



Reflections on the launch of IPED

Jo Brewis

University of Leicester. Leicester, UK

When Kate told me that *IPED* was launching, and about its feminist ethos, its multilingualism and the fact that it would be open access, I was absolutely delighted. The news came shortly after the announcement of the REF2014 results and coincided with the publication of the Chartered Association of Business Schools' Academic Journal Guide 2015. As such it provided a very necessary antidote to the strategic game playing evident in the former and the naked, albeit hugely influential, hubris of the latter. This first issue of the journal represents a lot of hard work on the part of the editorial board and considerable generosity on the part of its sponsors, the School of Management and Languages at Heriot Watt University. And *IPED* has none of the hierarchical trappings or rampant commercialism which are all too common amongst scholarly journals, and serve to explain some of their more invidious characteristics, 90% rejection rates, ferocious disciplinary gatekeeping and scathing reviews not least amongst them. Instead it is that rare creature – a publication run for academics, by academics, on a genuinely international and interdisciplinary basis.

I was also delighted, not to say flattered, when Kate asked me to write this short piece to mark *IPED's* first issue. And it was a real pleasure to read the five pieces that comprise it. Two of these were on issues that I know a little about – the first a research note by Susan Sayce and colleagues on equality and diversity practitioners in UK HEIs and the second an empirical paper by Maria Tsouroufli on the experience of international doctoral students in an English university. The other three – a review, also by Susan, of an edited collection about gendered images of science, engineering and technology amongst young people, a Connor Green's student essay examining remuneration for British apprenticeships and its various discontents via interviews with various stakeholders and James Richards' paper outlining the importance of bringing together critical accounts of work and employment and theories about Asperger syndrome – were not. But I certainly found something instructive in all of them. The Sayce *et al.* piece, which made excellent theoretical use of Meyerson and Scully's concept of the tempered radical, vividly reminded me of being departmental equality officer for three years and how frustrating it often was to see just how poorly resourced the central function was in a university which continually trumpets its inclusiveness. The Richards paper on Asperger syndrome was an eye opener in terms of the many profound challenges that those with this syndrome face in securing and retaining employment and the importance of applying the social model of disability in this regard. The student essay was an empirical gem, reporting on interviews not only from apprentices themselves but also their employers, an MP and a trade union representative. This is the sort of access most of us can only dream of! Tsouroufli's discussion of international doctoral students was another beautifully handled empirical study, combined with an enviable lightness of theoretical touch. Finally, I was especially struck by a comment in Sayce's book review about one chapter's argument "that rather than getting girls to fit with science, science needs to be more inclusive by

Opinion

focusing on its epistemic roots.” Rather like *IPED* itself, that’s an initiative I could really get behind!

In sum, this journal is a truly worthwhile endeavour. I know readers will enjoy this issue as much as I have, and I’d also like to urge you to get on board by submitting pieces, offering to review and recommending the journal to your colleagues and students. Let’s put our collective shoulders to the wheel to make sure *IPED* is the success that it so manifestly deserves to be.

Professor Jo Brewis

University of Leicester

j.brewis@le.ac.uk