

LLAKES Newsletter

Issue 11, Autumn 2016



Professor Alan Felstead,
Research Professor,
Cardiff University

Editorial

Welcome to the Autumn 2016 issue of the LLAKES Newsletter. Since the last Newsletter – in Spring 2016 – something of a political and economic earthquake has occurred with politicians, commentators and academics slowly coming to terms with a future Britain outside the European Union (EU). The terms of exit are still uncertain, but its effects will be felt over the years and decades to come.

One more immediate consequence of the vote to leave the EU in June 2016 was the resignation of David Cameron and the subsequent election of Theresa May as Prime Minister who committed herself to fighting injustice and making 'Britain a country that works for everyone'. It is therefore timely to remind policy-makers about some of the injustices at work as well as highlight some of the ways in which these injustices can be challenged.

An immediate source of such material is *Unequal Britain at Work* (edited by Alan Felstead, Duncan Gallie and Francis Green and published by Oxford University Press in 2015), a LLAKES-supported research output emerging from the Centre's 'Learning, Work and the Economy' Theme. This Newsletter showcases the results of four additional pieces of research carried out under the same theme. These findings are based on a variety of sources, most notably the Skills and Employment Survey 2012 and a two-year follow-up survey, as well as many observations of and interviews

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Editorial	1
Where are the graduate jobs?	3
What makes job quality better or worse?	4
Direct participation and employee well-being	5
Delegation and supervision in clinical practice: invisible learning among newly qualified nurses	6
Staff News	7
LLAKES Events and Publications	8

with health professionals working in the National Health Service (NHS).

Education has long been seen as force for social justice with university education representing the pinnacle of academic achievement. When numbers going to university were much smaller, the government foot most of the bill. Back in the 1960s local authorities were required to give maintenance grants, which were often means-tested, and central government paid for tuition. Gradually, this situation has changed with the introduction of tuition fees, the replacement of maintenance grants with loans and the ushering in of a world where universities can vary their fees (albeit up to a government imposed cap). With increasing, if variable amounts of personal investment, and larger numbers of university-educated students, it is reasonable to ask a number of questions. Do graduates really use the skills they acquire, and to what extent do they, and society more generally, benefit from the investment undertaken?

These questions are addressed by Francis Green and Golo Henseke in the first article in this Newsletter. They use data taken from the Skills and Employment Survey series for 1997, 2001, 2006 and 2012. Drawing on range of skill indicators they derive an index of jobs which require graduate level skills. They find that the proportion of graduates in the labour force has grown at roughly the same rate as the proportion of jobs

requiring graduate level skills. However, graduate earnings have widened over time with high flyers getting much better paid and the earnings of those not in graduate jobs falling. The index derived offers a new departure from definitions of graduate jobs based solely on occupation and provides a useful way of tracking the likely financial value of a degree for graduates who are often saddled with large amounts of debt.

Given her early statements, Mrs May's government might also be interested in LLAKES-sponsored research on how to promote 'good quality' work, including minimising the chances that 'you have a job but you don't always have job security' (Theresa May's first statement as Prime Minister, 13 July 2016). What are the factors which promote better work? This is the question addressed by Alan Felstead and Golo Henseke in the second contribution to this Newsletter. Their analysis is based on studying a panel of employees over two years, first interviewed in 2012 for the Skills and Employment Survey and then again two calendar years later. Since the same workers were asked the same survey questions, it is possible to examine the casual link connecting changes in predicted variables with changes in outcomes. This represents a unique research opportunity.

The results suggest that greater employee involvement in decision-making and greater employee control over the work task makes the job better in other ways too, including raising skill levels and prompting more skills development training. These results support the economic case for getting individual employees more involved in decisions about their jobs and the wider functioning of the organisation. The May government's suggestion of getting more worker representatives on company boards is line with this research finding, although more worker involvement on a day-to-day basis will also be required in order to harness involvement's full effects.

Duncan Gallie and his colleagues go a step further in the third article in this Newsletter. They examine whether employee involvement also has a positive effect on organisational commitment, job satisfaction and enthusiasm levels for the job (summarised as employee well-being). They, too, use the two-year panel survey referred to earlier. Their findings highlight the importance of enhancing opportunities for both kinds of employee participation – that which gives individual employees more organisational influence and that which gives them more day-to-day influence over task completion. The results show that enhancing both types of self-determination increases employee well-being over and above the beneficial impacts it has on objective job quality such as those outlined above.

Withdrawal from the EU poses significant challenges for staffing in the NHS. Recent figures suggest that the number of EU nationals joining NHS hospitals has soared – around one in five nurses recruited in England 2015/16 were non-British EU nationals, up from one in 14 in 2011/12. To make matters worse, the nursing workforce is ageing with one in three nurses due to retire in the next ten years.

Research carried out by Karen Evans in collaboration with the Centre for Research in Nursing and Midwifery Education (CRNME) at the University of Surrey adds the additional challenge of ensuring that patients are not exposed to unacceptable risks in a system which requires that qualified nurses to delegate more bedside care to less qualified staff. The fourth article in this Newsletter Karen's research outlines the rather haphazard way in which newly qualified nursing staff learn to delegate and supervise this aspect of care. She finds that delegation and supervision tends 'to be fairly *ad hoc* and contingent upon ward cultures and staff teams'. This is an alarming finding in a context where issues of patient safety, quality of care, and leadership have been in the public eye more than ever before. Such heightened awareness has been prompted by the publication of the Francis Report and revelations of the failings at the Mid Staffordshire Foundation Trust. This LLAKES research calls for more structured training of delegation and supervisory skills among newly qualified nurses to avoid the difficulties associated with leaving health care assistants 'to their own devices'. With many of the accusations of maltreatment and callousness so publicly aired in the Francis Report, the findings from the LLAKES project should not go unnoticed.

All four articles in this Newsletter report on the outcomes of data collection and analysis carried out on the basis of LLAKES-sponsored research. As a result of this activity, research teams and collaborations have been established which will endure well after ESRC funding of LLAKES comes to an end. This future research activity is likely to attract funding from a variety of sources. In this spirit, I would like to end this Editorial by reporting that funding from the ESRC, the Department for Education and Cardiff University has been secured to run the Skills and Employment Survey in 2017. This will be the seventh in a series of surveys which dates back to 1986 and has involved LLAKES researchers since 1997. LLAKES-sponsored research carried out in the 'Learning, Work and the Economy' theme will, therefore, endure. In this case by providing a lasting legacy of evidence on the injustices at work referred by Theresa May in her first speech to the nation as Prime Minister as well as offering suggestions on

how to fight them. Only time will tell whether the lessons learned will be acted upon by her government and/or those which follow.

Where are the graduate jobs?

Francis Green and Golo Henseke

One of the most striking social and economic changes of the last two decades is the rapid expansion of participation in higher education, resulting in more and more graduates joining the labour market. It is a worldwide phenomenon, and normally welcomed because more graduates are expected to improve economic prosperity of a nation and lower economic inequality. But increasingly observers are asking: where are all the "graduate jobs" to emerge that will fully utilise the skills that higher-educated workers bring to the labour market?

In a new strand of LLAKES research using the Skills and Employment Survey, we have been attempting to answer this question. To do so, we felt that we needed a better indicator of "graduate job" than just the traditional one stemming from being a manager or a professional worker. We defined a "graduate job" to be one which uses the skills acquired in the course of higher education, including many of the activities surrounding it. Using data on job tasks and educational requirements from the surveys in 1997, 2001, 2006 and 2012, we computed an index of graduate skill requirements, and then used a statistical technique called "cluster analysis" to divide all the minor groups of the occupational coding system into two blocks: graduate and non-graduate jobs. This showed that many jobs in the major group "Associate Professionals and Technicians" ought to be regarded as graduate jobs. This definition worked well, being the best available for predicting the destinations of graduates, their wages and their job satisfaction.

The new index shows that, just as the proportion of graduates in the labour force has been growing – from 30% to 42% between 1997-2001 and 2006-2012 – so also the proportion of jobs that are graduate jobs was rising over the same period almost as fast – from 32% to 41%. So far so good, then, for graduates' prospects over this interval. Most of the growth in graduate jobs came about because of the growing numbers employed in existing graduate jobs, though a small part was due to certain jobs becoming more skilled and therefore requiring graduate qualifications. Nevertheless, the earnings advantages for graduates have become increasingly differentiated over this period. For those at the median of graduate earnings, the benefits of higher education

rose a little, and for high-flyers they rose even more. For those in the bottom half of the graduates' pay distribution, however – primarily those who found themselves doing non-graduate jobs – the benefits of higher education fell. It is by no means guaranteed, then, that the expansion of higher education is going to be associated with any lowering of earnings inequality.

It is possible that this differentiation in the benefits of higher education is the first sign of what many have suspected, namely that there will arise a glut of graduates as the "massification of higher education" continues. Our figures are, inevitably, backward-looking and we cannot confidently predict the future. Yet there is a clear imbalance between what we know about supply and demand: while the proportion of graduates in the labour force is sure to go on rising for at least some time, the future demand for high-level skills is decidedly uncertain.

In an age when students are increasingly burdened with extraordinary debts when leaving college, it will be important to monitor the labour market demand for graduates in the coming years. Our graduate jobs index will be a useful way of keeping track, and can be used in conjunction with Labour Force Survey.

The index and the analysis can be found in the paper: Green, F. and G. Henseke (2016 online) 'The Changing Graduate Labour Market: Analysis Using a New Indicator of Graduate Jobs', *IZA Journal of Labor Policy*, 5:14, which can be viewed with Open Access at <http://www.izajolp.com/content/5/1/14> or on the UCL Discovery repository. As our research progressed we have been busy presenting our analyses to outside audiences such as the Department for Work and Pensions Economics Conference, the Skills and Policy Academic Panel of the Department for Business Innovation and Skills, the Education and Employers Conference, and the UKCES/LLAKES Master Class and OECD's 2nd PIAAC Conference in Amsterdam.

We have now begun to extend our analyses to a cross-section of 31 OECD countries, using data from the OECD's Survey of Adult Skills, within which a module of task-based questions were modelled on the British Skills and Employment Survey. Preliminary research with our international graduate jobs index puts England and Northern Ireland more than half way up the ranks, in terms of the prevalence of graduate jobs. We are looking at the hypothesis that the high number of graduate jobs partly reflects Britain's industrial structure (having many financial sector jobs) and partly reflects the relatively low quality of non-graduate

substitute labour. This work is ongoing, in conjunction with research funded through the ESRC Centre for Global and Higher Education.

What makes job quality better or worse?

Alan Felstead and Golo Henseke

Nobody can seriously say (at least publicly) that they are against making the quality of work better – it is a ‘motherhood and apple pie’ aim which no one can disparage. But what constitutes ‘good work’ is contested among commentators. It is argued, for example, that quantifying ‘job quality’ on economic indicators alone can be misleading with good pay only one of a possible range of indicators. Extrinsic features of work such as good pay, promotion opportunities and job security alone are not sufficient to satisfy workers’ needs from employment. Intrinsic job quality facets such as skills use, work intensity, the social environment and the physical setting, matter too.

What makes job quality better or worse is not simply of academic interest either. After all, employers, workers and governments have a stake in improving job quality since it can help to raise worker well-being and lower the social costs of ill-health. The all-encompassing nature of job quality and its importance was encapsulated not only in the Labour Party’s commitment in the 2015 Election Campaign to delivering ‘better work, better pay and better skills’, but also in international strategies such as the European Union’s ‘more and better jobs’ employment strategy and the International Labour Organisation’s ‘Decent Work’ campaign.

However, despite high level policy interest, robust evidence of what makes job better or worse is relatively scarce. This is because previous evidence has focused attention on the correlates of particular features of job quality such as skills use, training, discretion and work intensity. Such analyses are based on comparing snap shot surveys and on how particular features of work have changed over time. But by failing to follow the same person through time, they do not examine how that person’s job quality changes and which features remain constant – this is known as ‘unobserved heterogeneity’ and can confound correlates based on snap shot surveys. Unobserved heterogeneity summarises the influence of a rich list of unobserved factors such as upbringing, past work history, aspirations, personality, risk aversion and/or health that simultaneously affect an individual’s position in the job quality spectrum, how they report their personal circumstances and outcomes such as well-being.

To address this information gap, LLAKES sponsored a follow-up survey of the Skills and Employment Survey 2012 (www.cardiff.ac.uk/socsi/ses2012). A total of 1,108 of the 2,497 2012 respondents, who were willing to be re-contacted, were re-interviewed using around half of the questions they were asked in 2012. Around 95% of respondents were re-interviewed within 2 months of the second anniversary of their 2012 interview.

This unique follow-up survey of the *same workers* interviewed two years later using many of the *same questions* has allowed us to address the question of what makes some features of job quality better or worse. This makes the research distinctive in that it examines the causal sequence linking changes in independent variables to changes in outcomes. We have three main findings.

First, while most of employees in the panel experienced little change in the skills they used at work or in the pressure under which they laboured, sizeable minorities experienced a worsening or an improvement in these conditions. In fact, if anything, there was a tendency for skills to improve and work pressure to rise over the two-year period. Were the time period between interviews longer, these changes may have been even more dramatic. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that many employees experience changes in the intrinsic quality of their jobs even over a relatively short period.

Second, the findings point to a number of causal explanations which have been highlighted by the literature. The introduction of High Involvement Management (HIM), for example, raises and develops the skill levels exercised by employees, but not at the cost of enforced work intensification. Instead, HIM increases employees’ willingness to go the extra mile, while also dampening levels of work exhaustion. The implication here is that employers who tap into workers’ creativity are rewarded with greater effort, elicited not by force but by consent. Moreover, HIM also lessens over-exertion which can lead to ill-health and costs for both workers and employers. However, the impact of increased use of teamworking and computerisation for intrinsic job quality is less clear-cut. While both prompt an upward movement in the abilities needed at work, this comes at the cost of increased enforced work effort. In the case of computerisation, there is evidence that both levels of discretionary effort and work exhaustion are also raised. This suggests that the effect of teamworking and computerisation on skills use and work pressure is two-faced. One interpretation is that to operate in a team and work with more

sophisticated equipment requires workers with higher abilities, but both also serve to enhance levels of surveillance by employers and/or fellow workers.

Third, despite justifiable concerns that unobserved heterogeneity may confound the associations found in traditional cross-sectional analyses, estimates using both techniques produce broadly similar results. This provides some reassurance that existing cross-sectional analyses may not be as suspect as feared. However, replication of this study will be needed to provide further confirmation, but in the meantime we have provided more robust evidence on what policy makers need to do in order to have the impact they desire.

For the full results, see Felstead, A, Gallie, D, Green, F and Henseke, G (2016) 'The determinants of skills use and work pressure: a longitudinal analysis', *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, online, print version forthcoming, <http://eid.sagepub.com/content/early/2016/07/01/0143831X16656412>

Direct participation and employee well-being

Duncan Gallie, Ying Zhou, Alan Felstead, Francis Green and Golo Henseke

In its broad sense direct participation refers to the capacity of employees to personally influence decision-making at work whether at the level of the work task or the wider organization. The importance of participation for worker well-being has been highlighted both by researchers concerned with the quality of work (Boxall and Macky, 2014; Gallie, 2013) and with those interested in performance and productivity (Lawler et al. 1995; Appelbaum et al. 2000).

Research on the quality of work initially focused on the importance of greater participation in decisions about work tasks for job satisfaction and employee motivation (Hackman and Lawler, 1971). From the 1980s, such arguments were extended by psychologists to the importance of task control for psychological health and, in particular, for reducing the negative psychological effects of high levels of work pressure (Karasek and Theorell, 1990; Theorell, 2007). Although advocates of direct participation have emphasized its benefits for employees' well-being, there has also been a significant critical literature of the assumptions underlying theories of participation. This has pointed to the potential for management to use participatory mechanisms to heighten its control of

employees, by undermining traditional forms of union representation and inculcating a vision of the employment relationship favourable to management objectives (Ramsay et al. 2000; Barker, 1993).

Despite substantial empirical research, the existing evidence for the effects of participation on employee well-being remains controversial. In particular, there have been conflicting results on the issue of whether it could have negative effects on well-being as a result of work intensification. One possibility is that the diversity of results reflects methodological limitations of cross-sectional research. For the greater part, existing studies have been vulnerable to the objection that they fail to adequately take account of *prior* differences in the values, motivational dispositions and personality characteristics of employees which could influence both their propensity to participate in workplace decision-making and subjective well-being. Relatively few studies have used longitudinal data that is representative of the wider workforce, thereby allowing more rigorous testing of causal assumptions.

A second issue with extant research is that there are relatively few empirical studies of the *relative* importance of the potentially diverse mechanisms that could help account for the effects of participation. In principle, we distinguish between two broad types of mechanism. The first relates to the intrinsic effects of participation, whereby involvement in decision-making leads directly to more positive work attitudes. In the second, the beneficial implications of participation derive from the fact that it influences other features of the work context which in turn affect employee attitudes.

In assessing these issues, we draw on nationally representative longitudinal data of employees in the UK, which are part of the British Skills and Employment Survey (SES) series. The initial sample, interviewed in 2012, consisted of 3,200 people aged 20 to 65 in paid employment, with a response rate of 49%. In 2014 a random subsample of 1,108 of the original respondents were reinterviewed, with a response rate of 71%. Our fixed effect analysis of the longitudinal data leads to four main conclusions. First, in so far as there are significant overall effects of participation, they are positive rather than negative for employee well-being. This is the case both for individual task discretion and for wider organizational participation. Second, we find that the positive relationship between direct participation and employee well-being is not artefactual in the sense that unobserved dispositions that encourage individuals to participate also lead to higher levels of well-being. Controlling for time-invariant individual traits

does not eliminate the positive effect of participation on well-being. Third, the effects of direct participation reflected its intrinsic desirability as well as its implications for other aspects of the work environment in terms of training provision, intrinsic job quality and job security. Finally, task discretion and organisational participation were differentially important for particular types of well-being. Task discretion had its principal benefits for job satisfaction and affective psychological well-being, while organizational participation was important for organizational commitment and job satisfaction. They are not substitutable but rather complementary forms of direct participation.

Our findings point to the need for a broad strategy in enhancing opportunities for direct participation, increasing opportunities for employee influence at different organizational levels. Direct participation, in this broader form, is likely to be a particularly important aspect of any policy initiative to improve the quality of work, since it is not only intrinsically important to people, helping to meet their needs for self-determination, but also contributes to a wider improvement in the work environment.

References

- Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P. and Kalleberg, A. L. (2000). *Manufacturing Advantage. Why High Performance Work Systems Pay Off*. Ithaca, New York, Cornell University.
- Barker, J. R. (1993). 'Tightening the iron cage - concertive control in self-managing teams.' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38: 3, 408-437.
- Boxall, P. and Macky, K. (2014). 'High-involvement work processes, work intensification and employee well-being.' *Work, Employment & Society*, 28: 6, 963-984.
- Gallie, D. 2013 Direct participation and the quality of work. *Human Relations*, 66 (4): 453-73.
- Hackman, J. R. and Lawler III, E. E. (1971). 'Employee reactions to job characteristics.' *Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph* 55: 3, 259-286.
- Karasek, R. and Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy Work. Stress, Productivity and the Reconstruction of Work Life*, New York, Basic Books.
- Lawler, E., Mohrman, S. A. and Ledford, G. E. (1995). *Creating High Performance Organizations*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass
- Ramsay, H., Scholarios, D. and Harley, B. (2000). 'Employees and high performance work systems: Testing inside the black box.' *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 38: 4, 501-531.
- Theorell, T. (2007). 'Psychosocial factors in research on work conditions and health in Sweden.' *Scand J Work Environ Health*, 33: Supp 1, 20-26.

Delegation and supervision in clinical practice: invisible learning among newly qualified nurses

Karen Evans

There are growing pressures on nurses to delegate and supervise bedside care provided by healthcare workers (HCWs). The Francis Report highlighted that healthcare support workers, although supposed to be supervised by registered nurses, are often 'left to their own devices', potentially exposing patients to unacceptable risks. Delegation has been proven to be particularly challenging for newly qualified nurses, leading to performance problems associated with time management, inadequate workload distribution, and insufficient supervision of delegated tasks, with associated implications for clinical productivity. Despite the increasing relevance of delegation and supervision skills among nurses, newly qualified nurses (NQNs) often feel they can be left to 'sink or swim' as they make the transition from student to fully operational qualified nurse. That transition itself is not yet well understood and yet it is a vital stage in the qualified nurse's journey. A central element of it involves being able to delegate and supervise bedside care.

As part of a long-standing collaboration with the Centre for Research in Nursing and Midwifery Education (CRNME) the University of Surrey, I have been privileged to work with specialists in Nurse Education to explore how different forms of knowledge are put to work in attempts to get to grips with these challenges. The project, Academic Awards and Recontextualising Knowledge (Aark) has built on a proposition put forward in a LLAKES paper <http://eprints.ioe.ac.uk/6886/1/Evans2010Putting245.pdf> which has moved beyond stagnating debates about the so-called theory-practice divide to inject some new thinking into the challenges of practice-based learning in nursing.

The Aark project has involved:

- a) An investigation into newly qualified nurses' ability to re-contextualise knowledge to allow them to deliver, organise and supervise care;
- b) A pilot evaluation of a newly developed tool aimed at supporting newly qualified nurses in the organisation, delegation and supervision of bedside care.

The first phase of the study involved: observations of newly qualified nurses (NQNs); and interviews with NQNs, health care assistants (HCAs) and ward managers. Interviews were semi-structured and sought to understand NQNs transition from student to fully operational qualified nurse, with particular emphasis on delegation to, and supervision of, HCAs.

From the first phase of our study, we identified that newly qualified nurses need support during the transition from student to fully operational qualified nurse in the following areas: developing confidence; understanding role boundaries; accessing knowledge; developing communication skills; setting care priorities; achieving successful care outcomes.

This informed the second phase of our study, which involved the piloting of a tool designed to guide, assist and support nurse development in these areas. In the pilot study the nurses who made good use of the tool demonstrated learning by reflection and how that learning process in turn informed recontextualisation of knowledge.

Our summary research report (Magnusson *et al*) has highlighted the significance of the changing roles and worlds of nursing for recontextualisation in general and, more specifically, the development of capabilities relating to the prioritisation, delegation and supervision of care by nurses. The need for increased focus on learning and support was underlined by findings on the significance of invisible learning. How NQNs delegate to HCAs, and how they learn to supervise HCAs in carrying out those delegated tasks, also tend to be fairly *ad hoc* and contingent upon ward cultures and staff teams. This finding implies a need for more structured educational and training support in the development of the necessary capabilities.

Our research has produced a series of articles showing the different ways in which NQNs recontextualise many forms of knowledge in the workplace to emerge as competent and safe nurses. In a key paper - <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2014.10.018> - we have suggested that this process occurs in a liminal space with three phases, pre-liminal (separation), liminal (transition) and post liminal (reincorporation). There are support functions within the NHS to both recognise and support this liminal journey, most notably the preceptorship course but informally in support shown by clinical colleagues towards the NQNs. Our newly published paper, 'Delegation and supervision of healthcare assistants' work in the daily management of uncertain and the unexpected in clinical practice' <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/nin.12155/abstract> shows how knowledge recontextualisation processes inherent in 'invisible learning' have a range of practice implications. Adaptive and

productive forms of knowledge recontextualisation co-exist. Adaptive forms are not always beneficial, as they sometimes produce defensive practice. Productive forms are strengthened by access to, and support from, expert and intellectual resources that enable the NQN to 'stand back' from challenging situations and think about them in new ways. Learning through mistakes in delegation and supervision raises questions about the distinction between mistakes that can potentially be harmful to patients and staff, and mistakes that are perhaps less risky. It might be possible to have controls in place which assess the level of risk involved in decision-making such as 'flagging' areas of HCA bedside care which require greater or lesser monitoring by the NQN. The use of simulated situations as part of nurse training and post-qualifying transition might offer the opportunity to make 'safe mistakes' in the context of delegation and supervision of HCAs which can be useful for learning purposes.

In discussing the invisible ways newly qualified nurses learn in the practice environment we present the invisible steps to learning which encompass the embodied, affective and social, as much as the cognitive components to learning. These theoretical insights contribute to a greater understanding of the "invisible learning" which occurs as newly qualified nurses learn to delegate and supervise.

The Summary Report of the Aark project can be found at Magnusson <http://docplayer.net/366776-An-investigation-into-newly-qualified-nurses-ability-to-recontextualise-knowledge-to-allow-them-to-delegate-and-supervise-care-aark.html> [last accessed 21.9.2016]

Staff News

Lorna Unwin, Professor Emerita (Vocational Education) at University College London, and Honorary Professor at LLAKES, was a guest presenter at a symposium to mark the launch of the new City of Glasgow College. She was joined by Conor Ryan, Director of Research and Communications at the Sutton Trust, and Ng Cher Pong, Chief Executive of SkillsFuture Singapore and Deputy Secretary in the Singapore Ministry of Education. A summary of the discussions held is available at <https://www.cityofglasgowcollege.ac.uk/news-events/news/reflections-symposium>

LLAKES Events

Tuesday 17 January 2017

John Denham

*Employer Support for Higher Level Skills:
why does public policy fail?*

4.15 pm - 5.45 pm

Thursday 26 January 2017

Pauline Leonard

*Filling the empty box: youth volunteering
as an entry route in paid work*

2.00 - 3.30 pm

Tuesday 14 February 2017

Tom Schuller

*Outcomes and implications of GRALE 3: the third
global report on adult learning and education*

4.15 pm - 5.45 pm

Tuesday 28 February 2017

Tom Wilson

Unions and Skills

4.15 pm - 5.45 pm

Tuesday 14 March 2017

Lucinda Platt

*Child care and early child outcomes:
a cross-cohort analysis*

4.15 pm - 5.45 pm

Tuesday 28 March 2017

Peter Mayo

*Hegemony and Education under
Neoliberalism: insights from Gramsci*

4.15 pm - 5.45 pm

Tuesday 11 April 2017

Alison Fuller and Anne-Charlotte Teglborg

*What is the relationship between work, learning and
innovation? Evidence from an emergent community of
practice in homeless healthcare*

4.15 pm - 5.45 pm

All events are free to attend and are held at UCL
Institute of Education, 20 Bedford Way, London
WC1H 0AL. For further information and to book
places, please contact richard.arnold@ucl.ac.uk.

LLAKES Publications

Cheng, H., Treglown L, Green, A., Chapman B.,
Íšornilaki, E. and Furnham, A. (2016) "Childhood
onset of migraine, gender, parental social class, and
trait neuroticism as predictors of the prevalence of
migraine in adulthood", *Journal of Psychosomatic
Research*

Evans, K. (2016) "Reflections on Ulrich Beck's legacy
in the field of youth transitions and employment",
Work, Employment & Society

Gallie, D., Green, F. and Henseke, G. (2016) "The
determinants of skills use and work pressure: A
longitudinal analysis", *Economic and Industrial
Democracy*

Green, F and Henseke, G. (2016) "The changing
graduate labour market: analysis using a new
indicator of graduate jobs", *IZA Journal of Labor
Policy*

Guile, D. and Lahiff, A. (2016) "Apprenticeship for
'Liquid Life': Learning in Contingent Work Conditions
for Contingent Employment", *Vocations and Learning*

Lahiff, A. and Guile, D. (2016) "'It's not like a normal 9
to 5!': the learning journeys of media production
apprentices in distributed working conditions", *Journal
of Vocational Education & Training*

Contact LLAKES

www.llakes.ac.uk

+44 207 911 5464

ioe.llakescentre@ucl.ac.uk

[@llakescentre](https://twitter.com/llakescentre)