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Abstract

Enabling social justice and social mobility through widening participation in higher education is increasingly becoming a complex socio-political issue, as groups of students move into and out of policy and practice focus, offering the opportunity to leave some students 'misrecognised' (Fraser 2013) as deserving of access to UK universities (Stevenson et al 2010, Burke 2012). Current research would suggest students who care for children, are an example of such misrecognised groups of students; they do not feature specifically as the beneficiaries of widening participation policy, and are uncaptured by student demographic data (NUS 2009), while also experiencing numerous barriers specifically orientated around their status as carers for children. (Brooks, 2012; Moreau 2015)This paper focuses onthe application of Nancy Frasers theories of recognition (Fraser 2001) and their application to redressing social inequalities in higher education, using the experiences of students who care for children as a case study. Mobilising a Fraserian analysis I deconstruct the experiences of these students, drawing on the accounts of 16 student participants and 7 staff, from a two-year in-depth institutional ethnographic study at a research intensive university in the North of England.I suggest the students in my study can become framed as problematic within this institutional setting, which can at times be seen to be heavily process driven, and can lack a coherent and reflexive conception of social justice, which can lead to students being misrecognised as being deserving and undeserving of support in this institution.In concluding this paper I suggest that Fraser’s theories can pose new and creative ways to consider widening participation practices. Arguing that Frasers theories offer a coherent theory of social justice with which to address the complex web of economic, socio-political, and cultural barriers, which interplay to generate the social inequalities in these student’s experience. I suggest applying Frasers theories could be used by universities to engage explicitly with a reflexive discourse of social justice which could be used to inform and shape their policy and practice, and provide greater recognition to more diverse groups such as students who care for children.
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## Introduction

The issue of who is recognised (Fraser,1997) as deserving of widening participation is deeply political proffering the potential to generate and perpetuate social inequalities, for which we require a suitable theorisation of social justice to redress (Burke 2013, Morrison 2015). Historically widening participation has focused around a specific set of groups, such as those based on class, age, ethnicity, disability, and gender. (Great Britain 1963, 1997). Which can leave other students who experience barriers not related to these criteria misrecognised (Fraser 2003), as deserving or undeserving of access, or additional supports to enter higher education. (Burke, 2013). I, like others (Burke 2013, Morrison 2015), make the case in this paper that the work of Nancy Fraser, and her theories of Recognition (1997, 2001, 2003) proffer a useful means of understanding not only barrier of access of certain groups as Burke has done, but also their barriers to participation. In this paper I suggest that Students Who Care for Children are an example of one such group who are inconsistently captured within the target groupings of WP beneficiaries, but pose a great potential to advance drivers for HE in terms of goals for greater social justice, social mobility, equality, and diversity through higher education, but also economic advancement. However, many of the barriers captured from what is currently know of these students suggests that the barriers these students face are participation orientated as well as access orientated (Brooks 2012, Moreau Kerner 2015). It is here therefore that I would suggest that the ways in which Frasers theories of recognition proffers a Perspectival Dualism (Fraser 2003) to understanding the experiences of these students, as interwoven consideration is given to both issues of redistribution of resource to facilitate access and participation, as well as recognition as deserving/not, capable or not while participating.

## Fraser and Widening Participation

Nancy Fraser’s work on recognition has already been used by some to understand and theorise about the misrecognition of Widening Participation (WP) students in close up research to understand the relationship between those who are recognised as having potential and aren’t. (Burke 2013, Morrison 2015). Burke for example has used Frasers work to explore the way cultural subjectivities exist within the policy landscape of widening participation that Burke suggests “are tacit, implicit, and tend to favour the ontological and epistemological subjectivities of privileged social groups” (Burke 2013 p136). Going on to suggest that Nancy Frasers Theories of recognition offer a useful way of understanding how and why WP students experience misrecognition, compared to non-WP Students. Frasers theories acknowledge the complex way that social inequalities are the product of both economic redistributive inequalities, and cultural misrecognitions simultaneously, and in order to rectify the imbalances they create suggests that an approach which she describes as Perspectival Dualism (Fraser 2003) is required. Perspectival dualism avoids taking more linear approaches to social justice, which she highlights is seen in the ways that redistribution and recognition have been portrayed as sitting in opposition to one another, from which only one side can be taken. The reality Fraser argues is far more complex than this as social inequalities are accordingly intertwined, claiming;“Even the most material economic institutions have a constitutive, irreducible cultural dimension; they are shot through with significations and norms.” (Fraser 1997 p15). Fraser therefore creates a theoretical framework which sees redistribution and recognition as conjoined, on a continuum, which allows issues of social justice to remedied reflexively according to their interwoven cause. Fraser is inspired by the principal of avoiding moral or ethical judgement based answers to social inequalities, but instead seeking which resolve status subordination (Fraser 2001). For Fraser status;

“represents an order of intersubjective subordination derived from institutionalized patterns of cultural value that constitute some members of society as less than full members of society, as less than full partners in interaction.” (Fraser 2003 p 49)

Complimenting Fraser’s Status Model therefore is the principal of Parity of a Participation, which goes deeper than to suggest that participation is enough to resolve social inequalities. Thus the question emerges in the context of widening participation as to not only who should be recognized but how, as the question under a Fraserian lens not only captures the issues of a particular groups barriers to gaining access to higher education, but understanding any impediments to participation within that access which leads to status subordination. (Burke 2012) In this way seeking to “deinstitutionalize patterns of cultural value that impede parity of participation and to replace them with patterns that foster it.” (Fraser 2003 P 30)

Despite appearances, and claims of ‘transparency’ in university admissions process Burke has for example used Frasers theoretical framework to understand issues of access, in terms of how widening participation students have been misrecognized during them (Burke 2013 p136). Burke has witnessed the ways in which university admissions staff have brought to life the transparent Arts school admissions policies during interviews in ways that are deeply ingrained with cultural subjectivities. In the example of one student, Nina, a BME candidate, who had shown a strong portfolio prior to interview Burke observed how Nina was constructed during interview as an unsuitable candidate for the course as; “Nina’s clothes were noted as not fashionable, Interviewers said she lacked confidence, and they were dissatisfied with Nina’s intentions to live at home whilst studying – sign of immaturity.” (Burke 2015) Furthermore within the interview it also became clear that Nina’s inspiration for design was orientated towards her ethnicity, and inspired by hip-hop culture, which was not given the same recognition and value by admissions tutors;

“Interviewer one: Why should we say we’re rejecting her?, Interviewer two: Well she’s all hip-hop and sport tops, Interviewer one: We’ll say that her portfolio was weak.” (Burke and McManus 2009 p41)

However, an white middle-class candidate, was viewed differently; “he confirmed that he would ‘definitely be leaving home because it is all part of the experience. The young man was offered a place in spite of having considerably poorer qualifications than Nina, including having failed GCSE Art.” (Burke 2015) Here Burke demonstrates through the application of a Fraserian lens of recognition the way in which despite the redistributive resource of transparent administrative policies, the reality of this is not the case when these become imbued with cultural subjectivities. Here Burke has demonstrated the way in which according to Fraser cultural misrecognitions have taken place, but also unearthed redistributive inequalities when considering the economic disparities between Nina and the successful candidate; His economic ability to live at university helping him to be perceived as independent and able to be recognized as a potential student. (Burke 2013) While an interwoven combination of a misrecognition of Nina’s ethnic and cultural roots alongside economic maldistribution, in her desire to stay at home for university, are mobilised in ways which misrecognise her as a suitable student. Burke has highlighted the important insight that can be gained from the application of theories of recognition to issues of access, however little space has currently been given to how this translates into recognition during participation, or how Frasers theories could apply to understanding the barriers students may face through participation. I would suggest that Fraser can pose the potential to explore the experiences of groups who are not currently captured fully in widening participation targets, such as students who care for children, who may experience barriers in new and unique ways which have not been previously recognised, but who if we are widening, as opposed to just increasing participation have the potential right to recognition.

## Students Who Care for Children

Students who care for children are a unique group who are not specifically the targeted beneficiaries of widening participation policy, tracing back from Robbins and Dearing and aim higher the predominant target groups for widening participation have included groups based on social class, ethnicity, age, gender, and disability. (Great Britain, 1963; 1997; McCaig et al 2007) Yet this group of students pose the potential to reach economic drivers for HE, by skilling up a broader workforce, as well as proffering abilities to reduce social inequalities by supporting greater equality and diversity in universities. However this group has only been targeted in limited ways, OFFA’s young carers suggestion to universities as an underrepresented group is relatively new, (OFFA 2016) and has appeared in parallel to a general reduction in support for mature students, targeting of women, or part-time students, groups which might also have capture these students. However what research that exists demonstrates that these students experience multiple barriers which are wide ranging and diverse crossing both the barriers of access but also participation and include a deficit in time or space to study (Brooks, 2012), deficits in finances (Gerrard and Roberts, 2006), the provision of childcare, or accessible campuses (Springer et al., 2009), the maintenance of family life or self-identity (Wainwright and Marandet, 2010), or a combination of these factors (Moreau and Kerner, 2015). However what does appear as a theme in the broader patterns of research is that these students navigate complex processes of recognition and misrecognition. Moreau for example has specifically highlighted how their experiences of being at university often feature students as invisible or forced to navigate multiple identities which “position them at the nexus of several areas of policy intervention” (Moreau and Kerner 2015 p224). While Brooks has demonstrated the complex way in which Neoliberalism in UK universities creates a focus on individualisation which can frame the institutionalised inequalities of being a student parent as ‘personal failures’ (Brooks 2012 p424), a feeling the students in her study internalised. However current research being a relatively small body, there has been limited close up theoretical analysis of these student’s experiences understanding how or why barriers manifest themselves, hence I would argue a Fraserian Analysis can build on this, as I seek to do now.

## Recognition & Participation of Students who Care for Children

My research took the form on an Institutional Ethnography (IE), (Smith, 2006) which seeks to adopt a particular ‘standpoint’, in this case Students Who Care for Children, and adopt methodological approaches which best captures their experience of going about their ‘work’(Smith, 2006) or their every day/night lives within an institutional setting. The objective of this methodology being to map the power relations at play within the standpoints experience, to do this IE considers in particular the way in which ‘extra-local decision’ making may take place within an institution, and how ‘texts’ (Smith, 2006) by which a broad definition is understood from imagines, forms, tickets, to policy documents affect this. Considering how 'texts' carry meaning around these institutional contexts, and the way they are ‘activated’ (Smith, 2006) or brought to life, within the standpoint’s experience can tell us more about the location of power within an institution. IE thus poses interesting potential to understand the concept of participation further, and complements a Fraserian analysis in the way in which it prioritises capturing the experiences of a standpoint group in rich qualitative detail, from which a claims for recognition, and the interwoven lenses of redistribution claims and recognition claims could be understood. Taking place over two academic years (2013/14 and 14/15) at a research intensive Higher Education Institution (HEI) in the north of England, I engaged in a series of interviews with 16 students, combining from one-to-one interviews to focus groups seeking to explore their experiences. As well as a series of single interviews with 7 members of staff from a variety of roles; the role of the staff interviews provide context to support an illustration of the cultural environment of this particular HEI, rather than to validate these student’s experiences.

In many ways this HEI demonstrated a pattern of support for students who care for children, which compared to the literature (Brooks 2012, Moreau 2015, NUS 2009) was an example of significant progress, with facilities and resources made available specifically for these student’s needs, such as housing, childcare, and a student parent policy. However while some of these facilities where seen to be very responsive to their use was limited, only one out of the sixteen students was currently utilising university family accommodation due to availability, and although it was clear the value the student places on this was more orientated to the recognition this student experienced from the property manager than the facilities themselves; “she it turns out looks after all the family properties…she was giving us quite a sympathetic face you know that she could relate…” (Elaine) However, generally redistributive supports in this HEI happened in a limited form due to the capacity of provision, a pattern which was seen also in childcare facilities. This HEI held an on campus Crèche, however only two of the sixteen students where using these facilities one of whom, Barbara, was currently a member of staff at the university, and was able to pay for these services through salary sacrifice schemes, which supported her as an employee rather than as a student, and made them more affordable. At the same time this significantly informed her choice to study here; “because I was thinking about my childcare being here, I was thinking about being close to make it as easy as possible to study” (Barbara) However the other student whose child attendee the universities Crèche, Natalia, was a full time student, but had experienced great difficulty getting her child in; “we had waited for year 1 in the waiting list, until we get a place.” (Natalia) Suggesting that with limited capacity, and facilitating methods for staff at the university, such as the active promotion of the Crèche as a HR benefits of working here, these facilitates where not always accessible and inclusive to students. This was not necessarily because it was openly discouraged but because of a lack of information directed towards students. For example, it was clear during the focus group that while some students were aware of the child-positive environment of the university campus, few understood what that meant, and felt excluded from this, with details of the specifics of the universities provision being absent from inductions students experienced. Claiming of childcare;

“*Rachael*: I’m only aware of it because I walked passed it, *Steve*: “yeah I do all the time, because the building is right there and I go past it all the time me but I’m always wondering,” (Focus Group1)

While later on in the focus group, discussing possible kinds of support the students would like to see in place one participant reflects, that the potential supports they are discussing may be there; “*Rachael****:*** we didn’t know the crèche was happening, so we might be ignorant of this facility.” (Focus Group) Here a Fraserian interpretation highlights that while redistributive measures are in place to support these students, these are appearing to be imbued with cultural misrecognition from a lack of information at key points such as induction, which generates the tacit impression that these facilities are not for them, and contribute to wider feelings of otherness.

This cultural misrecognition being imbued in the resources available to these students, became more and more apparent in their accounts which suggest that these redistributive measures are not supported by cultural recognition, particularly during the application of the student parent policy. This policy was only seen in three of the sixteen student's accounts, with most commenting on an unawareness of any policy resources to support them, as nothing had been brought to their attention when they joined the university, or advised staff of their caring status. One Student, Elaine, became aware of the policy by her own exploration during the process of moving from full time to part-time PhD study giving birth. However she was aware very much that on reading the document its target audience was not necessarily the students, claiming; “it kind of strikes me as a bit of a document for university staff,” (Elaine). Accordingly, the policy became framed for Elaine as more of a standard which was there to protect her when things go wrong, and therefore only needed to be brought out then. Reflecting that it was “nice to know they had a policy so if anything went wrong, in terms of my supervisors reacted badly or something like that then I knew like I would have this behind me” (Elaine). Yet at the same time Elaine was equally aware of the potential need that there might be for this, and recalling how other PhD students within her department had been recognized as problematic due to their pregnancy. One student being told when informing her supervisor she was pregnant “oh no not another one [pregnant student]” (Elaine).

Similar disconnects occurred for other students, between the perceived realities of supports, and the ways in which these where brought to life. One student Michaela, highlighted how the student parent policy made specific provision to give students who care for children preferences over placements on courses such as medicine where work experience formed a core component of the course. However Michaela did not benefit from this policy recalling how, when;

“I got my placements - they were actually the most faraway regions possible. I started panicking, and I contacted the lady who had received all these forms and had started to do all the allocations, but received no reply….I had to contact the head of year…he said to me that they can’t be seen to support students at the expense of the support for their administrative staff…And he said you need to apologise, even when you’re not in the wrong” (Michaela)

Not only had Michaela been misrecognised by the original implementation of the policy, but this misrecognition was repeated and reinforced when Michaela tried to rectify this, leading to an acceptance and internalisation of this by Michaela who did apologise, demonstrating Brooks (2012) point of how these student accept as 'personal failures' these institutionally mediated inequalities.

A similar story emerges in the experience of Erica, who chose to attend this particular HEI because of the policies available to support student parents, recounting how she researched her choices, and specifically read these policies during application. Claiming; “and that’s what made me choose it, most of all because of that policy” (Erica). However, when activated the policy was not used in ways could support Erica, but instead became imbued with interpretations which emphasised her difference as a student who cares for children while studying. Recounting;

“I had to pick my son up from pre-school because he was ill…I ended up getting an official school level warning, and I had a meeting with this professor, and she kinda yelled at me about it and I said this was the situation, and [they said] can I give evidence to show that I had to pick him up” (Erica)

Here a building body of evidence in the data starts to accumulate which sees the apparently open and transparent process of supporting students who care for children imbued with cultural subjectivities. Here a Frasaerian analysis would suggest, these cultural subjectivities lead to misrecognitions which act to denigrate their status, and impede their parity of participation. Instead of recognizing the challenges of their participation, Michaela and Erica are framed as problematic, in the case of Michaela she is asked to apologize for the challenges her caring status elicits, for Michaela she becomes subject to disciplinary procedures. Instead of recognizing the diversity of these student’s needs, and the unique factors and barriers which make their participation in HE difficult the subjective interpretations of staff are allowed to shape these students as poor, subjecting them to remorse, and disciplinary procedures.

The cultural misrecognition that these students experience however are not just seen in their own accounts, staff recount how this is actually part of the wider culture of the HEI, and the location of decision making within this HEI are deeply federalised, and therefore a great level of power and influence is placed in coal face delivery of support mechanisms.Despite strategic senior decision making which may take place to see resources such as childcare, and student parent policies available at this HEI, the participatory experiences of these student are dependent on the decisions of coalface staff on the ground. It is here were status subordination occurs as staff seek to manage the challenges they face, and in an attempt to manage this students to become more homogenised and easy to manage. At this HEI this takes the form of either on the one hand students being problematised into conformity, as for Erica and Michaela, or diverted to widening participation units for being different. One member of staff, David, a student support officer in the Widening participation unit explains, he uses the comparison of Students Who Care for Children being like American Express credit cards (which within the UK are visible, but infamous for not being accepted by all retailers) especially if they have other WP backgrounds in addition. He claims in the wider university these students are like;

“American Express, they only have to deal with it say once every year, so when it comes along it is like oh sorry we need to go over there… I can sense how students would then want to not add fuel to a potential fire by saying not only am I a mature student but I have got caring needs as well” (WP Staff member)

The status of these students subordinated through the supports available, as the process of encouraging and supporting diversity transparently by having resources such as a widening participation unit, becomes a resource to transparently divert these students to, rather than working to recognise them. This potentially allows these students to become ghettoised, as they become discouraged to participate in certain schools and facilities, and thus experience both status subordination, and a lack of participatory parity.

What becomes apparent then is the ways in which at this university supporting these student's diversity can become deeply process driven and lack reflexivity and a coherent conception of social justice within this HEI to inform their work, which allows these misrecognitions to occur. Just as Erica had been surprised at how her case was handled in light of the supportive policies, one member of staff, Janice, talks at her surprise of how an extension request was handled in a department she was guest teaching in, contrasted with her experience elsewhere of a rigours open transparent review, this departments committee left the decision open to her;

“it bounced back to me saying, well how long would you give her an extension so they didn’t consider the person’s circumstances and look at reasonable adjustment, they actually just came back to me and said well how long will you give her.” (Janice)

While in this case the member of staff engaged reflexively, and sought to judge the case transparently and fairly as she could, this is the space within which cultural subjectivities and their social inequalities can be allowed to manifest. Much like Burkes (2013) example of admissions processes in terms of access, these committees, and disciplinary policies form the sites where misrecognitions are allowed to occur in the process of student participation and this requires redress also, to support the work and effort which goes into access.

Instead of being able to engage in a coherent theory of social justice to inform their practices this leads to recognition of these students mainly given via solo advocates, who act as ‘lone wolves’ (Mountford-Zimdars 2015), who engage their own personal politics to support the agenda of greater diversity, as also seen by Stevenson et al (2010). Erica for example recounts how one of the secretarial staff in her department has proved an invaluable source of support, acting as an unofficial go-between between the head of school, explaining how the secretary was;

“so warm and so supportive…she kind of spoke to the head of school, and told her to back off and handled that situation for me, and I go and see her regularly now like a sort of course councillor.” (Erica)

Similarly, members of staff become aware of when they are stepping into these roles of ‘lone wolves’, one Katherine an employability officer, recounting the absences of changing tables in a new building after moving in. She talks of her frustration at what appeared to be filling in the blanks others left behind, such as how; “I had to go and order that separately after the building was finished because nobody had thought to put it in” (Katherine). This did evoke further changes across the campus, however she too was very aware of how this was not necessarily orientated towards providing student support and recognition, and actually came from marketing, as “driving some of this is the number of second families there are now and the number of small children we have on campus on open day.” (Katherine) Which goes further to highlight the ways in which culturally the prospect of having students who have caring responsibilities on campus is misrecognised. Without these ‘lone wolves’ such as Katherine, Elaine’s Property Manager, or Erica’s Secretary, doubt could be raised as to if these students would receive recognition, or even if the redistributive resources, of facilities and policies, would be effectively utilised. While there is to a degree more options which could be added to support these students in terms of redistributive measures, see for example the practices that occur in Demark (Brooks 2012), what becomes evident here are the patterns of cultural misrecognition that occurs in this particular HEI which to a degree make both the students participation, and the access to resources available to support them problematic.

# Conclusion

In conclusion my current analysis shows that by applying Fraserian lenses to the experiences of students who cares experiences at this particular HEI demonstrates patterns of cultural value which creates status subordination, and barriers to participation. At this HEI redistributive remedies are still required to overcome barriers for these students, but it is cultural misrecogiton which is currently hindering participation, which impede these students parity of participation. As Fraser suggests therefore in seeking to redress the inequalities approaches need to be taken which “deinstitutionalize patterns of cultural value that impede parity of participation and to replace them with patterns that foster it.” (Fraser 2003 P30) This could be done by seeking to move away from process driven thinking, and instead engaging reflexively with and a coherent shared theory of social justice to inform practices. While this may be more challenging that this conclusion infers due to wider macro-socio-political moves in the HE sector, I would suggest that the patterns in this HEI may be seen elsewhere, and further research utilising the theories of Fraser's theories could offer greater insight into this. I would suggest here Fraser presents a coherent theory of social justice with which to address the complex web of economic, socio-political, and cultural barriers, which interplay to generate the social inequalities student’s experience, which might otherwise have been missed if applying discourses of fairness, or equality without engaging with a conception of Social Justice, not only to issues of access but also participation.
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