

In the Seminar Space: Navigating Graduate Teaching in Undergraduate Legal Education

Hadijah Namyalo-Ganafa

PhD Candidate - Global Sustainable Development, University of Warwick

Hadijah.Namyalo-Ganafa@warwick.ac.uk

Hadijah Namyalo-Ganafa is a Ugandan lawyer and academic, currently pursuing a Global Sustainable Development PhD at the University of Warwick. Hadijah holds a Master of Laws from Cornell University, a post graduate Diploma in Legal Practice from Law Development Centre and a Bachelor of Laws from Makerere University. Hadijah holds a Digital Arts and Humanities Certificate and Associate Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy (AFHEA). She undertook a practicum at Afya na Haki in Uganda as a Global Health and Human Rights Fellow, and the fellowship is a collaboration between the University of Warwick and the University of Toronto.

Hadijah's work reflects a profound commitment to global health, gender, human rights, and access to justice. Prior to joining Warwick, Hadijah taught law at Makerere University School of Law in Kampala, Uganda, contributing to legal education and mentoring future professionals.



Abstract

This reflective paper examines my evolving pedagogical identity as a Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) within a Global North law department, focusing on the facilitation of undergraduate seminars. Grounded in Warwick Law School's "Law in Context" philosophy, I reflect on a seminar where students critically engaged with the applicability of CEDAW in Global South contexts. This experience demonstrated how legal instruction can move beyond doctrinal delivery to become a dialogic practice shaped by lived experience, social histories, and interdisciplinary critique. Through scaffolded teaching, peer-led activities, and participatory methods, I aim to decentralise authority and foster cumulative learning across diverse student cohorts.

Navigating the dual role of postgraduate student and educator involves constant negotiation between institutional expectations and my commitment to feminist-informed pedagogy. I reflect on the emotional labour required to sustain inclusive engagement, respond to student needs, and maintain care and professionalism—labour that is often invisible, unevenly distributed, and unrecognised within formal teaching structures. Drawing on engaged pedagogy and personal experience, I argue that transformative legal education depends not only on intellectual rigour but also on emotional awareness, epistemic humility, and institutional recognition of the relational work performed by early-career educators. By foregrounding the complexities of care, credibility, and co-construction, this paper affirms the pedagogical agency of postgraduate teachers and calls for more socially responsive approaches to legal education.

Keywords: Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA), Seminars, Law in Context, Lived Experience, Emotional labour.

Introduction

This reflective paper explores my evolving pedagogical identity as a Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) within a Global North law department, specifically through the lens of undergraduate legal education. Drawing on my experience facilitating weekly undergraduate seminars, this paper reflects on how my teaching practice is informed by Warwick Law School's "Law in Context" philosophy as a relational and critically engaged pedagogy. To structure this inquiry, I apply Brookfield's (1995) Four Lenses of Critical Reflection, and the central guiding question is: How can early-career legal educators reconfigure authority, care, and credibility through feminist-informed pedagogy within institutional structures that often marginalise relational and emotional labour?

Navigating my dual identity as a postgraduate student and GTA requires constant negotiation between institutional structures that often prioritise standardisation and efficiency, and my commitment to inclusive, reflexive, and co-constructive pedagogy. My commitment stems from the belief that authority in seminars is not fixed but dynamic and relational. Rather than reinforcing a binary between teacher and student, I approach authority as co-constructed, emerging through student voices, peer-led presentations, and scaffolded learning. This reframing retains the educator's role in guiding inquiry while decentralising expertise and inviting students to shape the intellectual space. It reflects a feminist pedagogical commitment to shared credibility, and the collective construction of knowledge (Pugliese, 2023).

This paper reflects on how four interlocking dynamics inform my evolving practice. First, scaffolded teaching and participatory methods decentralise authority and support cumulative learning. Second, designing for emotional safety and epistemic humility acknowledges that cultural, linguistic, and disciplinary barriers shape engagement. Third, teaching demands invisible yet consequential emotional labour. Finally, occupying a liminal postgraduate educator identity brings both precarity and possibility, as I negotiate professionalism, care, and ongoing scholarly development within a system that seldom recognises relational work. Through these reflections, I argue that transformative legal education that fosters critical consciousness, contextual sensitivity, and inclusive participation (Duggan, M., & Bishop, C., 2023)—depends on scaffolded engagement, affective awareness, and the formal recognition of emotional and digital labour. These elements are essential for creating learning environments where diverse students can meaningfully engage with law as a socially embedded practice, even as early-career educators navigate institutional constraints and evolving professional identities.

Facilitating Seminars: Relational Pedagogy in Practice

Dressner (2025) describes relational work as the ongoing, often invisible labour involved in cultivating and sustaining meaningful relationships within the teaching and learning environment. Facilitating weekly seminars has become a central site for enacting my pedagogical commitments and navigating the tensions between institutional expectations and relational teaching. These seminars are not merely spaces for delivering content but dialogic environments where students are

invited to interrogate legal concepts through experiential, and socially grounded lenses. My role as a facilitator is shaped by the “Law in Context” philosophy, which positions law as a socially embedded practice rather than a neutral or purely technical system (Nelken, 2009). The “Law in Context” approach challenges students to critically assess not only what the law is, but what it does, whom it serves, and what it ought to become (Twining, 1997). It invites students to move beyond abstract doctrinal analysis by examining how law operates in practice shaped by lived experience, social histories, and interdisciplinary perspectives.

This can be illustrated by a seminar on CEDAW’s applicability in Global South contexts, where students examined how local socio-legal realities shape the implementation of global norms. One questioned whether CEDAW’s focus on formal equality addresses structural inequalities rooted in colonial legacies and customary law, another raised tensions between universal rights language and culturally specific gender norms. Anchored in the “Law in Context” philosophy, the discussion moved beyond doctrine to interrogate the values and power dynamics embedded in international legal frameworks. Students debated whether CEDAW enables transformative justice or reinforces top-down, exclusionary reform. This episode illustrates how contextualised legal education fosters critical engagement with law’s institutional purpose and its potential to address real-world inequities.

Each seminar fosters critical engagement, not only with legal texts but also with the historical, cultural, and political forces that shape how law is experienced and contested. For example, in exploring reproductive justice and social reproduction, students examine how legal frameworks intersect with care work, bodily autonomy, and racialised and gendered access to reproductive healthcare. Drawing on the framework of reproductive justice, which encompasses the right to have children, not have children, and to parent in safe and supportive environments (BlackDeer, 2025; Bhattacharya, 2016), students are invited to consider how law mediates power relations across class, race, and gender, and how it both reflects and reinforces broader social inequities. These discussions often reveal tensions between doctrinal clarity and socio-legal critique, demanding facilitation that balances analytical rigour and lived experience.

Students bring a wide range of experiences, epistemologies, and expectations to the classroom, shaped by intersecting factors such as race, gender, nationality, and prior educational exposure. To support this diversity, I employ scaffolded teaching strategies by initially providing structured support to guide students’ understanding, then gradually reducing this support as they develop confidence and autonomy in applying concepts independently (Belland, 2013). The two-semester structure of the module presents challenges for students in retaining and integrating earlier concepts over time. To address this, I embed regular thematic recaps and reflective prompts to reinforce key ideas, strengthen conceptual continuity, and support cumulative learning.

As students advance through the module, my role shifts toward facilitating deeper engagement with complex material and guiding them in connecting theoretical insights to legal practice. To support this progression, I employ participatory methods such as small-group discussions, peer-led presentations, and collaborative analysis as strategies that decentralise authority and promote shared ownership of knowledge. Small-group discussions allow students to process ideas collectively before contributing to the wider class, amplifying quieter voices and

building confidence over time, especially among those navigating unfamiliar theoretical terrain or classroom dynamics (Brookfield & Preskill, 2005). Peer-led activities further position students as active contributors to the learning process, fostering a sense of agency and intellectual investment. I strategically incorporate digital tools like Padlet to foster collaborative brainstorming and enhance student interaction.

These approaches reflect feminist pedagogical commitments to inclusivity, reflexivity, and co-construction of meaning (Abrams, 2021; Menkel-Meadow, 1988), and align with broader educational research on scaffolding as a strategy for cultivating learner autonomy and critical thinking (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). They also resonate with evidence that peer-to-peer learning enhances retention and analytical depth (Freeman et al., 2014).

Fostering meaningful engagement within a pluralistic classroom requires more than thoughtful structural design—it calls for a pedagogy that is critically responsive to difference and attuned to the affective dimensions of learning. As Ahmed (2012) reminds us, classrooms are never neutral spaces; they are shaped by histories of inclusion and exclusion, and by the emotional labour required to inhabit them. Student engagement is mediated by a complex interplay of cultural, emotional, and epistemic factors that influence how learners relate to legal content and to one another. Hesitation to participate often stems not from disinterest, but from navigating unfamiliar disciplinary terrain, linguistic challenges, or the emotional weight of sensitive topics. Recognising these dynamics is essential to cultivating inclusive spaces where students feel both intellectually and emotionally safe to contribute.

To support students in these complex learning environments, I cultivate a classroom ethos grounded in emotional safety, epistemic humility, and dialogic exchange. This involves designing activities that invite students to connect legal theory to lived experience, while also recognising the emotional risks that such engagement can entail. As Pekrun and Linnenbrink-Garcia (2012) argue, academic emotions ranging from anxiety and frustration to pride and curiosity play a central role in shaping students' motivation, cognitive engagement, and capacity for critical thought. Creating space for these emotions to be recognised and processed is essential for inclusive and transformative learning.

However, responding to students' emotional and epistemic needs within these relationally attuned environments requires sustained emotional labour from educators. This labour is often invisible, unevenly distributed, and rarely recognised within institutional frameworks. The following section explores these complexities in depth, examining how emotional labour and engaged teaching shape my practice as a postgraduate educator in legal education and how relational design functions as both a pedagogical strategy and a form of resistance to depersonalised models of legal instruction.

Emotional Labour and Engaged Teaching in Legal Education

Teaching law entails a form of emotional labour that is often invisible yet deeply consequential. Legal education has traditionally privileged rationality, detachment, and doctrinal precision, leaving limited space for the affective dimensions of teaching and learning. Yet as Heath et al. (2018) argue, the emotional demands placed on educators, particularly those in precarious roles such as postgraduate teachers' roles are substantial and frequently unacknowledged. From a feminist ethics of care perspective, this emotional labour is not ancillary but integral to engaged pedagogy. It involves attunement to students' emotional and epistemic needs, the cultivation of trust, and the capacity to hold space for discomfort, vulnerability, and growth (Chadha-Sridhar, 2024). Recognising emotional labour as a professional skill reframes care not as a personal disposition but as a deliberate, relational practice that sustains inclusive and transformative legal education.

As a GTA, I experience this emotional labour acutely. I am expected to perform care, maintain composure, and embody institutional professionalism, even while navigating my own uncertainties and evolving pedagogical identity. The dual role of being both a learner and an educator intensifies this labour, as I must balance the expectations of faculty with the needs of students, often without formal recognition or support. This is particularly pronounced in seminars that explore themes that evoke discomfort, vulnerability, and resistance.

To meet these challenges, I draw on bell hooks' (1994) concept of engaged pedagogy, which frames teaching as a practice rooted in mutual care, self-actualisation, and the integration of personal and political experience. hooks rejects the notion of the teacher as a distant authority, instead positioning the educator as a co-learner and someone who embraces uncertainty, models reflexivity, and cultivates spaces of critical inquiry. In my seminars, this means acknowledging my own positionality and inviting students to do the same.

Engaged teaching often requires navigating institutional constraints that limit educators' ability to respond emotionally to student needs. Rigid assessment frameworks, performance metrics, and prescriptive curricula can restrict the flexibility needed to foster inclusive and responsive learning environments. These pressures are especially acute for postgraduate and early-career educators, who must balance pedagogical care with expectations of professionalism, often without formal recognition or support. As Jones (2021) argues, emotional labour in legal education is shaped by power and identity; minoritised educators are frequently expected to perform inclusion, resilience, and emotional support in ways that exceed their formal roles. For postgraduate teachers, this creates a persistent negotiation between care and credibility, where efforts to build connection and foster student agency may be misinterpreted as a lack of academic rigour. These tensions underscore the need to reframe emotional labour not as ancillary, but as central to transformative legal pedagogy.

Despite these challenges, I view emotional labour and engaged pedagogy not as burdens, but as essential components of transformative legal education. They allow for the cultivation of critical consciousness, ethical awareness, and a sense of collective responsibility which are vital qualities for students entering a legal profession increasingly shaped by social complexity and moral ambiguity. By embracing the emotional dimensions of teaching, I aim to create learning environments that are not only intellectually rigorous but also humanising and just. For this work to be sustainable, institutions must recognise emotional labour as a

professional skill. It should be reflected in workload models, supported through training in relational pedagogy, and redistributed through collaborative teaching practices that prevent its concentration on postgraduate teachers. In the next section, I reflect on how my identity as a postgraduate teacher informs and complicates my pedagogical approach, and how occupying this in-between space offers both challenges and possibilities for reimagining legal education.

Postgraduate Educator Identity in Legal Education

Navigating the dual role of postgraduate student and educator presents a unique set of pedagogical and institutional complexities. Positioned between learner and teacher, I occupy a space that is both transitional and relational and this position requires ongoing negotiation of authority, credibility, and care. This liminality offers opportunities for reflexive practice and pedagogical innovation, but it also exposes the structural precarity and emotional demands that often accompany early-career teaching in higher education.

Scholarship on teacher identity highlights that professional development is not a linear process but a dynamic interplay between personal biography, institutional culture, and disciplinary norms (Orfali et al., 2024). For postgraduate educators, this process is shaped by limited autonomy, unclear expectations, and the need to balance teaching responsibilities with research and academic progression. As van Lankveld et al. (2017) observe, early-career teachers frequently experience tensions between their emerging pedagogical values and the constraints imposed by curriculum structures, assessment regimes, and hierarchical academic environments. In legal education, these tensions are particularly pronounced. The discipline's emphasis on doctrinal rigour and performative authority can conflict with more inclusive, dialogic, and emotionally responsive teaching approaches. As a GTA, I often find myself negotiating between institutional expectations of professionalism and my commitment to feminist-informed pedagogy. This includes modelling reflexivity, acknowledging my own positionality, and creating space for students to engage with law through their lived experiences. While these practices enrich the learning environment, they also require emotional labour and pedagogical vulnerability, and these qualities are not always recognised within formal teaching evaluations or workload models.

The emotional dimensions of postgraduate teaching are further intensified by the partial invisibility of pedagogical labour, particularly its affective, relational, and preparatory aspects (Leutwiler, Amorim-Ribeiro, and Grangeiro, 2024). While outward-facing tasks such as lecturing, leading seminars, and holding office hours are visible and institutionally recognised, the behind-the-scenes labour of managing classroom dynamics, responding to student distress, and sustaining engagement with complex socio-legal topics often remains unacknowledged. As an international student, I am acutely attuned to difference, and in facilitating seminars, I carry the responsibility of ensuring that diverse cohorts engage meaningfully with the concepts under discussion. This is no small task; efforts to foster inclusive and responsive learning environments can sometimes be misinterpreted as a lack of authority or academic rigour, leading to feelings of self-doubt. In my experience, cultivating peer support networks and engaging in reflective dialogue with colleagues has been vital.

This helps me to navigate these challenges and affirm the legitimacy and value of my pedagogical approach.

Despite its constraints, I view my postgraduate teaching identity as a site of possibility. It allows me to experiment with interdisciplinary methods, scaffolded learning strategies, and relational ethics that challenge traditional hierarchies in legal education. Anchored in the “Law in Context” approach, my practice foregrounds law as a socially embedded and contested institution, inviting students to engage with legal questions through historical, political, and cultural lenses. This interdisciplinarity not only enriches classroom dialogue but also shapes my own identity as an educator—one attuned to complexity, reflexivity, and the transformative potential of legal pedagogy. Drawing on Thomas Dotta and Lopes (2023), I understand identity formation as a process of becoming shaped not only by institutional structures but also by everyday interactions, feedback, and moments of connection with students. In this way, the “Law in Context” philosophy is not just a pedagogical framework but a formative influence on how I navigate and inhabit my role as a postgraduate teacher.

Conclusion

This paper has explored the layered complexities of postgraduate teaching in legal education, foregrounding the emotional, relational, and intellectual labour that underpins inclusive and transformative pedagogy. Through the lens of seminar facilitation, I have reflected on how scaffolded learning, feminist-informed practices, and the “Law in Context” philosophy enable students to engage critically with legal frameworks as socially embedded and contested systems. These pedagogical commitments resist dominant models of doctrinal delivery and instead cultivate dialogic spaces where authority is shared, difference is acknowledged, and lived experience is valued.

Yet enacting such pedagogy as a GTA involves navigating institutional constraints, professional expectations, and the affective demands of teaching. The emotional labour required to sustain inclusive engagement, respond to student needs, and maintain pedagogical care is substantial and frequently invisible, particularly for minoritised and early-career educators. As I have shown, this labour is not ancillary but central to the work of teaching law in ways that are humanising, ethically attuned, and socially responsive.

Occupying a liminal space between student and educator offers both challenges and possibilities. It enables reflexive practice, interdisciplinary experimentation, and relational ethics that challenge traditional hierarchies in legal education. At the same time, it exposes the precarity and emotional intensity of early-career teaching.

Building on these tensions, I argue for a reimagining of legal education and the operationalisation of institutional recognition in tangible ways. Central to this is the provision of structured time for debriefing after emotionally demanding sessions, acknowledging the affective toll of inclusive pedagogy.

Such recognition must also extend to training in relational pedagogy and dialogic teaching, equipping educators to sustain inclusive practices with confidence and care. In parallel, evaluation systems should be bias-aware, moving beyond reliance on end-of-term student surveys to incorporate multiple measures of teaching quality.

Crucially, emotional labour should be formally acknowledged within academic workload models, ensuring it is not dismissed as “extra” or invisible. Embedding such practices into institutional frameworks allows legal education to move toward genuine pedagogical justice—one that recognises the emotional dimensions of teaching and places relational pedagogy at its core. Within this framework, postgraduate educators are valued not merely as seminar facilitators but as co-creators of a more humanising, ethically grounded, and socially responsive future for the discipline.

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to the School of Law at the University of Warwick for the opportunity to serve as a senior Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA), a role that has been instrumental in shaping my pedagogical development. I extend sincere thanks to the many module leaders whose mentorship, guidance, and encouragement have supported me throughout this journey.

I also wish to acknowledge the APP PGR Programme Team for their invaluable teaching support through the Academic and Professional Pathway for Postgraduate Researchers who Teach. Their resources and sustained commitment to postgraduate development have significantly enriched my reflective practice and deepened my dedication to inclusive, relational pedagogy.

I am especially thankful to my PhD supervisors for their unwavering support, intellectual generosity, and thoughtful guidance. Their mentorship has not only shaped my research but also informed my teaching philosophy and approach to legal education.

Ethical Claim

This reflective paper is based on personal teaching experience and does not involve human participants or empirical data collection. Institutional approval for teaching-related activities was granted through my appointment as a Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) within the School of Law at the University of Warwick. I also participated in the APP PGR programme facilitated by the Academic Development Centre, which supports postgraduate researchers who teach. No conflicts of interest are declared, and all reflections are presented in accordance with ethical standards for professional and pedagogical practice.

References

- Abrams, J. R., (2021), Feminist pedagogy in legal education, in D. Brake, M. Chamallas, & V. Williams (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Feminism and Law in the United States*, Oxford University Press.
- Ahmed, S., (2012), *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*, Duke University Press, <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822395324>
- Belland, B. R., (2013), Scaffolding: Definition, Current Debates, and Future Directions, in J. M. Spector et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology* (pp. 505–518), Springer, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3185-5_39
- Bhattacharya, T., (2016), Introduction: Mapping social reproduction theory, in T. Bhattacharya (Ed.), *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression* (pp. 1–20), Pluto Press.
- BlackDeer, A. A., (2025), What is reproductive justice? in *Social Work and Reproductive Justice: A Necessary Fit* (pp. 5–24), Oxford University Press, <https://doi.org/10.1093/9780197755389.003.0003>
- Brookfield, S. D., (1995), *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brookfield, S. D., and Preskill, S., (2005), *Discussion as a way of teaching: Tools and techniques for democratic classrooms* (2nd Edition), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chadha-Sridhar, I., (2024), What is care ethics and why does it matter? *Oxford Law Blogs*, <https://blogs.law.ox.ac.uk/family-and-medical-law/blog-post/2024/07/what-care-ethics-and-why-does-it-matter>
- Dressner, M., (2025), *Navigating the relational work and emotional labor of relationship building in teaching: Forming teacher-student relationships in the context of perceived challenging student behaviors*, Columbia University Academic Commons, <https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/doi/10.7916/b51w-m850>
- Duggan, M., and Bishop, C., (2023), “Our Teaching Is Rocking Their Ontological Security”: Exploring the Emotional Labour of Transformative Criminal Justice Pedagogy, *Social Sciences*, 12(3), 162, <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12030162>
- Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P., (2014), Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(23), 8410–8415, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111>
- Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P., (2005), What is scaffolding? in A. Burns & H. de Silva Joyce (Eds.), *Teachers’ voices 8: Explicitly supporting reading and writing in the classroom* (pp. 8–16), National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Heath, M., Galloway, K., Skead, N., Steel, A., and Israel, M., (2018), Learning to feel like a lawyer: Law teachers, sessional teaching and emotional labour in legal education, *Griffith Law Review*, 26(3), 430–457, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10383441.2017.1406791>

hooks, b., (1994), *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*, Routledge.

Jones, E., (2021), The role and impact of emotions within everyday legal practice, *No Foundations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Law and Justice*, 18, 1–39.

Leutwiler, É. C. V., Amorim-Ribeiro, E. M. B., and Grangeiro, R., (2024), The emotional labour of higher education teachers: A scoping review, *International Journal of Emotional Education*, 16(1), 45–62.

Menkel-Meadow, C., (1988), Feminist legal theory, critical legal studies, and legal education: Or “The Fem-Crits Go to Law School,” *Journal of Legal Education*, Vol. 38, No. 1/2 (March/June 1988), pp. 61-85.

Nelken, D., (2009), *Beyond law in context: developing a sociological understanding of law*, (1st ed.), Routledge, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315261621>

Orfali, C. H., Arancibia Muñoz, M. L., Riquelme Plaza, I., and Unda Valenzuela, R., (2024), How higher education teachers see their professional identity, *Frontiers in Education*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1429847>

Pekrun, R., and Linnenbrink-Garcia, L., (2012), Academic emotions and student engagement, in S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, and C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement*, pp. 259–282, Springer, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_12

Pugliese, N., (2023), Feminist pedagogies, in D. L. Gray, K. M. Jackson, and J. L. Martin (Eds.), *Gender diversity, equity, and inclusion in academia: A conceptual framework for sustainable transformation* (pp. 204-212), Routledge, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003363590-22>

Dotta, T. L., and Lopes, A., (2023), Identities of teacher educators in higher education: A literature review, *Revista Colombiana de Educación*, 88, <https://revistas.upn.edu.co/index.php/RCE/article/view/13338>

Twining, W., (1997), 'Reflections on ‘Law in Context’', in *Law in Context: Enlarging a Discipline*, Oxford University Press, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198264835.003.0011>

van Lankveld, T., Schoonenboom, J., Volman, M., Croiset, G., & Beishuizen, J., (2017), Developing a teacher identity in the university context: A systematic review of the literature, *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(2), 325–342. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1208154>