

Inclusion in the Art and Design Curriculum: Revisiting Bernstein and 'class' issues.

Samantha Broadhead, Leeds College of Art

Introduction

Students who have started their undergraduate degree in art and design with an *Access to HE* diploma rather than 'A' Levels and a Pre-BA Foundation Course can be described as 'non-traditional' because they have had different previous learning and life experiences from traditional age-at-entrance students (James, 1995: 453; Penketh and Goddard, 2008: 316). They are likely to be perceived as mature and also to come from under-represented groups in higher education (Busher et al., 2012; Broadhead, 2014). If we as educators are to work towards an inclusive arts education, then the experiences of these students during their higher education need to be considered. Although the open and liberal nature of a visual arts curriculum appears to be inclusive, this cannot be taken for granted. Basil Bernstein has provided a useful lens with which to analyse art and design education where he has shown how seemingly opposing pedagogic models act selectively on different social groups and that more open teaching approaches can still privilege the middle classes. It is useful to revisit the ideas of Basil Bernstein in relation to how 'non-traditional' students can be excluded from some parts of art and design higher education (HE). In particular his concept of visible and invisible pedagogies provides a useful framework to examine teaching and learning in this subject area. This discussion seeks to explore how non-traditional students with diverse backgrounds are at times excluded from the visible and invisible pedagogies of art and design higher education. Bernstein proposes that educational institutions construct curricula based assumptions about the currency of students' skills and their access to resources such as time and space. Due to aspects of surveillance that are associated with an invisible pedagogy, non-traditional students from backgrounds other than the middle classes are in danger of being misread by tutors. In turn these students are likely to misread the significance of studio practice as a means of being creative. For Bernstein (1958:160-161) membership of the middle *classes* is defined by educational achievement and employment in skilled or non-manual work alongside a particular attitude towards the achievement of long-term goals. Later in his work he differentiates the middle classes into those who work directly with the economic field and those who work in the field of symbolic control (Bernstein, 2003: 204).

References are made to two papers of particular significance : *Class and Pedagogy: Visible and Invisible* (1975) which describes the class bias in the progressive education movement in Britain during the 60s and 70s, and a revision of that paper called *Social Class and Pedagogic Practice* (2003) which includes a discussion about market-orientated pedagogies. Bernstein presents us with two extreme models of pedagogic practice as being either explicit or

implicit; however, he makes the point that these two forms are hardly ever seen in a pure state.

Following on from this, the chapter goes on to argue that one means of teaching in art and design HE - studio practice - can be identified as an invisible pedagogy framed by a visible one as signified by the use of the studio brief. An argument is posed that non-traditional students may be excluded from taking part fully in the learning experience due to two main reasons. Firstly, students from non-traditional routes into HE may not have the skills that underpin a successful response to the brief; it is taken for granted that all students have certain abilities. Secondly, some students may not have access to the time and space needed for studio practice to be a successful form of pedagogy and they may also misunderstand the significance of these resources.

The argument is developed to consider the tensions between visible and invisible pedagogies. They do not always sit neatly together and this becomes apparent when students get feedback from tutors about their work. Learning outcomes which initially seem to be clear, stating what is to be achieved by the student, can become difficult and problematic when used to make judgements about art and design work.

Comments from art and design students are used to illustrate some of the points being made. These comments were collected from a longitudinal study about the experience of post-Access students during their undergraduate degrees, including feedback received from students at six points during a three year time span. Their names and the institutions in which they were studying are anonymised to protect their identities. These students are described as 'non-traditional' because they are mature and from diverse backgrounds. They also had entered HE with a qualification that was other than the traditional 'A' level route, (Burke, 2002: 81). I have worked in the art and design HE sector for many years and I have also been responsible for managing an 'Access to HE' course within a specialist art college. My experiences of teaching, managing and researching these cohorts of students in this particular subject area have informed the arguments discussed within this chapter.

Bernstein's model of visible and invisible pedagogy

Bernstein can be described as a generalist in that he aimed to construct a theory of education that could be applied to a range of pedagogic contexts. There are many examples of empirical research that apply his theories to the HE context (Maton in Davis et al., 2004; Power in Moore et al., 2006; McLean et al., 2013), but perhaps not so many that consider the area of art and design in particular (Addison and Burgess 2003: 63; Gamble in Davis et al, 2004). Bernstein (1975) himself used the child-centred or progressive education movement of the 1960s as an exemplar of invisible pedagogy. He argued that children were often exposed to invisible pedagogies during pre-school and primary levels, but owing to the middle-class need to pass examinations, the secondary system reverted to a more explicit visible pedagogy (Bernstein, 1975: 63). Most interestingly, he suggests that invisible

pedagogies are only retained in secondary school art departments where he says the teachers are more likely to be open to change and innovation (1975: 74). He also comments that within a person's educational journey he or she is likely to experience an invisible pedagogy again at university. It then seems appropriate to apply his theory to the context of art and design higher education as it provides a useful lens with which to analyse some of the issues. Bernstein's work initially focuses on the ways formal education disadvantages the working classes in particular; however, later in his career he opens up his critique to consider students from other underrepresented social groups.

Bernstein (2003: 198) argues that all pedagogic relationships are based on three rules. The first, which he calls a regulative rule, is that of *hierarchy* where the transmitter (parent/teacher/trainer/facilitator) and the acquirer (infant/pupil/trainee/student) understand their roles and recognise the asymmetrical nature of their relationship. The second rule is that of *sequencing and pacing*, where the order of what is transmitted (learned) is pre-determined through curricula. Also, the pace at which something is learned, the time it takes for a student to cover a particular topic, is also to some extent pre-set. The final rule is that of *criteria* – this is by what means are the student's efforts judged to be legitimate or non-legitimate outputs. Bernstein calls *sequencing* and *criteria* discursive rules.

Visible Pedagogy

Within a visible pedagogy hierarchy, sequencing, and criteria are made explicit so that the students are aware of what is expected of them: what they must achieve and in what time period. Bernstein (1975: 68) describes how this actually disadvantages social groups other than the middle classes. This arises from an assumption that everyone is at the same level when they enter a stage of education and will take a similar period of time to learn something. It often also assumes that part of the curriculum will be done at home because in order to fulfil the curriculum requirements two sites of transmission are often needed: the home and the institution. Those students, from working class backgrounds, for example, who do not have a quiet space to read at home, will, ultimately, not have access to the official pedagogy through text books. A visible pedagogy is potentially quite cost-effective as it requires a relatively small part of institutional space to occur and is supported by the home as a site of transmission, as Bernstein said:

Currently the visible pedagogy of the school is cheap to transmit because it is subsidised by the middle-class family and paid for by the alienation and failure of children of the disadvantaged classes and groups. (Bernstein, 2003: 207)

In order to combat some of the problems of students who cannot meet the sequencing and pacing rules, the institution can carry out various interventions (Bernstein 2003: 204). Firstly a repair system can be put in place to give students extra help. Secondly, the sequencing and pacing rules can be relaxed: the first two strategies would have cost implications attached to them for the institution. Thirdly, the pace of education is kept the same but less

is expected of those underachieving students in terms of outputs that meet the criteria. The final intervention can have far-reaching consequences later in a student's learning career, and this can be seen in the need for *Access to HE* courses that give mature students 'a second chance'. In effect an Access course is a delayed repair system that helps students achieve their learning goals later in life. It seems that visible pedagogies often disadvantage some students from working-class backgrounds and prepare those middle-class students who will work in directly in the economic field. The discussion will now progress to considering invisible pedagogies.

Invisible Pedagogy

Bernstein (1975: 59) defined this as being where the focus of education is placed on the acquirer rather than the transmitter. Thus the regulative rule of hierarchy is implicit rather than explicit; control of the student by the tutor operates in an indirect way. There is less emphasis on the acquisition of specialist skills. Instead, students are free to play, explore and rearrange their environment. Evaluation of learning is based on diffuse criteria. Tutors act as facilitators and may put a lot of time into preparing the context where learning takes place. Whereas visible pedagogies require less expansive resources, invisible ones need to utilise large amounts of time and space.

Symbolically space in a visible pedagogy is clearly defined, similar objects are grouped together, clearly defined activities occur within specific spaces (see figure 1).



Figure 1: Information technology room

Within an invisible pedagogy space is more open plan; there are less likely to be clearly defined boundaries and it will be less obvious when a rogue object 'pollutes' the space (see image 2).



Figure 2: Art and design studio

Students have control over how to order and utilise the space. This is one way of encouraging creativity within a student cohort, and can be seen as promoting student-focused education.

It is as if this pedagogic practice creates a space in which the acquirer can create his/her text under conditions of apparently minimum external constraint and in a context and social relationship which appears highly supportive of the 'spontaneous' text the acquirer offers. (Daniels, 1989; Bernstein, 2003: 201)

As in the case of visible pedagogies there are also class assumptions with respect to the concepts of time, space and control (Bernstein, 2003: 208). The cognitive and social messages of an 'open plan' life-style are less accessible to working class students who do not have the resources of space and time in other areas of their life (Bernstein, 2003: 209).

Some non-traditional students may then misread the cultural significance of such an educational practice.

An invisible pedagogy, as we shall see later, is likely to create a pedagogic code intrinsically more difficult, initially at least, for disadvantaged social groups (from the perspective of formal education) to read and to control. (Bernstein, 2003: 207)

Middle class families can afford the resources needed to facilitate invisible pedagogy at home where acquirers are controlled by sophisticated levels of communication (Bernstein, 1975: 67; Bernstein, 2003: 210). As a result people from middle-class families thrive when exposed to an invisible pedagogy in an official site of learning. This method of education privileges those middle-class students whose employment has a direct relation to the 'field of symbolic control and who work in specialized agencies of symbolic control...' (Bernstein 2003: 204). This is especially relevant to the subject area of art and design where its graduates could potentially be working in areas such as the media, advertising or product design. Bernstein (1975: 63-64) would describe people in these and similar professions as disseminators and shapers of symbolic forms that induce consumption.

Bernstein (2003: 200) argued that within an invisible pedagogy the acquirer is constructed as a text that can be read by the transmitter who draws upon a bricolage of theories (Piaget, Freud, Neo-Freudian, Chomsky, Ethological theories of critical learning). These theories tend to be those that focus on developmental stages based on age. Acquisition is only meaningful if contextualised within a certain stage where learning is viewed as a tacit invisible act. The institutional and cultural background of the acquirer is absent; the bricolage of developmental theories is asociological. The acquirer is active in his or her own acquisition; any intrusion from the transmitter is seen as potentially dangerous, as it subverts 'natural' development of learning and discovery by imposing social rules (Bernstein, 2003: 200). Thus teachers may appear be absent from the learning space which are inhabited only by students – but they still have an indirect control over the process.

As the transmitter views the acquirer as a text which is read, the space in which invisible pedagogies take place enables the surveillance of students where their learning practices are open to public scrutiny and interpretation (Bernstein, 1975: 67). As a consequence there is a potential for tutors to misread the students, particularly mature students who seem at odds with age-related stages of development.

Two opposing pedagogic practices have been distinguished between each other, 'in terms of those which have explicit hierarchical rules, explicit sequencing/pacing rules, and explicit criteria and those with implicit hierarchical sequencing/pacing and criteria rules,' (Bernstein,

2003: 201). It will now be argued that studio practice within art and design is an example where an invisible pedagogy has been embedded into a visible one.

Studio-practice as an invisible pedagogy embedded within a visible one

Studio practice can occur not only in physical spaces but in virtual ones too. The studio can also link with spaces situated outside the educational institution, for example, hospitals, galleries or prisons (Sullivan, 2006:30). However, the hub of art and design education still remains a personalised studio-based practice and it how this can be understood using Bernstein's pedagogic models is the focus of this discussion. In particular, it is argued that the ways in which art and design learning outcomes are communicated to students are suggestive of a visible pedagogy - but then this gives way to the invisible pedagogy of studio practice.

The academic regulations that guide the educational process in art and design education along with module specifications and art and design briefs aim to be explicit. Learning outcomes, assessment criteria and deadlines are stated on the art and design brief (the means by which learning activity is communicated to students) (see appendix 1). The brief and academic regulations are made available to all students through briefing sessions, student handbooks and virtual learning environments (VLEs). This frames the later activity in the studio and can be seen as a visible pedagogy where regulative hierarchies are made clear. The transmitters who write, mark and verify the brief are clearly distinguished from those who are the acquirers who respond to the tasks set and in doing so demonstrate the learning outcomes in their work. What counts as legitimate learning activity is also suggested on the brief. There are two ways in which this process can exclude some students. Firstly, what the student needs to do may not be communicated effectively. This can be seen in the comments from this part-time student who was trying to work out how learning in the first term was sequenced:

I know it's what they call Technique and Processes and because my subject is 2D/ 3D you can basically choose each term - and this is so complicated it took me a year to get my head round it. I'll never explain it - but you have to do something in studio practice. Full-timers do two studio practices, we only do one studio practice a year and you can choose between ceramics, print and 2D/ 3D (which is really vague and can be textiles, painting, drawing, sculpture). (Polly, Jan 2013)

Secondly, the deadlines published on briefs control, to some extent, the sequencing and pacing of learning. However, this assumes that all students have similar skills and resources to undertake the work in the same amount of time. This next student reflected on the modules she had studied at the end of her first year:

I found the computer one - the digital processing - very difficult because it's not easy for me. I don't have... (I do have a computer and packages) but it's not easy to train yourself to be at the level of the young people who are on this course - on computers. (Chad, June 2012)

Due to this student's age (she is in her mid-40s) it is unlikely that information technology was part of her school curriculum and so she is not very confident in the area of computer-aided design (CAD). She has tried to 'repair' this by training herself, which she has not found easy to do. From Chad's experience, by revisiting the notion of visible pedagogy, it is possible to see the assumptions institutions have about the skills of their students. It is also significant that she needs to supplement her education by managing the learning deficit herself.

Once the brief has been made available to students it can be seen that an explicit, visible pedagogy gives way to an implicit, invisible one. Students are free to explore the brief: usually by engaging with investigation, play and experimentation - at least at the initial stages of the learning process. It is assumed that students have the time to immerse themselves into studio culture where they can utilise their space creatively. Students may be working in an open-plan studio where they may be allocated a specific work space. Here students can develop ideas, present work in progress and experiment with media and processes. The absence of the tutor during this process is a significant characteristic of an invisible pedagogy and is quickly noticed by new students:

It seemed like the tutors had taken a backward step. You were left kind of on your own. That much I didn't mind but it caused a few problems in the beginning for me, particularly, because it felt like your hand was being held and then suddenly it's been taken away. (Snake, June 2012)

Open-plan studios provide the space in which learning takes place; timetabling is kept to the minimum so students can restrict themselves to studio-based activity. As with Bernstein's definition of the invisible pedagogy, control of the learning process ultimately remains with the tutors, although this is communicated implicitly. For example, there will be large periods of time where tutors do not *appear* to be present in the studio. Some students are not sure how to react from the lack of tutor input as one older student describes:

'Blowing in the wind' - I feel a bit 'blowing' - I'm not sure what I'm supposed to be doing; if I'm doing enough or doing it the right way. They keep telling me there is no right way or wrong way. I don't like things being undefined. There's not really much tutor input. I was kind of hoping they'd be constantly walking around, talking to people and getting them to open their minds up. (Jo, Nov 2011)

Jo's account suggests that he is experiencing the features of an invisible pedagogy. He is uncertain about what is expected of him, and has noticed the lack of tutor interactions. He says, importantly, that he doesn't like things not being defined. This causes him to again misread the significance of the pedagogy and he actually gives his work space in the studio away to someone else.

[O]riginally I didn't have a space I was the last one left. I had to give my space up because this lass wanted to be with a friend so I gave her my space and then I was just the last one to have a space. (Jo, Nov 2011)

Having a good space and spending time in it is an essential part of an invisible pedagogy; it is a resource-greedy method of transmission. Jo didn't recognise the importance of getting an appropriate space to work in and how giving his space away could hold back his progress on the course. The situation becomes more problematic when students are studying their course part-time. Firstly, they do not have the time to spend in the studio as they usually have other commitments. Secondly, part-time students are sometimes not given the same access to space as full-time students. The following, from a part-time student, evidences this clearly:

I was told, 'or well - you know - just wait a couple of weeks and see if there's an empty spot and creep into it.' But I was never there to do it - pointless. (Polly, June 2012)

The account suggests there is unequal access to the space which is a vital part of making an invisible pedagogy successful. The right to have a space is ambivalent when the student has a part-time status, as they can be seen to be wasting this valuable resource when they are not always present in the studio. The idea that students have to 'creep' into the spaces that are left by the full-time students is very telling as it signifies that they are not legitimated or valued by the institution (rather like stowaways on a ship). In this instance, rules about space and part-time students could be made more explicit; this would be fairer. Polly also misreads the significance of the space and why it is important to be seen to be utilising a creative space where creative exploration can take place.

This discussion about the characteristics of visible and invisible pedagogies in art and design education has pointed out that information which aims to be clear may actually be very confusing. Where the visible pedagogy of the brief assumes students have certain kinds of knowledge and skills it can exclude non-traditional students who previously have had very different learning experiences. When learning becomes more open in the studio some students can misunderstand how they are agents in their own learning. They may not realise the importance of making full use of the space. It could be argued that an invisible pedagogy requires time and space to be effective and actually doesn't work as well with part-time students who do not have the same resources as full-time ones do.

Students getting feedback about their work

The two modes of transmission in question do not always work easily in synergy. This can be seen at the point where tutors make judgements and give feedback on student work. This is where any tensions and inconsistencies in the process become apparent to staff and students.

Orr (2010:12-13) has pointed out that the role learning outcomes play in art and design pedagogic practice can be ambivalent, being designed to provide a only veneer of objectivity. Some art and design tutors are unlikely to refer directly to the learning outcomes, perceiving them as problematic to the learning process. This is because they have often been written by those who are distanced from what actually happens in the studio. Learning continues to be seen by studio teachers as tacit and invisible and the studio culture is used as a way to promote the 'uniqueness' of outputs. This corresponds with the 'pedagogies of uncertainty' which Shreeve (2012) has described as a means of promoting creativity and thinking outside the box. Evidence that some students find this means of teaching confusing and difficult comes from the National Student Survey (NSS) results. Within the area of art and design students often complain of feedback, particularly formative feedback, as being ambiguous and contradictory (Vaughan and Yorke, 2009: 14). Orr (2010:14) has described a mismatch between the learning outcomes and assessment practice. One possible explanation for this is that there are tensions between the visible pedagogy of the brief and the invisible pedagogy of studio practice. By referring to areas of tacit knowledge in discussions between tutors and students, feedback actually becomes confusing and this is where misunderstandings can arise. The unequal power relationship between tutors and students means that ultimately the criteria for legitimate learning activity are regulated and understood by the tutor and are difficult to challenge by students,

especially if these issues are difficult to articulate. This is demonstrated by one student's recounting of getting feedback about their work.

She was saying stuff, I was saying, 'you'll have to explain what you mean by that, you're going to have to explain to me exactly what...' I could see that she was getting frustrated; I was getting frustrated. I kind of just thought that's it! I don't want to hear any more. I don't to do any more feedbacks. And the last one we had to do, fortunately, I wasn't there so she couldn't give me any feedback. (Eliza, November 2011)

Bernstein (1975: 67) explains that control is maintained by the transmitter through sophisticated means of discourse or inter-personal communication between staff and students. Within art and design this is done in tutorials and studio critiques. However this has not been successful in Eliza's case. The miscommunication has led to her seeing feedback as something to be avoided, at least with this particular member of staff. This breakdown in control means that Eliza explores her work with greater autonomy, relying on the brief to act as a guide for her learning. However, the lack of successful regulation by her tutor means that she doesn't understand the diffuse and implicit criteria with which her work will be assessed.

There was a bit on texture and colour so the only things I could put in were embroidery as the sessions on colour were on Wednesdays when I'm not in. So I missed quite a bit of it and was told I was being, what's the word... 'safe' and yet I'd gone off and done my own research about colour and did what I thought the colours were relating to, I think it was lipstick and make-up reds so I did my colour palette based on lipstick. (Eliza, November 2011)

There are issues here that are concerned with pacing and criteria, that are the discursive rules of the pedagogic relationship between tutor and student. The tension between the explicit nature of the brief and the implicit nature of how the assessment criteria are applied causes confusion and frustration. Eliza has followed the brief and believes she has complied with what it has asked for; however, the tutor has used the word 'safe' to describe the embroidery which implies a lack of risk-taking and experimentation. An invisible pedagogy depends on access to time and space in order to take risks and to experiment widely. But this is exactly what Eliza does not have, as she is a part-time student with a family and demanding job. Her inability to use colour with confidence is because she has not had an appropriate amount of tuition in this area. This has not been perceived as part of the problem by the tutor, nor does there seem to have been any adjustment to take this into account. The deficit is seen to be

in the student's performance rather than due to a disruption to the sequencing and pacing of the curriculum caused by Eliza's need to work on a Wednesday.

Conclusion

By revisiting Bernstein's model of visible and invisible pedagogies a new look at the current issues surrounding art and design HE and inclusion is possible. It must be pointed out that Bernstein offers a very generalised and abstract notion of two forms of transmission that are presented as oppositional. Also, his writing style has been criticised for being hard to understand where the meanings of his terms are 'slippery' (Danzig in Sadovnik, 1995: 166; Power in Moore et al., 2006: 105). The difficulty with language is perhaps due to Bernstein's aim to describe an integrating and generalised theory. In his defence, he does also point out that, in practice, visible and invisible pedagogies do not exist in isolation and most programmes of learning blend features from both modes of delivery (Bernstein, 200:211). This is particularly apparent in the example of undergraduate art and design studio practice.

Aspects of art and design teaching that are explicit include the use of a studio brief that clearly tells the students what they need to achieve; the deadline and how their work will be assessed can be seen as an example of a visible pedagogy. For this to be effective the information needs to be accessible to students in terms of the language used to write the learning outcomes. If briefs are only present on VLEs then a certain level of computer literacy is assumed, which may be a problem for some students. It seems that where students don't have the skills in place to fully respond to the brief they need to be motivated to do extra study, possibly at home, as in the case of Chad trying to train herself. This supports Bernstein's assertion that visible pedagogies often need other sites of transmission in addition to what the institution provides. This is fine as long as the students have the additional resources to supplement their education.

Characteristics of an invisible pedagogy can be seen when studio practice is used as a mode of transmission. It is dependent on students being able to immerse themselves in a flexible space where they have relative autonomy to explore possibilities, experiment and test out materials and processes. The learning processes that occur are controlled implicitly by subtle modes of communication between tutors and students in studio critiques and tutorials; where the studio culture is well-developed, then students legitimate each other's activity through day-to-day discourse. However, if students don't understand the significance of using a space well by spending productive time in it then they are less likely to progress and succeed on their course. There could be very practical reasons why students cannot utilise their space; they may need to work and/or support a family. The studio is a space of seeing and being seen. There is an aspect of invisible pedagogy which is about surveillance where students are open to being 'read' by staff (Bernstein, 1975: 66). Where

students are not seen to be present in the studio there is a danger they may be misread as 'lazy,' 'not serious' or 'unengaged', when actually they are trying to manage their time with limited resources.

It is difficult to see how part-time students, in particular, can benefit from an invisible pedagogy when they are not seen as deserving a defined space to work in. Where institutions are striving to make their learning spaces cost effective, it is easy to see why those who could be underusing a space during half the working week are discouraged. However, in the current climate mature students need to work to support their studies as well as their dependants and other commitments.

Studio practice can be seen as an arena where the tensions between visible and invisible pedagogies become apparent. Students who believe they are producing work according to the explicit learning outcomes written on the brief can become confused and frustrated if they get negative feedback from their tutors, leading ultimately to low marks. Tutors value attributes that are tacit; those that are not easily expressed through the written or spoken word cannot be made explicit on a brief. As a result tutors may not refer to the learning outcomes when they are teaching in the studio space, seeing them as restraining creativity rather than facilitating it. This is apparent especially if studio tutors do not feel they had any control over the content of studio briefs. Orr (2010:15) has talked about the learning outcomes as being as starting points for making assessment decisions which are interpreted in conjunction with the tutor's connoisseurship. This can explain why students perceive the teaching and assessment process in art and design as mysterious because ultimately they are being judged on both explicit and implicit criteria. Some students may be aware of this but those who have not picked up on this subtlety are disadvantaged.

The reasons why these two modes of transmission do not seem to complement each other in art and design education are due to a mismatch of values. Art and design educators seek to encourage innovation and creativity through an open pedagogy that encourages the student to produce the unexpected whereas the systems of managerialism construct student success in terms of predictable, measurable outcomes (Biesta, 2014: 1-2). Bernstein (1975: 63) would see this as a result of a conflict between two contingents of the middle classes: those who work in the field of symbolic control and those who will work in directly in the economic field. It could also be seen in terms of the impact of market-oriented pedagogies on higher education which promote the outcome-based curricula of vocationalism (Bernstein, 2003: 213). By revisiting Bernstein's ideas it is possible to see how forms of pedagogy act selectively on social groups where those who have the resources and understand the significance of the pedagogy are advantaged in art and design HE.

References

- Addison, N. and Burgess, L. (2003) *Issues in Art and Design Teaching*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1958) 'Sociological determinants of perception: An enquiry into sub-cultural differences'. *The British Journal of Sociology*. 9 (2), 159-174.
- (1975) 'Class and pedagogies: visible and invisible'. In Halsey, A., Brown, P., Lauder, H., and Stuart Wells, A. (eds) (1997) *Education: Culture, economy and society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press , 59-79.
- (2003) *Class, Codes and Control: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*. London: Routledge.
- Biesta, G. (2014) *The Beautiful Risk of Education*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers
- Busher, H., James, N. & Suttill, B. (2012). *Opening Doors to Higher Education: Access students' learning transitions*. University of Leicester.
- Broadhead, S. (2014) 'Inclusion, democracy and the pedagogised other in art and design higher education'. *Enhancing Learning in the Social Sciences*. 6 (1), 1-14.
- Daniels, H. (1989) 'Visual displays as tacit relays of the structure of pedagogic practice', *British Journal of the Sociology of Education*, 10 (2), 123–40.
- Davies, B., Morais, A. and Muller, J. (2004) *Reading Bernstein, Researching Bernstein*. London: Routledge.
- James, D. (1995) 'Mature Studentship in Higher Education: beyond a "species" approach'. [Online]. http://www.academia.edu/451300/Mature_Studentship_in_Higher_Education_beyond_a_species_approach.
- McLean, M., Abbas, A. and Ashwin, P (2013). 'A Bernsteinian view of learning and teaching undergraduate sociology-based social science'. *Enhancing Learning in the Social Sciences*. 5 (2), 32–44.
- Moore, R., Arnot, M., Beck, J. and Daniels, H. (eds.) (2006) *Knowledge, Power and Educational Reform: Applying the sociology of Basil Bernstein*. London: Routledge.
- Orr, S. (2010) "'We kind of try to merge our own experience with the objectivity of the criteria": The role of connoisseurship and tacit practice in undergraduate fine art assessment'. *Art, Design and Communication in Higher education*. 9 (1), 5–19.

Penketh, C. & Goddard, G. (2008) 'Students in transition: Mature women students moving from foundation degree to honours level 6'. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*. 13 (3), 315–327.

Sadovnik, A.R. (1995) *Knowledge and Pedagogy: The sociology of Basil Bernstein*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Shreeve, A. (2011) 'The way we were? Signature pedagogies under threat'. In: *Researching design education, 1st International Symposium, CUMULUS // DRS for Design Education Researchers*. Proceedings of a conference held at the Paris Chamber of Commerce and Industry, 18 May 2011. Paris, France: CUMULUS ASSOCIATION and DRS, 112–125.

Sullivan, G. (2006) 'Arts-based research in art education'. *Studies in Art Education*. 48 (1), 19-35

Vaughan, D. and Yorke, M. (2009) "'I can't believe it's not better": The paradox of NSS scores for art and design.' Online. <http://www.adm.heacademy.ac.uk/library/files/adm-hea-projects/glad-nss-project/nss-report170310.pdf>.

Module Brief

xxxxx COLLEGE

Programme Title: BA (Hons) Textile Art	Level: 4
Module Title: Studio Practice	Module Code: 408
Brief Title: Portfolio	
Weighting of Brief within Module: 100%	Module Credits: 20
Tutor(s) Sam Broadhead	
Context	

This module provides an introduction to art, design and media, alongside considering relationships between theory and practice. Students enhance their knowledge and understanding, together with their own critical awareness and develop the ability to situate their practice within a global context. Through studio practice, studio critiques and tutorials, students investigate their own discipline and also the broader practices that are influential to the fields of art, design and media.

Brief

You will produce a portfolio of practical work that seeks to demonstrate an understanding and application of the techniques and processes of your studio practice in relation to broader practical and theoretical aspects of the creative industries. Your folio of practical work will be developed as part of a series of visual workshops held later in the academic year, this portfolio of tasks will also comprise of a series of formal experiments and visual records of technical processes that will help you extend and resolve your studio practice as a platform for development through into the next brief. Accompanying your studio practice you are expected to keep a record of studio critiques and edit these into a document which record your practical and theoretical development.

Preparation/Research Suggestions: Please refer to hand-outs

Briefing: 27 th Sept 2014	Interim Crit(s)/Formative Feedback: Fortnightly	Final Crit/Summative Feedback: w/c 30 th March – Practical w/c 23 rd April – Studio Critique w/c 28 th May – Reflective account	Deadline: All 10,00am, 2014. 6 th March – Practical 30 th March – Studio Critique 22 nd May – Reflective account
Work submitted after a set deadline loses 5 percentage points per day including days which fall over weekends as detailed in the Regulations for Undergraduate provision.			

Module Code: 408	Module Title: Studio Practice	Brief Title: Portfolio	Student Name:
------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------	---------------

Learning Outcomes You will be assessed on your ability to achieve the outcomes using skills from the following list: research, critical awareness, visual quality, innovation, technical competence and professionalism.		Assessed on this brief (✓)	Weighting /100	Grade
4A1	Demonstrate an awareness of a range of technical processes appropriate to the discipline.	✓		
4A2	Demonstrate an awareness of the relationship between the theoretical and practical contexts of their own subject area.	✓		
4B1	Analyse and investigate visually a range of primary and secondary sources.	✓		
4C1	Undertake practical research/experimentation that demonstrates an awareness of critical, effective and testable processes.	✓		
4D1	To communicate individual response in written, visual, oral and other appropriate forms	✓		
Grade Total				

All grades are provisional and are subject to confirmation and/or review by the Exam Boards held at the end of the academic year

Evidence/Assessment Method	Module Outcome
Practice: - Portfolio of related practical work and records of critiques.	4A1, 4A2, 4B1, 4C1, 4D1

Plagiarism is a serious matter which can attract severe penalties and permanent exclusion from the institution. See Regulations for Undergraduate provision for further details.

Programme Leader: (Programme Leader must approve brief before issued)	Date:
Assessment Review Peer (ARP): (ARP must approve brief before issued)	Date:

Appendix 1: An example of a studio practice brief given to students.