

Market driven system differentiation in England : can it foster equity and diversity?

MCCAIG, Colin <<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4364-5119>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/11297/>

This document is the Presentation

Citation:

MCCAIG, Colin (2015). Market driven system differentiation in England : can it foster equity and diversity? In: ECER : Education and Transition - Contributions from Educational Research, Budapest, 7-11 September 2015. (Submitted) [Conference or Workshop Item]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

**Market driven system
differentiation in England: can it
foster equity and diversity?
ECER 2015**

Colin McCaig

Sheffield Hallam University

Diversity and differentiation in the English context

- what it is where it came from - drivers
- systemic expansion and binary divide 1960s and 70s
- systemic growth from mid 1980s - emergence of 'widening participation' as a value in Polytechnics
- end of the binary divide - emergence of cheaper higher education
- the role of the state in WP
- WP as a marker of differentiation in HE market

Drivers of widening participation and differentiation

- global system expansion
- Polytechnics as a responsive 'public sector' of HE
- different types of student
- new types of supply and demand
- part-time and distance education

Systemic growth from mid-1980s

- UK context - market ideology
- expansion at lower unit cost (growth slide)
 - but growth restricted mainly to polytechnics
- 1988 Education Reform Act; 1992 Further and Higher Education Act
- End of the university/polytechnic binary divide
- HEFCE - need for diversity of mission

Drivers of differentiation

- Two types of higher education
 - the social justice case Leverhulme/SRHE 1983
 - the business imperative - vocational relevance
 - what of the universities?
- Academic drift
- A market in entry qualifications

Vertical and horizontal differentiation

Vertical	Horizontal
Price	Academic / vocational provision
Prestige	Binary system divide - University / Polytechnic
Quality	Social mobility for the few vs widening access to all that are qualified
Scarcity	Fair Access vs system diversity as a goal

Horizontal differentiation valued

A diverse HE service should be able to provide choices of curriculum offer; choices as to the mode, pace and place of delivery; choices regarding the physical and intellectual environment available; and choices between a range of different institutional forms and missions.

(HEFCE: 2000, para 14).

Elite to mass HE: the social divide

Both sectors function within the assumptions of elite higher education; the creation of the polytechnics simply allowed the system to grow up to the Robbins ceiling without diluting the social and academic distinction of the universities.

Trow, M. (2007) [Reflections on the transition from elite to mass to universal access: Forms and phases of higher education in modern societies since WWII](#), Springer

The state and WP

- Dearing Review (1997)
- The new Labour government and WP targets
- Aimhigher
- The 'fair admissions' debate - Schwartz Report 2004
- OFFA and the coming of fair access (HE Act 2004)
 - overt marketisation ... in bursaries if not fees
 - competitive WP positioning

WP and 'Fair Access'

Broadly speaking, widening participation is a sector-wide issue whereas fair access is one that concerns individual institutions...

*...the term [fair access] refers to the fairness, or otherwise, of the admissions processes of institutions..... But it has **also come to refer to the mix of students in individual institutions**. On the one hand, it is quite possible to widen participation without having fair access in either sense of the term. On the other hand, it is possible to concentrate on fair access in a way that detracts from a broader effort to widen participation.*

Bekhradnia, B (2003) Widening Participation and Fair Access: An Overview of the Evidence (HEPI)

WP and market differentiation

- Access agreement analysis (from 2006)
- Reveals mission and values divide between pre-1992 and post-1992 institutions
- Raising aspirations for all (WP) versus social mobility for the few (Fair Access)
- Reveals a market in bursaries
 - differential outreach targeting
 - by age and social groups
- Post-1992s missions begin to reflect Pre-1992 discourses and behaviours

Overt marketisation

- League tables emerge mid-2000s
- Browne review of student finance (2009)
- Conservative/Liberal Democrat coalition (2010-15) - fee increase
- 2011 White Paper 'students at the heart of the system'
 - variable fee market
 - driven by student choice based on information
 - best institutions can expand numbers of higher qualifies students
 - weaker institutions would have to lower fees to maintain numbers

Competition as the market driver

*We propose to allow unrestrained recruitment of high achieving students, scoring the equivalent of AAB or above at A-Level. Core allocations for all institutions will be adjusted to remove these students. Institutions will then be free to recruit **as many of these students as wish to come**. This should allow greater competition for places on the more selective courses and create the opportunity for more students to go to their first choice institution if that university wishes to take them. AAB will represent a starting point, but **our ambition is to widen the threshold** over this parliament, ensuring that the share of places liberated from number controls altogether **rises year on year**.*

BIS 2011 White Paper: *Students at the Heart of the System*, para 4.19

Marketised differentiation

Marketised differentiation - vertical but no horizontal axis

Price (maybe but not yet)... but

League table rankings

- **entry qualifications**
- **student satisfaction**
- **outcomes data**

Prestige - e.g. research rankings

Quality

Scarcity

Levels of financial support

Institutional type

Approach to widening participation - types of outreach

Impact on post-1992s: risk averse behaviours

- HEA research into the new marketised landscape (Taylor & McCaig 2014)
- raising of entry requirements
- dropping of lower entry, sub-degree and part-time courses
- emphasis on employability
- 90 institutions chasing a place in the 'Top 50'

Risk aversion

I think there is a pressure point [around widening participation] there because I know that the governors are very keen on the widening participation, widening access...agenda, versus the fact that of course *if you look at our numbers at the moment, we exceed all of our benchmarks on widening access, low participation neighbourhoods, BME, percentage state schools, mature students ... So **losing some of those numbers would not probably make a very big significant impact on that agenda*** (Post1).

The market effect meant that "the business model is absolutely simplified: **recruit, retain, recruit, retain**" (Post2)

Can differentiation foster equity and diversity?

- vertical differentiation reinforces hierarchies
 - good for 'fair access' and social mobility
 - pathways to the top for the brightest of the poor and underrepresented
- horizontal differentiation values difference
 - diversity of provision
 - diversity of learning styles
 - diversity of students' backgrounds

Summary discussion

- Vertical differentiation preserves elite universities' autonomy
- Vertical differentiation relies on wide variation between markers
- Leaves no space for horizontal differentiation values
- Once state became involved in WP pre-1992s interests came to the fore
- Fair Access and the 'crisis of social mobility' rhetoric maintains the differentiation
- WP at post-92s threatened by the focus on league tables- chasing the 'top 50'

Further reading

- Bekhradnia, B (2003) *Widening Participation and Fair Access: An Overview of the Evidence* (HEPI)
- McCaig, C (2011) "Trajectories of higher education system differentiation: structural policymaking and the impact of tuition fees in England and Australia" *Journal of Education and Work*: 'Vol. 24, Nos. 1–2, February–April 2011, 7–25.
- McCaig, C (2015) The Impact of the Changing English Higher Education Marketplace on Widening Participation and Fair Access: Evidence from a Discourse Analysis of Access Agreements, *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning*, Volume 17, Issue 1, March 2015
- Taylor, C. and McCaig, C. (2014) *Evaluating the impact of number controls, choice and competition: an analysis of the student profile and the student learning environment in the new higher education landscape*, Higher Education Academy, York, August 2014
- Trow, M. Policy Analysis, In *Educational Research, Methodology, and Measurement: An International Handbook*. John Keeves, ed