

EDITORIAL

“It Depends”: Exploring the Context-Dependent Nature of Students as Partners’ Practices and Policies

***Mick Healey**, University of Gloucestershire and Healey HE Consultants, UK and **Ruth L. Healey**, Department of Geography and International Development, University of Chester and Healey HE Consultants, UK

Contact: mhealey@glos.ac.uk

“For me context is the key—from that comes the understanding of everything.”
Kenneth Noland (1988; as cited in Gibbs, 2010, p. 1)

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONTEXT

In running workshops and presenting keynotes on Students as Partners (SaP), one of the most common answers we give to questions is “It depends.” The breadth and complexity of practices and policies surrounding SaP mean that it is often difficult to make generalisations. This difficulty is intensified by the newness of the field, at least as it relates to learning and teaching in higher education, where the term has only become extensively used in the last decade and particularly in the last five years, and then only in selected countries. Unsurprisingly, the term is used in a variety of different ways (Cliffe et al., 2017).

The main reason it is difficult to generalise about SaP is that the practices and policies are context dependent. There is a need to identify the structural, temporal, and personal dimensions that define the context. Here we argue that we cannot begin to understand the processes and outcomes of specific partnerships without taking account of the context in which they operate. This argument has implications both for how we design SaP practices and policies and how we report research and evaluation findings.

A similar case has been made in relation to educational research and development in general. Acedo (2010), for example, argues that there is a “need to be sensitive to the context, whether in research, policy-making, or pedagogical practice” (p. 417). Not surprisingly “one-size fits all” policies enacted at national and institutional levels play out differently in different contexts. This leads to a critique of attempts to identify “best practice,” as what is appropriate in one context may not be in another (Crossley, 2010). This point is made forcefully by Gibbs (2010):

Many context variables are so influential that extrapolation from one context to another is fraught with difficulties and leads to many errors and confusions, including the adoption of contextually inappropriate educational practices, wrong-headed explanations of local pedagogic phenomena, the alienation of teachers who

know more about the crucial features of their context than do the pedagogic researchers, and a retreat into methodological obscurantism on the part of researchers, in an attempt to explain apparently inconsistent findings which are more likely due to unnoticed contextual variables. (p. 1)

Gibbs goes on to illustrate this claim with a host of areas in higher-education research where there are exceptions to broad generalisations due to contextual differences (see also Cousin, 2013).

Our argument is that we should recognise the context-dependent nature of SaP work, see it as a strength, and be cautious of over-generalising. The key feature of context-directed research is that it is motivated by the specific professional context in which it occurs. As Taber (2013) notes “the research is successful if context-bound knowledge is developed which can better inform future action in that context (regardless of whether or not findings are seen to be generalisable to other contexts elsewhere)” (p. 127). McKinney (2015) makes a similar point about the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL): “By definition, SoTL work is local, context-specific, action research” (p. 1).

In this editorial we highlight four inter-related areas that underpin the context-dependent nature of SaP work:

- The meaning of partnership;
- The emotions, motivations, attitudes, behaviour, and values of participants;
- The aim, scale, and timeframe of the project or initiative; and
- The conceptual framework adopted.

This is by no means an exhaustive list, but space does not allow us to include other areas (such as the cultural, social, economic, and political context that may help to explain some institutional and international differences in practice and policies).

THE MEANING OF PARTNERSHIP

One of the most cited definitions of staff- or faculty-student partnership is “a collaborative, reciprocal process through which all participants have the opportunity to contribute equally, although not necessarily in the same ways, to curricular or pedagogical conceptualization, decision making, implementation, investigation, or analysis” (Cook-Sather, Bovill, & Felten, 2014, pp. 6-7). As Healey, Flint, and Harrington (2014) also note, SaP should be viewed as a process: “It is a way of doing things, rather than an outcome in itself” (p. 7). The term “students as partners” highlights the shifting role of students and their partners in such work. As Matthews (2017) points out “Students as partners offer a view of student engagement that is a joint endeavour to shape and influence university teaching and learning. The language of students as partners deliberately emphasises the relational and social elements of mutual learning” (p. 1).

Like SoTL, SaP is a “big tent” (Huber & Hutchings, 2005, p. 30). Healey et al. (2014; 2016) identify two fairly distinct literatures that adopt a SaP approach, though the term “partnership” is not always used explicitly. First, there is the use of SaP in learning, teaching, and research; secondly, there is the employment of SaP in quality enhancement initiatives where students act as change agents. Whereas examples of the first, such as peer learning and assessment and undergraduate research, are reasonably common and can involve many students; examples of the second, such as students undertaking SoTL projects with staff and engaging in curriculum design projects, are relatively new and usually involve only a few

students. Engaging students in quality enhancement initiatives as partners means going beyond collecting students' views and feedback. It may involve, for example, students co-researching the initiative, co-designing the curriculum, or acting as consultants to staff implementing innovative forms of teaching. Some of the generalisations made about SaP, such as the difficulties of scaling it up (Bovill, 2017; Bryson, Furlonger, & Rinaldo-Langridge, 2016), apply more to this second version of SaP than to the first, particularly where the number of partners is small, and the relationships are intensive. In other words, statements about SaP depend on the nature of the SaP initiative you are talking about.

Who is involved as partners is a further critical question. Students may partner with a range of others as partnerships can involve “students with students, students with staff, students with senior university administrators, and students with alumni or members of industry” (Matthews, 2017, p. 1), and we note that staff includes not only academics but also librarians and learning support staff. Moreover, as we have already argued, some forms of SaP may necessarily involve a selection of students. A similar point is made by Bovill (2017) who suggests that “it may be difficult, impossible, or even undesirable in some contexts to involve all students . . . [because] meaningful partnership requires a high level of equality and contribution from partners” (p. 1-2). Who is involved among staff or other partner groups will also have an effect on how the group operates. This leads to the second area underpinning the context-dependent nature of SaP practices and policies.

THE EMOTIONS, MOTIVATIONS, ATTITUDES, BEHAVIOUR, AND VALUES OF THE PARTICIPANTS

Cook-Sather (personal communication, January 5, 2018) argues that “to do SaP work one must be willing to be uncertain, open, receptive, responsive as well as tentative, humble, courageous, and daring through the give-and-take of developing and sustaining partnership work”. In other words, we need to acknowledge the emotional as well as the intellectual and practical work involved in partnership and the affect that different emotions have on partners and partnerships. Research into emotions in the workplace has demonstrated that positive affects create supportive working practices and the maintenance of social bonds (Fredrickson, 2001; Niven, Totterdall, Holman, & Headley, 2012), whereas negative expressions, such as anger, can provoke reciprocal negative feelings (Williams, 2015).

It is reasonable to assume that similar patterns will emerge within Students as Partners work—that is to say, it depends on the emotions that people bring to and develop within a partnership. Emotions affect both the process of partnership itself and the potential and actual outcomes. Yet, as Felten (2017) argued in the last issue of the *International Journal for Students as Partners*, the scholarly literature on partnerships virtually ignores emotion. He goes on to make two claims:

1. We cannot understand the experiences of or outcomes for individuals in partnerships without attending to emotions.
2. We cannot understand the interactions and relationships between individuals in partnerships without attending to emotions. (p. 3)

Emotions are related to the motivations, attitudes, and behaviours of the partners. Motivations and attitudes are critical as people often engage in partnership despite

institutional policies. Motivations and attitudes underlie the subsequent behaviours of people. The attitudes and behaviours referred to in the literature are:

mainly focused on interpersonal relationships; for example, listening to one another (Werder & Skogsberg, 2013; Powers, 2012); recognition of the different contribution partners make (Williamson, 2013); a willingness to meet others “where they are” (Powers, 2012); communicating openly and honestly (Cook-Sather et al., 2014; QAA, 2012); and, sharing a commitment to continued learning and celebrating and being proud of successes (Powers, 2012; Cox, 2004). (Healey et al., 2014, p. 29)

Many of the attitudes and behaviours of the partners illustrated in this quote can be seen as promoting a shared emotional connection and affecting the motivation of the participants to engage in partnership. In other words, these might be considered to be partnership *values*. Cook-Sather et al. (2014) identify the values of respect, reciprocity, and shared responsibility as part of effective SaP, and the Higher Education Academy (2015) extends this list further to include seven more values: trust, courage, plurality, authenticity, honesty, inclusivity, and empowerment. As emotions, motivations, attitudes, behaviours, and values of participants vary and change during partnerships, they make an important contribution to the context-dependent nature of SaP and emphasise the importance of what individuals bring to the partnership.

THE AIM, SCALE, AND TIMEFRAME OF THE PROJECT OR INITIATIVE

The *aim* of the project or initiative affects who is involved in the partnership and what they bring to it in terms of emotions, motivations, attitudes, behaviour, and values. The aim is the fundamental factor underlying the vision for any SaP work, and when in doubt about how to develop a practice or policy, the best advice is “return to the aim.” The aim is, of course, also influenced by the national and institutional contexts, as the cultures embedded in these influence what is possible. The aim may relate to an outcome (e.g., enhanced student engagement) and/or an output (e.g., a new co-designed module) developed through the process of working in partnership.

The next two contextual factors help to clarify the aim. The first is the *scale* of the project. For example, will it operate between or within nations, within or across institutions, or at faculty or department level? Or is the aim better suited to a specific programme, course/module, or teaching session? The disciplinary context is also an important factor that operates across these scales (Healey & Jenkins, 2003). It may be easier to operate at the module or unit level than that of the programme, “at least until an institutional ethos develops that values student-staff partnership” (Bovill, Cook-Sather, Felten, Millard, & Moore-Cherry, 2016, p. 206).

It is equally important to clarify the *timeframe* for the partnership. The time allowed for the initiative and the amount of time participants are expected to contribute to the project are important contextual factors. These depend, in part, on whether or not there is funding to support the project. For example, funding might be used to buy out some of the staff time from other activities and pay students for their work on the project. If no funding is available, it might be possible for the project to be part of a programme of learning in which students receive academic credit for their partnership work and staff may receive recognition in terms of a contribution to their workload. As Healey et al. (2014) suggest,

“Embedding the recognition and reward of staff and students engaging in partnerships, is one way in which institutions and students’ unions can embody an ethos and culture of partnership in practice” (p. 33).

The aim, scale, and timeframe are important features of the context-dependent nature of SaP work in practice and as research. As they are clarified, it becomes easier to envisage which conceptual framework might be the most appropriate.

THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK ADOPTED

Conceptual frameworks help to elucidate the nature of partnership both in theory and in practice (Cook-Sather, 2017). Context informs the conceptual frameworks we select, whilst simultaneously providing a lens through which to view context and identify what is possible. Matthews et al. (2018) discuss different conceptual frameworks in SaP, drawing in part on the argument that theories are models that enrich understanding, structure inquiry, and support future planning (Roxå, Olsson, & Mårtensson, 2007). Yet the value of different SaP conceptual frameworks may be different for different partners and partnerships, particularly in relation to the experience level of the participants involved. As Gibbs (2010) acknowledges, “if a theoretical model, or an empirical prediction based on it, is not born out, it may simply be that it is not salient in that context—but it might still be very useful in other contexts” (p. 1). The notion of “it depends” relates here both to *which* conceptual framework is adopted and to *how* it is used.

Newly formed partnerships may utilise frameworks to support understanding of what partnership means in their context and of what members aspire to achieve in their partnership. Alongside this, conceptual frameworks aid partners in planning how they want their own partnership to look and feel. For example, a framework emphasising social justice may be more likely to lead to the inclusion of marginalised voices than one simply emphasising enhancing student learning. Core to SaP is recognising that all parties have something to bring to the table. Whilst staff bring disciplinary, administrative, pedagogic, and/or research expertise and experience (depending upon the staff involved), students, among other things, bring their expertise at being students. Indeed, as Cook-Sather et al. (2014) suggest:

most students are neither disciplinary nor pedagogical experts. Rather, their experience and expertise typically is in being a student—something that many faculty [staff] have not been for many years. They understand where they and their peers are coming from and, often, where they think they are going. (p. 15)

Not only do students bring this form of expertise, they also bring knowledge based on who they are, depending on the diversity of their identities—knowledge that is only recently being recognized as essential to understanding effective and inclusive approaches to teaching and learning (de Bie, Marquis, Cook-Sather, & Luqueño, 2018). This way of looking at the different roles of staff and students in partnership projects, whilst fundamental to the process, is likely to be taken as a given in contexts where such practices are more common.

Established partnerships may use conceptual frameworks to reflect on the strengths and limitations of their current and recent partnerships. As Deming (1993, as quoted in Trowler & Cooper, 2003) argues, “Without [good, explicit] theory, experience has no

meaning. . . one has no questions to ask. Hence, without theory, there is no learning” (p.223). Matthews et al. (2018) suggest that the set of related theoretical concepts of liminality (Felten, 2016), threshold concepts (Marquis et al., 2016), and translation (Cook-Sather & Abbot, 2016), for example, provide useful tools for considering SaP and how people might be supported to understand the process of partnership. People who have experienced partnerships are arguably in a better position to reflect on partnership through these conceptual frameworks than those who are new to this approach.

Overall, theory has value in different ways at different times in the partnership process. Which conceptual frameworks are useful and how relates to the experience of the individuals and institutions of SaP practices and policies; as usual, “it depends.”

CONCLUSION

Students as Partners is an ethos. It provides a lens through which to reconsider the nature of higher education. As new approaches and ideas emerge, we will gradually discover to what extent change in higher education may be accomplished through the adoption of this ethos; the “big tent” has plenty of space for yet unknown SaP processes. National political and policy agendas, of course, provide opportunities and constraints on the enactment of SaP. There is a danger, however, that some managers and policy makers may attempt to hijack the term partnership to mean increased choice for students in the higher education marketplace, rather than recognise that SaP work is a counter-reaction to the neo-liberal, competition-driven, student as customer policies promoted by many governments (Dwyer & Russell, 2018; Healey, Healey & Cliffe, 2018).

Adopting a SaP approach can be transformative, as it requires an openness to working in new ways. SaP “is a radical cultural shift from *staff making decisions to benefit students* toward a mindset where *students and staff are working together* – as colleagues, as partners, as trusted collaborators – with shared goals” (Matthews, Cook-Sather & Healey, 2018, p. 24). SaP involves a radical rethink of the power relationships between staff and students, which encourages them to co-create knowledge, co-design the curriculum, and to learn together. However, the reality of partnership is that it is messy, constrained by context, and all parties should be prepared to some degree to “occupy” different spaces if it is to be successful. There is a natural feeling of uncertainty and fear. Recognising this, developing resilience, and demonstrating compassion for one another are useful ways of beginning to cope with this tension (Gibbs, 2017; University of Hertfordshire, 2018). Nevertheless, despite the uncertainty and messiness of engaging in partnership, it can be an amazingly affirmative and stimulating experience for all parties (Cook-Sather et al., 2014; Healey et al., 2014). With minds open to making the most of the opportunities provided by the context in which one finds oneself, Ntem (personal communication, 26 January 2018), in commenting on an earlier draft of this editorial, suggested that “the ideology behind ‘it depends,’ also leaves room for ‘it will be,’ or even ‘it can be.’”

We have argued in this editorial that SaP practices and policies are worked out within a context, which includes the meaning of partnership; the emotions, motivations, attitudes, behaviour, and values of the participants; the aim, scale, and timeframe of the project or initiative; and the conceptual framework adopted. Attempting to divorce SaP research and decision-making from context is problematic. Recognising the importance of the context-dependent nature of SaP should enhance our understanding of partnership practices and policies. Hence, we need to ensure that in our presentations and publications

we report the context of our studies and be wary of over-generalising. Attention to context provides a more nuanced approach than one in which context is ignored. So, as far as we are concerned, we will continue to answer many questions about SaP with “It depends.”

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are very grateful for the insightful and helpful comments we received on earlier drafts of this editorial from Anita Acai, Alison Cook-Sather, Beth Marquis, Kelly Matthews, Anita Ntem, and Cherie Woolmer.

NOTE ON CONTRIBUTORS

Mick Healey is an higher education consultant and researcher at Healey HE Consultants. He is also an Emeritus Professor at the University of Gloucestershire, UK and the Humboldt Distinguished Scholar in Research-Based Learning at McMaster University, Canada. He is the Senior Editor of the *International Journal for Students as Partners*.

Ruth L. Healey is a Senior Lecturer at the University of Chester, UK. In 2016, she joined Healey HE Consultants. She is a National Teaching Fellow, a member of the Editorial Board of the *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* and is one of the inaugural editors of the *International Journal for Students as Partners*.

REFERENCES

- Acedo, C. (2010). Editorial: Context matters. *Prospects*, 40, 417-420.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-010-9175-1>
- Bovill, C. (2017). A framework to explore roles within student-staff partnerships in higher education: Which students are partners, when, and in what ways? *International Journal for Students as Partners* 1(1).
<https://mulpress.mcmaster.ca/ijsap/issue/view/306>
- Bovill, C., Cook-Sather, A., Felten, P., Millard, L., & Moore-Cherry, N. (2016). Addressing potential challenges in co-creating learning and teaching: Overcoming resistance, navigating institutional norms and ensuring inclusivity in student-staff partnerships. *Higher Education*, 71(2), 195-208. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9896-4>
- Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2016). Engaging students as partners in learning and teaching: Implications for academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development: Special Issue*, 21(1), 1-3.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2016.1124967>
- Bryson, C., Furlonger, R., & Rinaldo-Langridge, F. (2016). A critical consideration of, and research agenda for, the approach of “students as partners.” *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Improving University Teaching*, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia. Retrieved from <http://www.iutconference.com/2016/01/a-critical-consideration-of-and-research-agenda-for-the-approach-of-students-as-partners/>
- Cliffe, A., Cook-Sather, A., Healey, M., Healey, R., Marquis, B., Matthews, K. E., Mercer Healey, M., & Healey, R.L. (2018). “It depends”: Exploring the context-dependent nature of students as partners’ practices and policies. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 2(1).
<https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v2i1.3472>

- Mapstone, L., Ntem, A., Puri, V., & Woolmer, C. (2017). Launching a journal about and through students as partners. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v1i1.3194>
- Cook-Sather, A. (2017, June). What our uses of theory tell us about how we conceptualize student-staff partnership. Paper presented at the RAISE International Colloquium on Partnership, Birmingham. Retrieved from http://www.raise-network.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/RAISE_Keynote_Colloquium_ACS.pdf
- Cook-Sather, A., & Abbot, S. (2016). Translating partnerships: How faculty-student collaboration in explorations of teaching and learning can transform perceptions, terms, and selves. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearningqu.4.2.5>
- Cook-Sather, A., Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2014). *Engaging students as partners in teaching and learning: A guide for faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cousin, G. (2013). Evidencing the value of educational development by asking awkward questions. In V. Bamber (Ed.), *Evidencing the value of educational development*. SEDA Special 34, pp. 19-22.
- Cox, M. (2004). Introduction to faculty learning communities. *New Directions in Teaching and Research* 97, 5-23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tl.129>
- Crossley, M. (2010). Context matters in educational research and international development: Learning from the small states experience. *Prospects*, 40(4), 421-429. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-010-9172-4>
- de Bie, A., Marquis, E., Cook-Sather, A., & Luqueño, L. (2018). Valuing knowledge(s) and cultivating confidence: Contributing to epistemic justice via student-faculty pedagogical partnerships. Manuscript in preparation.
- Deming, W. E. (1993). *The new economics for industry, government, education*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Centre for Advanced Engineering Studies.
- Dwyer, A. (2018). Toward the formation of genuine partnership spaces. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v2i1.3503>
- Felten, P. (2016). On the threshold with students. In R. Land, J. F. H. Meyer, & M. T. Flanagan (Eds.), *Threshold concepts in practice* (pp. 3-9). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305112911_On_the_Threshold_with_Students
- Felten, P. (2017). Emotion and partnerships. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v1i2.3070>
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218-226. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218>
- Gibbs, G. (2010). The importance of context in understanding teaching and learning: Reflections on thirty five years of pedagogic research. Keynote presented at the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching Annual Conference, Liverpool, UK. Retrieved from <http://issotl10.indiana.edu/plenary.html>
- Gibbs, P. (Ed.) (2017). *The pedagogy of compassion at the heart of higher education*. Netherlands: Springer.
- Healey, M. (2018). *Students as partners and change agents in learning and teaching in*
- Healey, M., & Healey, R.L. (2018). "It depends": Exploring the context-dependent nature of students as partners' practices and policies. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v2i1.3472>

- higher education. Retrieved from <https://www.mickhealey.co.uk/resources>.
- Healey, M., Flint, A., & Harrington, K. (2014). *Engagement through partnership: Students as partners in learning and teaching in higher education*. York: Higher Education Academy.
https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/engagement_through_partnership.pdf
- Healey, M., Flint, A., & Harrington, K. (2016). Students as partners: Reflections on a conceptual model. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 4(2).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.20343/teachlearningqu.4.2>
- Healey, M., & Jenkins, A. (2003). Discipline-based educational development. In H. Eggins, & R. Macdonald (Eds.), *The scholarship of academic development* (pp. 47-57). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Healey, R. L., Healey, M., & Cliffe, A. (2018). Engaging in radical work: Students as partners in academic publishing. *Efficiency Exchange*
<http://www.encyexchange.ac.uk/12775/engaging-radical-work-students-partners-academic-publishing/>
- Higher Education Academy (2015). *Framework for student engagement through partnership*. York: Higher Education Academy. Retrieved from
<https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/downloads/student-engagement-through-partnership-new.pdf>
- Huber, M. T., & Hutchings, P. (2005). *The advancement of learning: Building the teaching commons*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Marquis, E., Puri, V., Wan, S., Ahmad, A., Goff, L., Knorr, K., Vassileva, I., & Woo, J. (2016). Navigating the threshold of student-staff partnerships: A case study from an Ontario teaching and learning institute. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 21(1), 4-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2015.1113538>
- Matthews, K. E. (2016). Students as partners as the future of student engagement. *Student Engagement in Higher Education Journal*, 1(1).
<https://journals.gre.ac.uk/index.php/raise/article/view/380/338>
- Matthews, K. E. (2017). Five propositions for genuine students as partners practice. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 1(2).
<https://doi.org/10.15173/ijsap.v1i2.3315%20>
- Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., Acai, A., Dvorakova, S. L., Felten, P., Marquis, E., & Mercer-Mapstone, L. (2018). Toward theories of partnership praxis: An analysis of interpretive framing in literature on students as partners in teaching and learning. Manuscript in preparation.
- Matthews, K. E., Cook-Sather, A., & Healey, M. (2018). Connecting learning, teaching, and research through student-staff partnerships: toward universities as egalitarian learning communities. In V. Tong, A. Standen, A., & M. Sotiriou, (Eds.), *Research equals teaching: Inspiring research-based education through student-staff partnerships* (pp. 23-29). London: UCL Press. Retrieved from
<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/ucl-press/browse-books/shaping-higher-education-with-students>
- McKinney, K. (2015). Tips for publishing SoTL work. SoTL Advocate Blog 13th January. Retrieved from <https://illinoisstateuniversitysotl.wordpress.com/2015/01/13/tips-for-publishing-sotl-work/>

- Niven, K., Totterdell, P., Holman, D., & Headley, T. (2012). Does regulating others' feelings influence people's own affective well-being? *Journal of Social Psychology, 152*(2), 246-260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2011.599823>
- Noland, K. (1988, March). Context. Speech delivered at University of Hartford to symposium "The Bennington Years." Retrieved from <http://www.sharecom.ca/noland/nolandtalk.html>
- Powers, M. (2012). Reflections on seven core principles of facilitating faculty-student partnerships within an educational initiative. *Teaching and Learning Together in Higher Education, 7*. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/tlthe/vol1/iss7/9?utm_source=repository.brynmawr.edu%2Ftlthe%2Fvol1%2Fiss7%2F9&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages
- QAA (Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education) (2012). Chapter B5: Student engagement. *UK Quality Code for Higher Education*. Gloucester: QAA. Retrieved from www.qaa.ac.uk/publications/informationandguidance/pages/quality-code-B5.aspx
- Roxå, T., Olsson, T., & Mårtensson, K. (2008). Appropriate use of theory in the scholarship of teaching and learning as a strategy for institutional development. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 7*(3), 276-294.
- Taber, K. S. (2013). *Classroom-based research and evidence-based practice: An introduction* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Trowler, P., & Cooper, A. (2002). Teaching and learning regimes: Implicit theories and recurrent practices in the enhancement of teaching and learning through educational development programmes. *Higher Education Research and Development, 21*(3), 221-240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436022000020742>
- University of Hertfordshire (2018). Embedding and assessing compassion on the university curriculum. Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3jFVTCuSCog>
- Werder, C., & Skogsberg, E. (2013). Trusting dialogue for engaging students. In E. Dunne, & D. Owen (Eds.), *The student engagement handbook: Practice in higher education* (pp. 133-144). Bingley: Emerald.
- Williams, M. (2015). Affect, emotion, and emotion regulation in the workplace: Feelings and attitudinal structuring. *Negotiation Journal, October*, 425-428. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nejo.12120>
- Williamson, M. (2013). *Guidance on the development and implementation of a student partnership agreement in universities*. Edinburgh: Sparqs. Retrieved from <https://www.sparqs.ac.uk/ch/Student%20Partnership%20Agreement%20Guidance%20-%20final%20version.pdf>