# Care and compassion in large-group teaching: uncovering teachers' experiences

**Emma Kennedy**
University of Greenwich, UK


**Suzan Koseoglu**
University of Greenwich, UK


**Shreyashi Chakraborty**
University of Greenwich, UK


**Punitha Puttuswamy**
University of Greenwich, UK

## *Abstract*

Large-group teaching has long been a mainstay of university education, often through lectures. In the UK, neoliberalism in higher education has pushed universities to increase cohort sizes as a way to meet higher education demands and ensure economic sustainability. Consequently, the proportion of staff undertaking large-group teaching has increased to ensure students receive adequate contact hours for direct learning from teaching staff on a larger scale. Our project explores the nature of this contact: what type of teaching experience does it provide? For staff dedicated to pedagogies of care, how do high student-to-staff ratios affect their ability to connect with students? Using professional conversations (Leonard, 2012; Jarrett, 2021) as a participatory research method, we capture the experiences of participant-teachers who lead large group lectures. These professional conversations elucidate the intricate ecology of lecture spaces, encompassing the human, spatial (physical and technological) and structural or policy factors that influence the teaching experience. This approach enables us to examine how these forces shape the large-group teaching experience, uncover the complexities of teaching large classes and contribute to the broader discourse on a pedagogy of kindness (Denial, 2019; Bali, 2021). We aim to challenge the notion that care, compassion and kindness flow only from teachers to students and are solely a human-driven process. Our findings suggest

Kennedy, Koseoglu, Chakraborty, Puttuswamy
Care and compassion in large-group teaching:
uncovering teachers' experiences

pathways to mutual compassion and care in large-scale pedagogy, involving both human and nonhuman elements.

**Keywords:** lectures; large-class teaching; learning spaces; compassionate pedagogies.

## *Introduction*

Despite numerous claims to the contrary, the lecture is far from dead. In fact, it is thriving, as universities around the world seek to address increasing student enrolments through large-scale teaching. This trend perhaps supports Trow's (1973) prediction about mass higher education, where access to higher education becomes a civic right, leading to 'growth and massification' (Marginson, 2016, p.29). Five decades later, mass higher education is further shaped by the demands of neoliberalism. As more students enrol in universities, questions arise around how to fund these institutions and allocate resources efficiently (Arvanitakis, 2014; Jones, 2019).

In England the removal of limits on university expansion has contributed to a significant increase in student numbers. This change, alongside the growing trend of massification and higher student enrolments, has led to a growing concern regarding student wellbeing and, to a lesser extent, staff wellbeing. There is surprisingly limited research on how teachers navigate the challenges of teaching and managing large groups of students, how these challenges affect their wellbeing, and what mechanisms they adopt to cope with the demands of their evolving roles. This gap highlights the need to investigate and understand the factors impacting teachers' wellbeing and to identify ways to mitigate and prevent adverse effects and support educators in their modified roles.

In this article, we address the identified gap in scholarship by focusing on how teachers experience large-group teaching through the lens of a pedagogy of care and kindness (Noddings, 2005; Denial, 2019; Bali, 2021). We use professional conversations as a method to gather insights from staff and to explore how the pedagogy of care, and the connections it highlights between staff and students, was experienced by staff as they recall and reflect on their experiences of large-group teaching. We highlight how seemingly nonhuman factors within the classroom, such as the design of the learning spaces (classroom layout, seating arrangements) and available technology (projectors, online

platforms), are more than just administrative issues as they play a significant role in shaping the dynamics of the classroom. These nonhuman elements can intervene in the human-human relationships and influence the relationships between teachers and students that teachers view as central to their identity and effectiveness. This article also suggests some ways to address the challenges posed by these factors.

## *Literature review*

As this research explores the experiences of teachers teaching large cohorts, we begin by examining the existing scholarship on massification in higher education and its effects on staff and student wellbeing. Subsequently, we adopt a perspective that approaches education in a radically different way: pedagogies of care and kindness. Finally, the research draws on scholarly work surrounding teachers' identity and wellbeing in higher education. It provides a context for the personal experiences that we, as educators, discuss in this paper.

### Massification and large-group teaching

Whether it is seen as a social justice project or a neoliberal imperative, many think massification has created significant challenges for universities globally (Maringe and Sing, 2014). Msiza, Ndhlovu and Raseroka (2020, p. 50) refer to assessment as the 'sausage factory, in and out', highlighting the challenges resulting from massification in South Africa and echoing Mahabeer and Pirtheepal's (2019) finding in the same context. Mahabeer and Pirtheepal (2019) further critique the disconnect between government demands, neoliberal university structures, and teaching staff's lived experience, leading to increased workloads and eventual academic burnout.

In the UK context, a similar trend is suggested by Watermeyer et al. (2024, p. 446), who state that 'the neoliberal transformation of higher education in the UK and an intertwined focus on the productive efficiency and prestige value of universities has led to an epidemic of overwork amongst academics'. This trend is reflected in the literature on large classes. To address the massification of UK higher education and diversified access, and to maintain and encourage student engagement, the use of interactive technology such as student response systems (Wang and Calvano, 2022) and online asynchronous forms

(Howard and Das, 2019) are identified as potential solutions. Additionally, self- and peer-to-peer assessment (Atkinson, 2011; Donovan and Hood, 2021) and e-assessment (Mo et al., 2022) are discussed as strategies to manage the increased demands of large cohorts on marking and feedback.

However, studies indicate that students highly value human connections (Wang, 2023) and meaningful personal tutor-student relationships (Evans et al., 2021) at all levels. Wang and Calvano (2022) found that large classes often result in lower levels of interaction and satisfaction, and Cuseo (2007) argues that large class sizes had a negative impact on students. Conversely, Ake-Little, Von der Embse and Dawson (2020) found class size did not have a uniform effect on student outcomes. Perhaps a useful answer lies in Blatchford and Russell (2020), who show that, despite mixed effects of class size on attainment itself, a focus on the process and experience in the classroom can reveal the mechanisms and effects of class size on different outcomes like engagement and wellbeing in a more nuanced way.

**Teacher identity and wellbeing**

Staff experience in the classroom must be understood within the context of their overall experience within their organisation and the higher education sector. Morrish (2019) has noted a decline in university staff wellbeing since 2005, while Kinman (2019) found that heavy workloads and employment insecurity negatively impacted staff. Mula-Falcón, Caballero and Domingo Segovia (2022) and Shams (2019) found staff had to switch between different professional identities and value sets. Nixon and Scullion (2022) identified a profound ambivalence in how staff view students. On the one hand, students are seen as authority figures and consumers in a market-based system; on the other hand, they are viewed as anxious individuals needing care. This ambivalence parallels Korczynski and Ott's (2004) characterisation of customers as paradoxically both 'sovereign' and manipulable within a highly rationalised production model, which is unsurprising in the context of marketised universities.

Shams (2019, p. 621) considered the switching of value sets by staff as 'agentic', but it may impede another crucial factor for teacher wellbeing: engagement with students and colleagues (Laiho, Jauhiainen and Jauhiainen, 2022). Envisioning the future of higher education, staff emphasised that social connection and engagement were essential

regardless of the technologies used (Veletsianos, Johnson and Houlden, 2024). This might explain why, according to Laundon and Grant-Smith (2023), staff wellbeing suffered more in large and diverse classes, and educators who rated higher on empathy and responsiveness were more susceptible to burnout. However, this perspective treats wellbeing as a zero-sum game, implying that staff wellbeing must be sacrificed for students, or vice versa. Brewster et al. (2022) offer a more nuanced view, suggesting that student and staff wellbeing are interconnected, a concept echoed in the idea of pedagogies of care.

## Pedagogies of care and kindness

The pedagogy of care (Bali, 2021) offers a way to examine staff experiences of large-group teaching space (in-person or online) that focuses on the shared experience of staff and students. hooks (2003, p.91) states that 'committed acts of caring let all students know that the purpose of education is not to dominate', that is, care on a teacher's part can disrupt the traditional assumed power relationship between teacher and student. Bali (2015), citing Noddings' (1984) work on care, emphasises constant communication involving but not limited to asking and listening between teacher and students, even where the group is too large for communication at an interpersonal level between teacher and student.

Care does not just flow one way between teacher and students, however, and this is what makes the pedagogy of care so powerful for uncovering the experience of staff in large-group teaching. Bali (2021, n.p.) identifies three types of care that teachers may receive: 'care from fellow teachers, care from their own students, and equitable caring policies from their institutions'. These three types are interrelated and can support one another, but the first two cannot sustain wellbeing without the third, 'equitable caring policies'. These include recognising affective and emotional labour and service work with the same prestige granted to research, and policies that 'enable us to care for our students', such as flexible grading and learner autonomy (Bali, 2021, n.p.). With this, Bali recognises that care is not just something one individual gives to another, but something that is enabled – or, more often, impeded – by broader structural issues.

This dynamic, intersectional vision of care is echoed by other conceptualisations of compassionate pedagogy. Cate Denial's 'pedagogy of kindness' (2019, n.d.) 'is not about

sacrificing myself, or about taking on more emotional labor [sic]'. Rather, it means 'recognizing that our students possess innate humanity, which directly undermines the transactional educational model'. Quinn and Burtis (2022, n.p.) describe 'designing for care' as 'creating, crafting, and teaching [...] in the intentional narrative of a shared humanity' and crucially, 'the intentional framing of course design and teaching through a structure that demonstrates care towards all those involved'. Again, while care can be demonstrated by individuals, we see here a concept in which structures, which include human and nonhuman participants, can help sustain care.

## *Professional conversations: understanding participant perspectives*

Grounded in the tradition of using conversations as a methodology in collaborative action research (Feldman, 1999), professional conversations is a participatory research method that centres dialogue and the sharing of experience in the research process (Jarrett et al., 2021). Jarrett et al. (2021) emphasise the significant role such conversations have in the co-creation of knowledge and in promoting change, as the process of engaging in an intentional conversation that aims to explore and investigate an issue encourages reflexivity and the critical examination of 'familiar routines' and power dynamics (Bergold and Thomas, 2012, cited Jarrett et al., 2021, p. 2). Professional conversations can be situated in the interpretive paradigm, whereby researchers are part of the phenomenon they explore as co-researchers and research participants. This means that, while participant researchers bring their own experiences and worldviews into the research process, critical inquiry in a safe space is essential to challenge assumptions and biases in the conversation structure and the interpretation of the resulting data.

All four co-authors of this paper were the participant-researchers in the professional conversations. All academics in the same institution, two come from an Education background, one from Computer Science and one from Human Resource Management, and have between two to ten years' teaching experience. To aid self- and collective reflexivity in a trusted space, we first had one on-campus meeting followed by two semi-structured online meetings and continued the conversations via unstructured online discussions. Apart from the first on-campus meeting, where our experiences of teaching large classes in general was the entry point to the discussion, we began each conversation with a specific theme in relation to large-group teaching. These themes

Kennedy, Koseoglu, Chakraborty, Puttuswamy
Care and compassion in large-group teaching:
uncovering teachers' experiences

included: lived experience with large-group teaching, teaching with technology, structural hinderances and wellbeing. Divergences from the meeting themes were welcomed, provided the discussions remained related to the overarching theme of teaching large classes. As participant-researchers, we did not just narrate our experiences to one another in these conversations, but engaged in deep critical reflection (Brookfield, 2009) on power dynamics and hegemonic assumptions.

The on-campus meeting was not recorded, but the initial conversation helped to shape the discussions in online meetings. We recorded each online meeting and used the transcripts for a thematic analysis. Following the tradition of interpretive qualitative data analysis, semantic and latent coding was used, as appropriate, with the aid of NVivo. One of the researchers led the data analysis due to issues with access and discussed the emerging themes with the other participant-researchers to allow for their input. This is a limitation of this study, which could be addressed in future studies.

All co-researchers gave their informed consent to participate in the conversations. Transcripts of the conversations were shared amongst the co-researchers, ensuring equal participation. Any information that could personally identify the participants was removed from transcripts to maintain privacy. While the quotations used in the study come from the four co-authors, we have not attributed them to individuals.

## Analysis and discussion

We identified three salient themes emerging from the qualitative analysis, all centred around the common thread of connecting with students. These were: when connections become unwieldy, when physical and digital spaces interrupt connection, and when mutual engagement becomes mutual disengagement. When we use the term 'participants', we refer to the research team, the participant-researchers.

### When connections become unwieldy

In defining large classes, participants' definition of large was shaped not only by the number of students but also by the difficulty in connecting with them. One said, 'they're large because I don't get a sense of who everyone is in the programme', while for another,

'my starting point was to class it with the number of students, but I think the diversity in the group, our relationship with the students, maybe we should also consider that in the way we define large classes'. This description, which was common to discussions of both distance learning and in-person teaching, mirrors Harrison and Klein's (2007) conceptualisation of diversity as separation – distance between groups – and disparity, as well as variety. Therefore, discussions of large classes should go beyond numbers to encompass factors such as separation, variety and disparity.

While participants went beyond numbers alone in defining large classes, numbers were important. As one participant mentioned, 'if it goes beyond 40 or 30, you would not be able to capture their names, however much you try', and 'the point of connections becomes very unwieldy when it's a huge cohort'. This 'connection' was key for participants: when asked about their experience of teaching, it was connection – or lack thereof – that defined a positive or negative experience. For one, 'when there is a large course […] getting a nod out of everyone, or at least 50% of them are with me, becomes a challenge'. For these participants, what made large-class teaching difficult was the inability to connect with every student.

That said, participants did not give up on connecting with students, but all expressed their commitment to a dialogic teaching style that was based on mutual engagement. For one, 'get[ting] into interaction and express what [students] are learning, what is the difficulty or how they have grasped what is being taught becomes very, very essential for me'. For another, teaching meant 'acknowledging that you [students] are present, I see you […] I don't see you as just a random person there'. For these colleagues, teaching depended on 'the physicality, seeing or observing expressions and feedback […] from the students always will help me tailor my teaching'. Participants saw mutual engagement and dialogue as a necessary part of lecturing, rather than an optional extra.

**When physical and digital spaces interrupt connection**

Although the participants viewed engagement and dialogue as core to teaching, this was often made more difficult by the design of the classroom. One said, 'I like moving around and being very close to the students and knowing their expressions and understand[ing]', but in large lecture theatres 'you have to climb up so many stairs to reach the last ones […] my reachability to them is very limited'. The physical impediments of the teaching

space were not limited to stairs; lighting was also an issue: in one room, 'I can't really see the faces of the students […] it's really difficult to keep an eye-to-eye contact with the students all the time'. This sense of disconnection was intensified in some rooms which effectively created zones where the lecturer did not feel connected to the students. One room had 'a huge pillar in the back of the classroom' and students 'gathered behind that wall, not even visible to me'. In another, where 'students enter from the back […] they're not disturbing the lecture, but it also means that a lot of stuff is happening far away from you'. Here we see the physical design of the classroom intruding on a teacher's deeply held pedagogical values. While the issue may seem logistical in origin, it has profound consequences.

Beyond the physical design, the classrooms' technological infrastructure affected connection, and sometimes the two worked in tandem. One participant described the audiovisual environment created by the physical-digital world of a particular lecture theatre:

> the seats are really squeaky when people are coming in. If people are coming in sitting next to you […] and you're trying to hear, and if somebody moves away from the microphone, it's like right, now I'm not even listening to the lecture.

This auditory environment – which the participant linked to poor behaviour – was created by the combination of inadequate microphone provision and noisy seating arrangements. Participants noted that digital or audiovisual tools, or the lack thereof, determined pedagogical choices, such as where to stand, that, in their view, should be led by their core value: connection with students. A decision often relegated to the administrative arena can have a deep impact on pedagogy.

When participants considered digital technologies in the lecture theatre, especially mobile phones, again they were viewed through the prism of whether they helped or hindered the teacher-student connection. Participants considered that, while technologies such as Mentimeter could help engagement, smartphones (through which students access Mentimeter in most scenarios) could also lead to disconnection:

> it helps in engagement at some times, but it is also very, very distracting, because we are trying to have a conversation, and I hear something from them, but they are in a different world altogether.

Here the participant specifically contrasts the pedagogical goal, a 'conversation', with the reality that the students are 'in a different world'. Other participants linked this to the claim that 'Gen Z' (those born 1997-2012) are inherently more able to multitask, and the loneliness caused by the 'absent presence' (Gergen, 2002, p. 227) that smartphones can exacerbate. For colleagues, smartphones were not neutral tools but actively affected the classroom environment.

## When mutual engagement becomes mutual disengagement

Participants identified a perceived demand to buy and learn about digital tools to improve mutual engagement, which they felt could threaten teacher wellbeing. This took the form of financial pressure: 'it was actually stressing me out […]. How do I afford these gadgets?', but also pressure to demonstrate 'good' teaching: 'asking them to engage with the gadgets […], it could just increase the level of anxiety in the faculty to prove that they are capable'. Tools here become an extension of broader social pressures on teachers, extending their own specific demands.

Participants often felt contradictory pressures and wellbeing issues related to pressures from the structural environment of higher education. This made itself felt through two in-class incidents that were described in the conversations. The first was a student's protest about an assessment; the participant noted that 'I just said that no, this is what the assessment is', because they could not change it, but 'the thought process was: how many other students will talk about this? […] how many will complain?' In this incident we see the polar opposite of the connection and trust that the participants held as their core value. The student did not trust the teacher to design the assessment, and likewise the teacher did not trust the student not to complain maliciously. Mutual engagement becomes mutual disengagement, facilitated by a sector in which staff and students alike are made individually responsible for their 'performance'.

The second incident reported was a group of students who disrupted a lecture on entering; the participant confronted them, leading to 'a few minutes of argument, and then, it flashed to me that I'm […] derailing the class and I had to just flip and come back'. The participant reported that while 'I can't express what emotions I was going through', they had to 'continue as smooth as it was earlier'. For this participant, students' needs were the reason for suppressing their own emotions in the moment; they saw student wellbeing as more

important than teacher wellbeing. Another felt that the common argument, 'you are disturbing your classmates rather than the teacher as such', while effective, 'is very dehumanising to us […]. You are demeaning yourself, but you know that this is probably the only thing which is going to work'. In this atmosphere, again, a disconnect between students and staff led to staff feeling that their wellbeing must be denied in favour of that of students.

Noddings (2012, cited Bali, 2021, n.p.) notes that when the relationship of care is one-way and 'the cared-for is unable to respond in a way that completes the relation', the one doing the caring 'need[s] the support of a caring community'. In these incidents, we see just such a one-way delivery of care; the teacher cares for the students (both those who are active in the incidents and the others in the room) but does not receive care back or feel that they can ask for it. In this case, the teacher simply pushes down their emotions; what would it look like if they could take that emotion to Noddings' 'caring community'?

### Conclusion and ways forward

How can higher education tackle the difficulties outlined here? Maringe and Sing (2014) suggest a range of solutions, including curriculum and assessment redesign, enhancing staff intercultural understanding and increasing student engagement. However, our conversations have highlighted several key structural factors. One crucial factor is the design of learning spaces, both physical and digital. It is essential for staff to see and be seen by students, as well as to hear and be heard. Decisions about factors such as audiovisual equipment and physical room design are often seen as matters of mere logistics, not the domain of teaching staff. However, the conversations showed that these 'administrative' factors impacted the very foundation of teachers' pedagogy – the ability to make connections with students.

Large student-staff ratios make connection more difficult. Potential solutions could include recruiting more staff, limiting student numbers, or replacing mass lectures with smaller-group teaching sessions, with a clear understanding of how diversity impacts the classroom environment. However, we recognise that these may not be feasible in the neoliberal university context. As this research is highly reflexive, further research must be

done on precisely what hinders connection from staff and student perspectives, so that any changes to pedagogy are made with more representative work underpinning it.

Recognising the human aspects of higher education leads to intriguing questions in the design of learning spaces and curricula. What would a classroom look like if it were designed with care and connection at its core? Can pedagogies of care and kindness be integrated into teacher education programmes taught at universities to counter the toxic efficiency and productivity demanded by the neoliberal system and prioritise community and inclusivity? Can the institutions and structures of higher education be reimagined to support care as a priority?

Our findings clearly corroborate the works of Bali (2015; 2021), hooks (2003) and others on pedagogies of care, showing that the individual alone – whether staff or student – cannot deliver care or wellbeing at scale, for themselves or others. The solution, therefore, must be structural, that is, significant changes in perceptions of how higher education teaching and learning should occur and what is acceptable or required in these spaces for effective learning and teaching. Designing learning spaces with connection at the forefront can create safe and transparent spaces where teachers can share their experiences not only with colleagues and senior management but also with students to facilitate and enhance teacher-student wellbeing and connection. Such safe and transparent spaces could lay the foundation for a two-way bridge essential for developing and practicing the pedagogy of care and kindness, simultaneously instilling humane values in future generations.

## *Acknowledgements*

## *References*

Ake-Little, E., Von der Embse, N. and Dawson, D. (2020) 'Does class size matter in the university setting?', *Educational Researcher*, 49(8), pp.595–605. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20933836

Arvanitakis, J. (2014) 'Massification and the large lecture theatre: from panic to excitement', *Higher Education*, 67(6), pp.735–745. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9676-y

Atkinson, S.P. (2011) 'Embodied and embedded theory in practice: the student-owned learning-engagement (SOLE) model', *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 12(2), pp.1–18. Available at: https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v12i2.929

Bali, M. (2015) 'Pedagogy of care - gone massive', *Hybrid Pedagogy*, 20 April. Available at: https://hybridpedagogy.org/pedagogy-of-care-gone-massive/ (Accessed: 28 June 2024).

Bali, M. (2021) 'Pedagogy of care - caring for teachers', *Reflecting Allowed*, 10 April. Available at: https://blog.mahabali.me/pedagogy/critical-pedagogy/pedagogy-of-care-caring-for-teachers/ (Accessed: 28 June 2024).

Blatchford, P. and Russell, A. (2020) *Rethinking class size: the complex story of impact on teaching and learning*. London: UCL Press.

Brewster, L., Jones, E., Priestley, M., Wilbraham, S.J., Spanner, L. and Hughes, G. (2022) '"Look after the staff and they would look after the students": cultures of wellbeing and mental health in the university setting', *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 46(4), pp.548–560. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2021.1986473

Brookfield, S. (2009) 'The concept of critical reflection: promises and contradictions', *European Journal of Social Work*, 12(3), pp.293–304. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13691450902945215

Cuseo, J. (2007) 'The empirical case against large class size: adverse effects on the teaching, learning, and retention of first-year students', *The Journal of Faculty Development*, 21(1), pp.5–21. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228378064_The_empirical_case_against_

large_class_size_Adverse_effects_on_the_teaching_learning_and_retention_of_first-year_students (Accessed: 13 March 2025).

Denial, C. (2019) 'A pedagogy of kindness', *Hybrid Pedagogy*, 15 August. Available at: https://hybridpedagogy.org/pedagogy-of-kindness/ (Accessed: 28 June 2024).

Donovan, P. and Hood, A. (2021) 'Experiential learning in the large classroom using performative pedagogy', *Journal of Management Education*, 45(3), pp.344–359. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562920965625

Evans, C., Rees, G., Taylor, C. and Fox, S. (2021) 'A liberal higher education for all? The massification of higher education and its implications for graduates' participation in civil society', *Higher Education*, 81(3), pp.521–535. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00554-x

Feldman, A. (1999) 'The role of conversation in collaborative action research', *Educational action research*, 7(1), pp.125-147. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09650799900200076

Gergen, K. (2002) 'The challenge of absent presence', in J.E. Katz and M A. Aakhus (eds.) *Perpetual contact: mobile communication, private talk, public performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 227–241. Available at: https://works.swarthmore.edu/fac-psychology/569

Harrison, D.A. and Klein, K.J. (2007) 'What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety, or disparity in organizations', *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), pp.1199–1228. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.26586096

hooks, b. (2003) *Teaching community: a pedagogy of hope*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Howard, C.D. and Das, A. (2019) 'Designing competitive discussions for equity and inclusion', *International Journal of Designs for Learning*, 10(1), pp.1–13. Available at: https://doi.org/10.14434/ijdl.v10i1.24670

Jarrett, K., Cooke, B., Harvey, S. and López-Ros, V. (2021) 'Using professional conversations as a participatory research method within the discipline of sport pedagogy-related teacher and coach education', *Journal of Participatory Research Methods*, 2(1), pp. 1-9. Available at: https://doi.org/10.35844/001c.18249

Jones, C. (2019) 'Capital, neoliberalism and educational technology', *Postdigital Science and Education*, 1(2), pp.288–292. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-019-00042-1

Kinman, G. (2019) 'Effort-reward imbalance in academic employees: examining different reward systems', *International Journal of Stress Management*, 26(2), pp.184–192. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000128

Korczynski, M. and Ott, U. (2004) 'When production and consumption meet: cultural contradictions and the enchanting myth of customer sovereignty', *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(4), pp.575–599. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2004.00445.x

Laiho, A., Jauhiainen, A. and Jauhiainen, A. (2022) 'Being a teacher in a managerial university: academic teacher identity', *Teaching in Higher Education*, 27(2), pp.249–266. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1716711

Laundon, M. and Grant-Smith, D. (2023) 'Defining and advancing a systems approach to achieving educator wellbeing: an integrative review of wellbeing in higher education', *Student Success*, 14(3), pp.104–119. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5204/ssj.3191

Leonard, S. (2012) 'Professional conversations: mentor teachers' theories-in-use using the Australian National Professional Standards for Teachers', *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(12), pp.45-62. Available at: https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2012v37n12.7

Mahabeer, P. and Pirtheepal, T. (2019) 'Assessment, plagiarism and its effect on academic integrity: experiences of academics at a university in South Africa', *South*

*African Journal of Science*, 115(11–12), pp.1–8. Available at: https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2019/6323

Marginson, S. (2016) 'Martin Trow: higher education and its growth', in S. Marginson *The dream is over: the crisis of Clark Kerr's California idea of higher education*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, pp. 28–35.  Available at: https://www.luminosoa.org/site/books/10.1525/luminos.17/read/?loc=016.xhtml (Accessed: 13 March 2025).

Maringe, F. and Sing, N. (2014) 'Teaching large classes in an increasingly internationalising higher education environment: pedagogical, quality and equity issues', *Higher Education*, 67(6), pp.761–782. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9710-0

Mo, D.Y. Tang,Y.M., Wu, E.Y. and Tang, V. (2022) 'Theoretical model of investigating determinants for a successful Electronic Assessment System (EAS) in higher education', *Education and Information Technologies*, 27(9), pp.12543–12566. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11098-1

Morrish, L. (2019) *Pressure vessels: the epidemic of poor mental health among higher education staff*. Higher Education Policy Institute, Occasional paper 20. Available at: https://www.hepi.ac.uk/2019/05/23/pressure-vessels-the-epidemic-of-poor-mental-health-among-higher-education-staff/ (Accessed: 28 June 2024).

Msiza, V., Ndhlovu, B. and Raseroka, N. (2020) '"Sausage factory, in and out": lecturers' experiences of assessing in an era of massification in a teacher education institution', *Educational Research for Social Change*, 9(spe), pp.40–57. Available at: https://doi.org/10.17159/2221-4070/2020/v7i0a3

Mula-Falcón, J., Caballero, K. and Domingo Segovia, J. (2021) 'Exploring academics' identities in today's universities: a systematic review', *Quality Assurance in Education*, 30(1), pp.118–134. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-09-2021-0152

Nixon, E. and Scullion, R. (2022) 'Academic labour as professional service work? A psychosocial analysis of emotion in lecturer–student relations under marketization', *Human Relations*, 75(9), pp.1798–1823. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/00187267211022270

Noddings, N. (1984) *Caring: a feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (2005) 'Caring in education'*, The encyclopedia of pedagogy and informal education.* Available at: https://infed.org/mobi/caring-in-education/ (Accessed: 4 July 2024).

Quinn, J. and Burtis, M. (2022) 'Introduction', in J. Quinn, M. Burtis, S. Jhangiani and C.J. Denial (eds) *Designing for Care*. Hybrid Pedagogy Inc. Available at: https://pressbooks.pub/designingforcare/front-matter/introduction/ (Accessed: 28 June 2024).

Shams, F. (2019) 'Managing academic identity tensions in a Canadian public university: the role of identity work in coping with managerialism', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 41(6), pp.619–632. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2019.1643960

Trow, M. (1973) *Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education*. Berkeley, California: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Available at: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED091983.pdf (Accessed: 29 June 2024).

Veletsianos, G., Johnson, N. and Houlden, S. (2024) 'How do Canadian faculty members imagine future teaching and learning modalities?', *Educational technology research and development* [Preprint]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-024-10350-4

Wang, Y. (2023) '"It is the easiest thing to do": university students' perspectives on the role of lecture recording in promoting inclusive education in the UK', *Teaching in Higher Education*, 29(8), pp. 1974–1991. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2162814

Wang, L. and Calvano, L. (2022) 'Class size, student behaviors and educational outcomes', *Organization Management Journal*, 19(4), pp.126–142. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/OMJ-01-2021-1139

Watermeyer, R., Phipps, L., Lanclos, D. and Knight, C. (2024) 'Generative AI and the Automating of Academia', *Postdigital Science and Education*, 6(2), pp.446–466. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-023-00440-6

## *Author details*

Emma Kennedy is an Associate Professor in HE Learning and Teaching in the Academic and Learning Enhancement Team at the University of Greenwich. She has worked in Educational Development since 2015. Her research interests include staff engagement and wellbeing, inclusivity and multimodal learning in higher education. She is a co-editor of the SEDA blog and member of SEDA's Educational Developments committee.

Suzan Koseoglu is Senior Lecturer in HE Learning and Teaching in the Academic and Learning Enhancement Team at the University of Greenwich. Her research and writing focuses on feminist pedagogy, critical pedagogy and open education. Her works include 'Critical digital pedagogy in higher education' (published by Athabasca University Press), '30 Years of gender inequality and implications on curriculum design in open and distance learning' (published by JIME) and 'Access as pedagogy: a case for embracing feminist pedagogy in open and distance learning' (published by AJDE).

Shreyashi Chakraborty is Senior Lecturer in Human Resources and Organisational Behaviour in the Department of Management and Marketing at the University of Greenwich's Business School. Her research interests include gender diversity management policies and practices, especially in the Indian software industry. She is actively engaged in consulting with firms on developing training and development modules and devising solutions and initiatives for better workplaces.

Punitha Puttuswamy is Lecturer in Computer Science in the School of Computing and Mathematical Sciences at the University of Greenwich. Her research interests and

technical expertise include computer vision, artificial intelligence and machine learning. She has over two decades of experience in academia and industry.

## *Licence*