusion related policies and systems. For this reason, rather than specifically
asking students to relate experiences of inclusion or exclusion, the instructions given to
students when contributing their stories was to describe positive or negative learning
experiences, where their learning needs had either been met or unmet. This was a risky
strategy in that the results might have revealed nothing more than more common or
traditional student evaluation methods. Indeed, in some senses the factors identified as
hindering or helping learning are not obviously linked to inclusion (e.g. difficulties with essay
writing or workload issues). However, there is a strong social thread running through these
factors linked to the relationships that students have with peers and tutors (e.g.
communication) as well the relationships that students have with their departments (e.g.
facilitated through information and communication systems and infrastructure). This social or
relationship thread is strongly evident in the identified narratives of inclusion and exclusion,
suggesting that it is possible to reveal meaningful narratives of inclusion and exclusion
without necessarily requiring participants to use or engage with these terms or concepts.

6.2 Inclusion or exclusion is not a disability specific experience

The illustrative quotes relating to inclusion and exclusion spanned the whole range of
programmes at the School of Education and were not isolated to students from particular
groups such as disabled students. Furthermore, the information gained from the participants
revealed valuable and insightful information about the impact of identified issues on students’
self-esteem, confidence and identity as well as on their academic and home lives. This helps
those working with students to understand not only that exclusion is not a disability specific
experience, but also that it is not restricted to the academic lives of students. This has
particularly significant implications for staff development in terms of developing a holistic
approach to promoting inclusion, where partnerships across a range of individuals and
services are developed.

7. Conclusions

Results from the PAIRS project suggest that participatory methods can produce rich, detailed
information about the inclusion and exclusion experiences of students; but can also offer
inclusionary experiences in themselves. The methods are labour-intensive and require
significant commitment in terms of time and investment, particularly with regards to ensuring
that participants are adequately briefed and equipped to participate in a meaningful way. But
perhaps most importantly, the methods and outcomes of the PAIRS reveal the participants
as people and therefore have the potential to break down the “us” and “them” barriers that
can exist in higher education.
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