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Abstract

In recent years, material resources for art and design in Further Education (FE) have diminished, and Awarding Bodies' (ABs) regulations are frequently changed. FE colleges, which typically provide second chance or alternative pathways for learners, are required to deliver vocational courses of learning based upon current practices. The implications for foundational learning are considerable, especially for experiential learning, as colleges manage the overlapping fields of AB's requirements, FE funding and scrutiny, and art and design practice, to balance the requirements of government and the interests of learners and teachers. The purpose of the study reported in this thesis was to examine the processes of curriculum construction through teachers' course planning and students' responses, particularly in relation to the conceptions of 2D and 3D teaching and learning. The study also aimed to examine the way in which the curriculum reflected cultural values, and to explore the impact of assessment practices on the shaping of the curriculum.

The research was undertaken in a large FE college in England, and employed an interpretive ethnographic methodology, gathering data from participant observations and interviews with teachers and students in one class, in a twelve-month period between 2011 and 2012. In addition to this ethnographic methodology, the study also included the analysis of students’ work and a content analysis of relevant ABs’ and course documentation. A thematic analysis of the data was undertaken, drawing on the theoretical concepts of Bernstein and Lowenfeld, in order to consider the nature of the constructed curriculum.

The findings suggest that a curriculum in which students have limited experience of 3D and haptic learning discriminates against essential experiences for foundational learning in art and design. In addition, the BTEC curriculum may unnecessarily reinforce cultural bias due to the selection of artists and topics for focus. Further, the nature of BTEC assessment is such that it shapes the curriculum in unanticipated ways, serving to create an emphasis on small units of production, rather than offering sustained opportunities for exploratory and open-ended practice over time. The research questions the continuing claims made with regard to the importance of vocationality and specialist learning for foundational students, in the light of the declining access to fundamental experiences with a variety of materials and technologies.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The focus for this study is a BTEC Level 2, full-time Art and Design course. I begin by offering a rationale for the project, based on an assessment of the current provision for Art and Design in Further Education (FE). The chapter then moves on to summarises both the aims of the research and the significance of the study, before outlining how the rest of the thesis is structured.

Justification for the Research

The justification for the research is five-fold. Firstly, the study stems from the social and economic importance of the creative industries (DCMS, 2014). Secondly, it is based on the significance of the locally constructed curriculum, which is operated in FE. Thirdly, FE remains an under-researched sector and (Elliot, 1987; James and Biesta, 2007), and would benefit from participant-orientated research. Fourthly, the ever-reducing material resourcing for practical learning, indicated above, is creating critically diminished opportunities for practical teaching and learning in art and design. In addition, my experience as a teacher has constantly been inspired by observing and taking part in students' excitement as they discover their own solutions in lessons in which they work in two and three dimensions. These five strands of enquiry I associate with the experiential nature of practical learning in art and design, and are discussed below.

The Creative Industries were, at the time I began the research, central to governmental aspirations for the advancement of the knowledge economy as 'their importance to these industries to national wealth is more recognised' when the government's intention was to put 'creativity at the heart of education' (DCMS, 2014, p3). Creative Industries are defined as 'those industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation, through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property' (DCMS, 2014, p4). The Creative Economy occupations include:
Advertising, architecture, the art and antiques market, crafts, design, designer fashion, film and video, interactive leisure software, music, the performing arts, publishing, software and computer services, television and radio (and has) close economic relationships with other sectors such as tourism, hospitality, museums and galleries, heritage and sport.

(DCMS, 2014, p5)

Each of the Creative Industries has occupational traditions and employment characteristics which correspond to vocational outcomes. Vocational art and design has its aim to educate practitioners in relevant occupations, and to prepare students to consume society’s artefacts and utilise productively numerous modes of communication in order to become creative individuals. Creative individuals exhibit multiple skills in relation to conceptualising the environment and, thus, affecting change. Design creatives often work in teams, networked to other parallel disciplines, which they are dependent upon in shaping our social conceptions and sensory responses to our environment (Dorst, 2008; Freidman, 2003; Carvalho, Dong and Maton, 2009). The Creative Industries visualise and communicate ideas about their environment using two-dimensional and three-dimensional properties, based upon sensory perceptions.

The second reason for this research study is based on the practice of teachers translating or recontextualising the discourses of regulation and current practice into curricula. All teachers are required to a greater or lesser extent to transmit and construct knowledge, achieve certain outcomes and engage in educational relationships with their students. In practical art and design the modelling of techniques and processes, alongside cognitive and perceptual enquiry, utilises material resources and academic knowledge in dynamic relationships with other qualities. Course designs, as foundational curricula, have consequences for students’ opportunities and act as local art and design practice. I therefore wished to explore the way in which the foundational art and design curriculum is constructed and experienced by students in FE.

The third justification follows from the diminishing access to the vocational, full-time study of art and design since the 1990s (FEFC, 1996). This stems from the reduction in resources, specifically the reduced timetabled access to studios and workshops, reduced contact with teachers and fewer specialised encounters with materials. This has significantly reduced the
scope of teachers’ lesson planning and limited students’ acquisition of media skills and their tacit knowledge (Polanyi, 1962; Schön, 1983; Crawford, 2009).

My interest in this research topic is also based upon my personal experience as a teacher and manager in FE colleges, working mainly with adolescent and young adult students. I witnessed students who, for the first time as they were being encouraged to freely experiment with materials, seemed to exhibit a spirit of sensory discovery and invention that was especially liberating. At the same time, their discoveries could be imaginatively linked to the world of art and design, and thence to the world itself; a process of innovation and self-discovery which became, in many cases, allied to socially meaningful exploration. It was also significant that, in some circumstances, the apparent advantages of social and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1984) did not always lead to superior performances, as results could challenge conceptions of social barriers. I was, therefore, interested in examining the processes of meaning making in an FE college in more depth than I had been able to as a manager and teacher.

**Aims of the Research**

Art and design within the under-researched FE has not been subject to extensive research, which is also the case for the sector as a whole (James and Biesta, 2007). Research in design education has focussed on more defined occupational categories, such as architecture, engineering design and fashion design (Carvalho, Dong and Maton, 2009; Lee, 2011; Steyn, 2012), and less on foundational courses which attempt to incorporate fine art practice. The aim of this research is to examine the nature of the curriculum in an introductory, Level 2 (L2) FE Art and Design BTEC course. An empirical, interpretive method was adopted which reflected the practical nature of art and design, and was intended to impact teachers' practice. Further Education policy-churn (Wolf, 2011), the continual changes to Awarding Bodies and funding and inspection requirements create challenging contexts for FE teachers to recontextualise regulation and curriculum specifications. The research has specific interest in foundational, vocational courses where students are introduced to a widening range of practices in art and design, which in turn reflect social and cultural changes. This places particular responsibility for re-evaluating the relevance of practical skills and the role of two-dimensional and three-dimensional experience. This led the focus of the research from examining how the curriculum was constructed in the studio, to considering its broader,
social relevance, analysing principle constraints such as assessment practices, and exploring the key role of sentient 2D and 3D knowledge.

Eisner (1988) following Bernstein (1971) points out that 'that the curriculum is a mind-altering device' (p19). As such, it is a cultural expression, and in art and design is an important vehicle of self-expression (Efland 1990; Newbury 2004). Prior to and following the second world war there was an essential focus for child-centred approaches to art education, championed by Cizek (Viola, 1956; Lowenfeld, 1952), which had implications for how art and design was and continues to be seen as a valuable component of the broader school curriculum (Eisner, 1991) and important for students' social development (Dewey, 1934). Therefore, studying the art curriculum is an important element of educational research. This study has a particular interest in 2D and 3D work. This is firstly because these are commonly used demarcations of knowledge and activity, which can be confused as merely heuristic representations, yet they can have restricted occupational languages and specific requirements in BTEC Units. Secondly, in our ocularcentric society (Jay, 1993; 2006; Classen, 1997; Howes, 2005), this curriculum division privileges visual experience as the primary means of perception, which calls into question the value of other sensory perceptions.

The balance of skills and aptitude associated with two-dimensional and three-dimensional practices remains a productive source for exploring themes in art and design education. Two-dimensionality can be articulated as essentially an optical, retinal or pictorial representation of reality, which explores the visual functions of location and identification (Milner and Goodale, 2008). As a differentiated activity, three-dimensionality is focussed on tactile, kinaesthetic and propriocentric skills. (Howes, 2005; Paterson, 2007). As related capacities, 2D and 3D skills are also interdependent, sensory facilities, which presents a potential for considering sensory exploration and expressions, and their embodiment as connected, legitimate forms of knowledge and understanding (Pink, 2007; 2009)).

The 2D / 3D binary continues to be a generative conceptual tool when analysing the social relevance of art and design education, and of art and design practices. Nineteenth century purposes for state controlled design schools were for improving the quality of manufactured goods as well as to progress popular taste in consumer goods and the fine arts (Bell, 1963; Newbury, 2004). Within Western traditions, two-dimensional, optical representation has progressed powerfully as productive media and vehicles of consumer taste, from photography
to film, to television and video (Jay, 1993). Three-dimensional manifestations, such as in architecture and mass production, were more complex to implement in design and manufacture, and have different implications for mass consumption. In understanding art and design, its history, and its education, to what extent the teachers and students are conceived of as consumers and makers involves dynamic interpretations of two-dimensional and three-dimensional meanings. Where students are to be introduced to the range of 2D and 3D practices, as optical /visual and haptic/ kinaesthetic skills, knowledge can be accumulated, to use Bernstein's terminology (1990; 2000), as strongly or weakly classified domains. The research addressed skills and knowledge in 2D and 3D as subject demarcations and as bases for the accumulation of interdependent, sensory awareness and knowledge.

In examining the BTEC curriculum, the study inevitably also considers aspects of assessment. In addition to strict funding regulations for vocational provision based upon Guided Learning Hours (GLH) for under nineteen year olds and qualifications for over nineteen year olds, the important characteristic of vocational education is its assessment structures. BTEC course structures use Criterion Referenced Assessment (CRA), which places the emphasis on outcomes that students can demonstrate and measures achievement against explicit, centrally devised, pre-determined statements of standards. CRA is related to competence based assessment and both are considered behaviourist in conception, instrumentalising the process of learning by, amongst other things, separating assessment from learning and understanding, through attempting to objectify outcomes (Hyland, 1993).

Continuous assessment is a key feature of BTEC assessment, along with the emphasis on formative assessment and students' ownership of their learning within an ethos of student-centred pedagogy. Stronach (1989) points out that much of the rhetoric of the new pedagogy such as participation, ‘negotiation’, ‘collaboration’ and ‘ownership’ is congruent with humanistic ideas of change management and in his opinion masks the underlying contradiction between emancipatory intentions and the instrumentalising effects of the new structures. Torrance et al (2005) argued that:

…the move towards criterion-referenced assessment, and its vocational sibling, competence-based assessment... has significantly benefited learners in the (Learning and Skills Sector) in terms of the numbers of learners retained in the system and the awards which they achieve

(Torreance et al., 2005, p80)
Torrance et al (2005) also found that a ‘symbiotic’ relationship existed between assessment transparency and instrumentalism; the clearer the task was phrased, the easier it was achieved in a superficial manner and assessment, implying that CRA leads to 'assessment as learning' (ibid p1).

The research questions therefore explore some of the issue outlined above and allow an exploration of the construction of the BTEC Art and Design curriculum in an FE class. The questions are as follows:

- How is knowledge constructed in the L2 BTEC Art and Design curriculum?
- What are the cultural values espoused in the curriculum and how do students respond to these?
- How far is the curriculum driven by assessment?
- What place do visual and haptic skills have in the curriculum?

These are important questions for FE teachers and managers to address, as both procedural and theoretical knowledge risks being subordinated to ill-defined skills in mandated curricula. The locally constructed curriculum has cultural implications stemming from its explicit and implicit relevance to learners' everyday experience. The vocational relevance of students’ learning is validated by a system of assessment, which utilises contradictory ideologies, and contributes to the dilution of practical learning opportunities. These have implications for policymakers, employers, course designers, managers, and teachers.

**Significance of the Study**

The study has implications for policy in this field. Since the 1992 Further and Higher Education Act, art and design courses, as experienced by successive student cohorts, have suffered from reductions in time, space and material resources to support practical learning. In Wolf's (2011) review of vocational qualifications, she discounted the value of many lower level vocational qualifications, without defining vocational education as anything more than a route for the less academic. If vocational education is to be anything more than a means of maintaining the academic / vocational divide by applying assessment methods to identify the 'less able or non academic' (Torrance et al, 2005, p9), then substantial material learning needs
to be maintained. This research underlines the importance of such creative, experiential learning, which risks falling under the horizon of the economy's policy makers.

The creative industries, as a source of production and consumption, remain key contributors to the UK economy, and in 2013, 11.3 per cent employment growth was recorded, compared to a national average rate of 2.8 per cent of other industries (DCMS, 2014). Art and design courses are part of the creative industries and represent an important route for students less willing or able to take the graduate route to employment. The emphasis on increasing efficiency and reductions in cost during the past thirty years (FEFC, 1996) is likely to continue, and policy makers and course designers need to address specialist study in these key, material-intensive subjects.

Efficiency and effectiveness indicators construct success as relating to factors of enrolment/completion, which establishes crude inspection league tables for comparing dissimilar local achievements. Ofsted, which is also subject to financial constraints, has acted more as an inspectorial rather than an advisory regime as some inspectorates have acted in the past. Given that the reliance upon current indicators of success are likely to remain, teaching teams can find the expansion of their qualitative narratives of value, based upon their local research, as a counterbalance to the power of quantative measures of success.

There are also implications of the study for practice. BTEC, as a principal Awarding Body, creates regulative discourse through its construction of unit content and guidance, and practice via verification and standards moderation. An important development in the centralised control of the curriculum has been, since 2012, the submission of students' final projects as externally assessed 'examination' work, relying less on the internal judgement of teachers. The remoteness of judgements from their context, and the dependence upon photographic or photogenic qualities of sampled evidence, renders these processes susceptible to reliance upon visually abstracted evidence. This relies less upon essential, multiple sensory characteristics of art and design learning, and may inadvertently discriminate against three-dimensional expression. Trends such as these restrict the latitude that previously teachers had to design specialised content, which can further legitimate existing ambiguities in unit content. This research aims to identify essential experiential practice, which will continue to distinguish more equitable art and design learning.

Teachers and managers in larger centres have considerable scope for accommodating research-based reflection in quality review processes. The busy and over-regulated
environment of FE can benefit from developing flexible approaches to analysing data reflexively, from the experiences of teachers and students. Results and shared experience from more extensively provided centres can have applicability for smaller providers and those able to share specialised provision in larger centres. It is hoped that this thesis can contribute to all of these areas identified above.

**Overview of the Chapters**

Chapter Two introduces the curriculum in art and design through outlining the formation of the National Curriculum and the curriculum in FE from the late 1980s, and identifying changes in emphasis from child-orientated to subject-centred pedagogies and outcome-focussed ideologies. The National Curriculum was ostensibly detached from a vocational curriculum. However, its characteristics of ideas-based learning based upon practical work about artists, designers and their work was shared with the vocational curriculum, which would have influenced both teachers and UK school students progressing to FE course, which is the focus of the study reported in this thesis.

The chapter discusses the development of BTEC within the FE context and examines the tensions created between teachers’ professional status, their subject affinities and their concern for the personal development of their students. This chapter presents the analysis of the curriculum as socially constructed knowledge, for which the theories of Bernstein (1971; 1990; 2000) are introduced in order to consider the nature of legitimate knowledge and its construction, and the place of dispositional knowledge or knower codes (Maton, 2014). The place of outcome-based assessment is examined and its role in the construction of learning and curriculum knowledge. This is followed by an analysis of the experiential character of art and design teaching and learning, and the binary of 2D / 3D as visual and haptic learning, re-applying the theories of Lowenfeld (1939; 1945; 1952) to contemporary practice.

Chapter Three outlines the choice of qualitative, interpretive methods drawn from ethnographic and case study practice, and outlines my philosophical approach and its applicability for the research. I describe the sampling process, the schedule of observations and the semi-structured interviewing process. The methodology was also determined by ethical considerations, such as the need for presentation to parents and guardians prior to the approach to students to request participation. Ethical issues are thus addressed, along with a description of the approaches to data analysis.
Chapter Four analyses assignment briefs and constituent tasks as contrasting processes, as, respectively, progressive and behavioural learning processes, which are repeated in four main course assignments. Bernstein's (1990; 2000) concepts of sacred and profane knowledge are referenced in an exploration of contextualised, experiential knowledge as constituting powerful knowledge (Young and Muller, 2013) for students. This is framed as studio experience and contrasts with the significant encounters with art in a field class visit to the Tate Modern Museum; these feature as examples of the tensions between a focus on high and low culture. Students’ work and responses in interviews are examined in relation to a focus on the development of horizontal knowledge structures (Bernstein, 1990; 2000), that is, knowledge and experience as cumulative experience. How this develops differently on the course for haptic, compared to visual, learning outcomes is a specific focus for study. The chapter concludes with the exploration of visual and haptic knowledge as powerful knowledge. Chapter Five concludes the thesis. The research questions are reflected upon in depth and the implications for research, policy and practice are considered.

Conclusion

In this introductory chapter, I have provided the context and rationale for the research into curriculum construction in an FE art and design course, relating the curriculum to the Creative Industries, and teachers' recontextualising of the curriculum. I have pointed to the aim of the research to examine structural constraints developed around criterion-based assessment, and identified the balance of 2D and 3D subjects as an issue to be revisited as sensory representations of the visual and the haptic. This research has significance for policy makers and teachers in reconstructing their practical curriculum. I now move on to provide a review of literature, which informed this study.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review is constructed to provide a background to the present study. Given the lack of previous research on the teaching of art and design in FE colleges, it was not possible to provide a review of similar studies. Instead, the chapter provides a review of literature which is pertinent to the key aims of the study and offers a theoretical framework for the work. In the first section of the chapter, the policy background to FE and BTECs as principal qualifications in the field is considered. The second section reviews factors relating to the construction of the curriculum and examines the teachers' primary role in its construction, the approaches to experiential, practical learning and the cultural implications of the studio curriculum. In the third section, I draw upon the theories of Bernstein (1971; 1990; 2000) in order to examine the construction of procedural knowledge, known as 'knowing how', and theoretical knowledge, 'knowing that'. This provides a framework for the analysis of the construction of the curriculum. The fourth section analyses the role that assessment has in shaping the curriculum. The final section of the chapter discusses how the binary of visual and haptic sensory perception can be theorised within subject classifications, employing Victor Lowenfeld’s (1952) conception of visual and haptic student dispositions as sensory dimensions of learning.

The Further Education Context

FE is the largest educational sector in England. In 2010, over five million people were involved in some form of FE education or training (BIS, 2010). This research study conceives FE as a distinctive environment, which has grown alongside preconceptions of it as the ‘Cinderella service’ (Randle and Brady, 1997; Simmons and Thompson, 2008), and focusing on manual training. FE's association with manual activity continues to reinforce the contrast with 'academic' curricula, for instance GCSE and A Levels, creating a binary that continues to reflect an academic / vocational dichotomy (Sanderson, 1999; Pratt, 2000). Two other characteristics distinguish FE from the other sectors including the reliance on practical ‘learning by doing’, highlighting practice and its instruction over time, and its ‘voluntarism’
or traditionally loose arrangements between employers, the state and students (Raggatt and Williams, 1999).

It is here argued that art and design education within the complex umbrella of FE has survived despite, and possibly because of, its ‘loose boundaries’, tortuous reformations (James and Biesta, 2007) and externally imposed controls in the most ‘highly regulated’ and complex of educational sectors (Wolf, 2011). The association of FE and hence art and design in FE with manual training, and embedded social stratification, has remained despite the loss of clear links to large-scale craft industries since the early twentieth century (Board of Education, 1926). The further decline in manufacturing activity after World War II led to the reduction in the number of art schools from one hundred and seventy to twenty nine able to deliver the new Diploma in Art and Design (Peters, 1967). This raises the question of what is 'vocational' or 'work related' in such a dispersed discipline.

Amongst governmental attempts to improve the standing of vocational education was the governmental commission of a review by Wolf (2011). She asserted the value of general education for employment, yet sidestepped many problems involved in co-ordinating employers’ needs (Finegold and Soskice, 1988) with apprenticeships, and fails to deploy a better definition of ‘vocational’ than in her previous publication:

> It does not mean a medical or veterinary degree; or a postgraduate law-school course; or taking one’s accountancy examination while working for one of the big city accountancy firms...Vocational education instead refers to courses for young people, which are offered as a lower-prestige alternative to academic secondary schooling.

(Wolf, 2002, p58)

Wolf’s (2011) is amongst the latest in policy recommendations foregrounding the importance of technical education whilst reflecting critically upon the economic ideology of education. Her report reinforced the subordinate status of vocational education, failed to clarify vocationality, and perpetuated the perception that vocational education was for those ‘whose aptitudes and talents are practical’ (Wolf, 2011, p6).

FE's principal role is to deliver vocational, practical learning by occupationally experienced teachers. Plumbers teach plumbing and builders bricklaying, and so forth. Similarly, art and design is taught by practitioners who can do and make, that is demonstrate, their knowledge or their 'know how'. Know how, as distinct from 'knowing that', associates directly with
practical learning and the acceptance of 'implicit' knowledge, being developed separately to 'explicit knowledge (Polanyi, 1962; 1967). This underlines the importance of the practitioners' expertise. The second principle quality of FE, its voluntarist relationship between government, students and employers, has developed differently in art and design first because employers are dispersed and are usually very small enterprises (DCMS, 2014), and secondly because central government has traditionally controlled certification (Peters, 1967), so there is no industrial body to set specialised standards.

The voluntarist nature of FE spawned, in the 1980s, what Fisher (2003) named the 'Golden Age of BTEC', when BTEC developed a series of guides to progressive delivery. In Teaching and Learning Strategies (1986a) and Assignments Help Students to Learn (1986b), these espoused features that have remained as BTEC doctrine, for instance work experience, integrated assignments, team teaching and student ownership of their assessment.

Since the 1980s, and in particular the incorporation of colleges in 1993, there has been a continuing implementation of a process of 'managerialism', associated with the de-professionalization of teachers (Randle and Brady, 1997), and the 'market economisation' of FE (Smithers and Robinson, 2000). These developments have not deflected teachers' loyalties towards their subject, the profession and their students (Elliot, 1987; Hodginson and James 2003), but have in many ways have diluted vocational education towards a generalised 'vocationalism' (Raggatt and Williams, 1999). Centralised control has remained funding-led (Smithers and Robinson, 2000) and along with inspection regimes has led to teachers’ and managers’ constant awareness of short-term measures of success and financial targets.

The new instrumentalism emanated from the marketisation of FE, which Ball (2008) attributed to Thatcher’s reforms. As Bolton (1998) argued:

Tory education policy was becoming more concerned with setting in place an education 'market' characterised by choice and diversity than with the nuts and bolts of curriculum and assessment.

(Bolton, 1998, page 52)

These reforms were accepted by New Labour, but they did not simplify the complexity of FE. It is not appropriate here to comprehensively examine or contest these effects, other than to note that these FE policy reforms offered profound contradictions for teachers. This is especially so for art and design teachers because since 1996, the FE art and design subject
sector has experienced massive reductions in practice time, and equally swingeing increases in staff-student ratios (FEFC, 1996). This also raises the question as to what extent their professionalism relies upon practice to represent vocational knowledge, when as Huddleston and Unwin (1997) assert:

The problem for many teachers in colleges is that the space, time and freedom for experimentation appear to have been squeezed out as the pressure to achieve qualification targets has come to dominate their daily life.

(Huddleston and Unwin, 1997, p 48)

Some tensions for teachers will be directly attributed to policy change and associated structural reformation, others may seem ‘cultural’ or a result of unintended consequences. A central issue for teachers with subject affiliation may be how to maintain and develop subject integrity; which is for some akin to personal integrity (Elliot, 1987).

Multiple policy and operational changes to funding and qualification authentication can have a disenfranchising effect upon teachers. Managerialism and bureaucracy (Avis, 2003) complicate the traditional FE tensions between vocational authenticity and students' needs. Although teachers are required to follow students' needs, they also need to maintain an interesting curriculum for themselves, as Bruner (1977) asserts:

A curriculum is more for the teachers than it is for the pupils. If it cannot change, move, perturb, inform teachers, it will have no effect on those whom they teach. It must be first and foremost a curriculum for teachers

(Bruner, 1977, xv)

This was the context for the research in one of many colleges that are dependent upon Awarding Bodies' profit–making priorities. All of these trends influence pedagogy, curriculum, assessment, teaching and learning (Hodkinson, Biesta and James 2004), with, importantly, different perceptions between teachers and managers of how change happens and is legitimated (James and Biesta, 2007).
**Curriculum Construction**

The National Curriculum’s content and underlying purpose is not the focus of this thesis but is outlined in this section as an aspect of the discourse surrounding the art and design curriculum, as it may have shaped current attitudes of students and teachers alike. Teachers and UK student participants attended UK schools since 1989, which was the inception of the National Curriculum.

The National Curriculum (NC) was a product of the 1988 Education Act, resulting in reforms, which some educationalists thought more liberating for teachers than others. Steers (2014) was in the former camp, whereas Maisuria (2005) thought the reforms more constraining. The principal significance of the NC was its centralising, staged, development framework. It consisted of the statutory Key Stages (KS) 1-3, attainment levels, attainment targets, domain definitions of learning, and GCSE and A Level qualifications. The NC for Art expresses its broad intent for pupils to:

> Explore visual, tactile and other sensory experiences to communicate ideas and meanings. They work with traditional and new media, developing confidence, competence, imagination and creativity. They learn to appreciate and value images and artefacts across times and cultures, and to understand the contexts in which they were made. In art, craft and design, pupils reflect critically on their own and other people’s work, judging quality, value and meaning. They learn to think and act as artists, craftspeople and designers, working creatively and intelligently. They develop an appreciation of art, craft and design, and its role in the creative and cultural industries that enrich their lives.

(QCA 2007 p43)

Importantly, art and design in the NC is intended to support the general curriculum, in terms of personal development and democratic effectiveness:

Learning and undertaking activities in art and design contribute to achievement of the curriculum aims for all young people to become:

- successful learners who enjoy learning, make progress and achieve
- confident individuals who are able to live safe, healthy and fulfilling lives
- responsible citizens who make a positive contribution to society

(QCA 2007 p43)
In 1986 a working party established by the Secondary Examination Council drafted a remarkably simply GCSE art structure which was framed as a conceptual model with three domains:

Domain A …relates to the initiation of ideas such as investigation, imagination and creativity…Students should demonstrate the ability to: locate order and use information; translate ideas from one form to another and from one media to another; develop a personal approach to selecting, organising and modifying initial ideas.

Domain B…relates to the student’s ability to select, control and use appropriate media and skills for the realisation of their ideas, feelings and intentions

Domain C…relates to aspects of art, craft, and design which provide (i) a personal context for student’s own experiencing and working activities; (ii) a wider cultural context informing the student’s appreciation and understanding.

(China, 2013, n.p.)

In plain terms, this was about children being able to generate some ideas, realise them in some tangible form and talk about them. Clearly, this is not what art and design, as a field of knowledge, is all about. The working party was constructing a framework for assessment and an educational sequence for delivery. It is a structural model which has persisted as an assessment framework about doing and making, which can be observed, and what they know, assessed by what they do, make, say and write. The implication in the arrangement of the above three domains is that these processes are sequentially arranged, that is, ideas precede making, and contextualisation, both personal and social, comes last. Art teachers may well insist that ideas can come from many sources in any order. Nevertheless, the above 1986 definition is an early example of an assessment typology configuring a knowledge structure, albeit for general schooling and not necessarily for FE.

The gist of the above thinking can be traced in the NC guidance most immediately affecting KS 3 and GCSE Art entitlement statements, which are compared below, to descriptive statements about A Level Art. The GCE A Level statements, as paraphrased by Rayment (2004), are in italics:

Record responses, including observations of the natural and made environment;

record from direct experience, observation and imagination
Gather resources and materials, using them to stimulate and develop ideas; *develop ideas for their work, investigating visual and other sources of information;*

Explore and use two-and three dimensional media, working on a variety of scales; *explore and use a range of media for working in two and three dimensions;*

Review and modify their work as it progresses; *review, modify and refine work as it progresses and realise intentions;*

Develop understanding of the work of artists, craftspeople and designers, applying knowledge to their own work; *identify the distinctive characteristics of art, craft and design and relate them to the context in which the work was created, making connections with their own work;*

Respond to and evaluate art, craft and design, including their own work and others’ work; *make critical judgements about art, craft and design, using a specialist vocabulary.*

(QCA, NC 2007; Rayment, 2004, p3)

There are several interpretations to be gathered from the above comparison. Firstly, the first three criteria emphasise visual and plastic media, the remainder underline the importance of language. Secondly, there is an emphasis upon the individual and personal responsibility for work, implying a subjective reality. Thirdly, broad differences between 2D and 3D, and art / craft / design are perpetuated as convenient or heuristic devices, without critical differentiation. Lastly, there is an implicit elevation of the traditional processes of observation, drawing and making as foundational bases for propositional knowledge; ‘knowing how is prerequisite to ‘knowing that (Tickle, 1983). The important message for this research study is that each of these implied characteristics potentially shape the approach to the study of the UK students on foundational courses. Students will have knowledge of artists and designers through the acquisition of specific skills, and will be able to relate their own work to them. The acquisition of specific skills to carry out the above is not emphasised in one interpretation of the NC, nor are the materials specified in the second, which often specify generalised categories of art, craft and design. More focussed courses involving problem-solving and problem-seeking, which characterise design practice (Carvalho, 2010; Lee, 2009), and real world application represent alternative models for the art curriculum, which is not that outlined by Hickman (2005) for the secondary sector.
Hickman (2005) sees the beginning of ‘an analytical, critical and historical dimension to art in British schools’ reflected in Allison’s (1982) conception of a sequential, developmental curriculum model in four domains:

- The Expressive / Productive domain
- The Perceptual Domain
- The Analytical / Critical domain
- The Historical / Cultural Domain

Hickman (2005) argues that these domains of learning intend to offer a balanced curriculum, moving away from student-centred to *subject centred, sequentially- based and outcome-focused* learning in art and design. Allison’s (1982) proposed domains corresponded to the NC learning domains, which detail the Knowledge Skills and Understanding of KS3 Art and design:

- Exploring and developing ideas
- Investigating and making art, craft and design
- Evaluating and developing work
- Knowledge and understanding

Prior to Allison, Eisner (1933-2014) promoted disciplinary, domain/ occupational categories for art and design education, emanating from the USA, known as ‘the productive, the critical and the historical’ to later include the ‘aesthetic’ (Steers 2014). This concept was earlier titled Discipline Based Art Education or (DBAE Eisner, 1988), which Steers (2014) saw as influential in forming the British curriculum. These overlapping principles of curriculum construction, whilst being 'hermetically sealed' (Torrance et al, 2005) from the FE post-compulsory sector, nevertheless had the effect on learners and teachers, of directing the curriculum towards academic learning.

In contrast, FE can provide full-time education in art design in a way that the maintained sector cannot, albeit it is more directly subject to many governmental directives for the improvement of national skills (Blunkett, 2000; Foster Report, 2005; Leitch Report, 2006), as mentioned previously. These policies were shaped by the discourse on the necessary effects of globalisation and the consequent promotion of the knowledge economy (Blunkett, 2000) and hence the ‘creative industries’. Higher Education's (HE) specialised categories of art, craft and design, has contributed to the construction of art and design curriculum domains,
which along with associated professional fields constitutes ‘practice’, for vocational purposes. HE provides advanced levels of expertise and industrial experience to the knowledge economy, and differs from FE in having fewer requirements for staff contact. FE students have therefore, potentially, more contact with teachers who can directly model behaviours and processes.

FE is a unique regime for art and design students, and is an opportunity to acquire a continuous, full-time experience, based on the practices of artists and designers. This provides greater emphasis upon instruction than in HE programmes, where content can often be as much the responsibility of students as teachers (Orr and Nuttall, 1983). FE had similar advantages compared to schools, where practical class periods are constrained by other timetabling patterns. In schools, the challenges of change included the preferences of senior management teams for craft design and technology (CDT) over art and design (Gast, 2011), which reflected concerns for students’ employability or readiness for work, and Awarding Bodies’ ‘entrenchment’ of CDT as separated from Art and Design (Gast, 2011). The combination of art and design with CDT, domestic science and textile design in many schools dilutes the extent to which art and design is practised and supported in schools. Their division in schools fuels ideological difference and can lead to the unfortunate exclusion of resistant materials and access to machine tools in art and design students’ experience (Gast 2010; Coles 2012).

Partly as a result of this dilution, some traditional skills have been neglected. Two Ofsted reports, ‘Drawing Together’ (Ofsted, 2008) and ‘Making a Mark’ (Ofsted, 2011) failed to include key traditional skills as priorities. The first did not focus upon the development of specialised drawing skills, perhaps contributing to the latter regretting that drawing was ‘a low priority in too many schools’, echoing Further Education Funding Council (1996) inspectors’ observations about the ‘relative neglect of fundamental specialist and vocational skills such as drawing’ (FEFC, 1996, n.p).

Access to specialist provision and expertise for art and design students has become more difficult. Mason (2004) in a comparative study of the teaching of craft skills in Japanese and English schools, noted the decline in the provision of practical facilities in UK schools. In 2011 a full time Level 2 (L2) programme was delivered in thirteen hours per week, supplemented by four hours Functional Skills in Mathematics and English. In the last overview of art and design in FE, an FEFC inspectorate report noted:
A few years ago it was not uncommon for there to be only five students for each member of staff and for up to 36 hours to be timetabled each week. In 1994-95 inspectors observed excellent teaching with a staff-to-student ratio of under 10:1 and 29 timetabled hours per week.

(FEFC 1996, p26)

This reduction in resources by some sixty-four per cent is within the experience of current FE managers and has had various effects in the different sectors. There is evidence that the popularity of GCSE art and design was declining; 155,700 students were entered in 2010-11, a fifteen per cent decline in registrations since 2008-09 (Ofsted 2010-11). This is within the context of an overall decline of eight per cent in the number of students in Key Stage 3 (NSEAD, 2015). CDT suffered a slightly greater decline of seventeen per cent over the same period. However, this is not the whole picture. BTEC vocational qualifications are the other main vehicle for accreditation in art and design. Level 2 BTEC art and design has proved very popular in schools. Registrations in schools for the current version of this vocational qualification have remained high from 39,118 in 20010-11 to 38,257 in 2011-12 (EDEXCEL/Pearson, 2012).

In FE colleges there were 7,992 L2 Art and Design registrations in 2010-11 (a previous version was more popular in colleges) and 6590 in 2011-12 (EDEXCEL/Pearson, 2012). A contrary picture emerges for A Level in schools, where entries of 42,633 in 2011-12 (NSEAD, 2015) represents an increase of four per cent over the previous three years. This may not necessarily contradict an overall impression of a decline in school provision. Schools do not in general require the breadth of resources that colleges traditionally provide. The increase in popularity of A Level art and design may reflect the continued aspiration of students to attend better-equipped HE provision.

Coles (2012) noted the gradual disappearance in schools of specialised equipment such as ceramic kilns and textile looms and the increasing reliance upon painting as a subject focus. Universities’ faculties provide a wide variety of subject disciplines. UCAS (2012) lists 73 separate subjects under ‘Art’ and 188 under the classification ‘Design’. Photography, Fashion and 3D are additional sub-specialisations. The gap between school provision and HE requirements is the role that FE fulfils, alongside a vocational, ‘work-orientated’ responsibility.
The focus for this research is art and design on a Level 2 BTEC course within FE, although its relationship with the two other sectors, secondary education and HE, has been important to mention. Firstly, this is because of its relationship with the NC, discussed above, and secondly, most art and design practitioners and teachers will have studied at degree level. Finally, just as FE art and design is shaped by the maintained sector, many of its learners aspire to undergraduate courses, which are the principal route to employment in art and design (BTEC Art and Design Guidance 2010). Universities supply the majority of art and design teachers. FE provides the majority learner’s first experience of full time, specialised visual art and design making in a variety of contexts; most University art and design faculties require some sort of full time foundational course, in art, craft and design, which FE provides.

Specialised visual art relies upon working definitions, and Hickman (2005) suggests art is ‘something concerned with making’ (p11). Art teachers would concur, as mostly they have no need, or would prefer not to differentiate between art, craft and design, as distinctions are blurred in the NC and teachers may not want to deny achievement in one discipline over another. Craft objects, Hickman points out, have the distinction from art works of having a utility, and the use of particular materials will mostly define the crafts. Design, he asserts, has more of a ‘technological / utilitarian’ quality. However, when considering the above practices and the acquisition of expertise and knowledge, when craft knowledge is considered as an ontological entity, this identifies ways of developing craft knowledge, not reliant upon, nor reducible to, the sum total of what practitioners do, nor solely the materials they use. The graded meaning of the disciplines is differentiated in terms such as ‘artist-craftsperson’, ‘designer-craftsperson’ and ‘artist-designer’ and so on. Research into design practice reveals that design is defined by situation and is context-bound (Carvalho, Dong and Maton 2009). The use and purpose of materials gives different viewpoints on theoretical and practical knowledge for both craft persons and designers.

In researching design education, Friedman (2003) identifies six knowledge domains or contexts, involving various elements of ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ knowledge, and stresses the importance of sequence in knowledge acquisition. In associated research into design practices Dreyfus, (2004), Dorst (2007) and Shay and Steyn (2014) propose a model of student progression from novice to expert status, where a mixture of declarative and tacit knowledge can lead to a ‘designerly ways of knowing’ (Cross, 2004 p221) Design education and training can have relevance to craft and art education, as design and art share a common language of
art and aesthetic criticism. Similarly, design and craft share a common language of making and problem seeking/solving (Steyn 2012). A familiar distinction between art, craft and design exists in the dualism of 2D and 3D as categorisations of outcome, activity and even student dispositions. The last corresponds with Lowenfeld’s (1952) theoretical differences of visual and haptic dispositions, which is discussed later in this chapter.

Lowenfeld and Britain (1975) had previously incorporated Piaget’s (1952) model of cognitive developmental stages into a theory which foregrounded student preference. Efland (1990) subsequently formulated his expressionist, reconstructivist and scientific rationalist curriculum streams, which drew respectively on theories of romantic idealism, and social improvement. These fundamentally different epistemological approaches that are variously subject, student, and sociologically orientated, are translated and reduced in BTEC’s declared purpose for the Level 2 art and design curriculum, which is not so much based on specialist knowledge as ‘personal skills and attributes essential for successful performance in working life (BTEC, 2010, p 4). Associated critical, boundary-crossing knowledge, or ‘powerful knowledge’ (2000; Wheelahan, 2007; Young and Muller, 2013) is here instrumentalised in service to the Knowledge Economy and the creative industries. The purpose of vocational education is thus incorporated within the technicist purpose of education as a whole, targeted at economic goals and outputs (Moore, 2004). The previous examination in this chapter of BTEC’s history illustrates how constrained it is by this purpose in delivering economic outputs, and how this limits the experience of art and design students.

This section has considered the influences on the construction of the art and design curriculum. The study reported in this thesis also involves an analysis of the processes of curriculum construction and, in considering that, I now turn to the work of Basil Bernstein in order to develop a coherent theoretical model for understanding how curricula are constructed.

**Bernstein’s Theories on Curriculum**

The object of art and design teaching and learning is nothing less than the personal, material examination of space and time, in space and time, with special knowledge developed alongside the personal and everyday – the esoteric and the mundane, the sacred and the profane. In proposing the structural link between the teaching of esoteric goals and the separately conceived mundane spheres of knowledge, Bernstein (2000) adopted Durkheim’s W
(1966) concept of *sacred* and the *profane* knowledge, which is useful in understanding art and design curriculum and pedagogies. It is possible to consider an art and design curriculum as a standalone framework of aesthetic knowledge, an elite activity for the consideration of 'sacred’ knowledge, which may well be part of its attraction, but that would not fully explain its importance and its power as a medium for also understanding the everyday, mundane world of artefacts, and sensory perception. In Bernstein’s terms (2000), the mundane and the sacred exist separately and interdependently.

The work and theories of Bernstein (1971; 1990; 2000), along with his predecessors and successors, provides insight into the principles of knowledge construction, of both *disciplinary* knowledge and *knower* dispositions, and of how the discourse of knowledge can be understood. These distinct knowledge structures Maton (2014) classifies using the terms *epistemic codes* and *social codes*, the latter having particular significance for contextualised vocational knowledge, as it is characterised as much by *who* you know as *what* you know (and knowing *how* compared to knowing *that*).

The *transmission* and *acquisition*, to use Bernstein’s terminology, of this knowledge is dependent upon material richness to match conceptual, and abstract or textual references in the curriculum, as well as cognitive and affective meaning. This corresponds to Hickman’s (2005) conception of ‘balance’ in the curriculum. Balance in the curriculum can also be seen as the successful acquisition of practical knowledge and skills which requires the following: the articulation of materiality and the material environment, that is, how the teaching and learning is equipped; the means of perceiving and feeling the environment- how the sensate understanding of the environment is processed; and understanding the structure or principles of the subjective and sensate as well as the material.

Bernstein (2000) conceives knowledge in the arts and humanities, as 'horizontal discourse'. This includes art and design education, where problem or processes are involved, and which is context-bound (Lawson, 2004; Steyn 2012). According to Maton (2014), theories or principles abstracted from such contexts, or horizontal discourse, can be increased in semantic density, or abstract language, allowing transfer and application in other contexts. This can be seen as a process at the heart of ‘learning by doing’, a tenet of instruction from Dewey (1938), Read (1943), which is bound into sensory learning and materiality in the views of Archer (1979), Itten (1963), Lawson (2004), and Cross (2004).
Moore (2004), in his theorisation of knowledge as a societal construction, points to the co-construction of knowledge from accepted canons and the disposition of the knower. Maton (2014) further codifies knowledge and knower relationships as *epistemic* and *social* codes, which he calls Specialisation codes, where epistemic knowledge is more likely to be identified with vertical knowledge structures, for instance in the case of technical and scientific fields, and social knowledge engages horizontal structures, such as the 'softer' (Friedman, 2003), fields of the arts. A principal point that Moore (2004), and Maton (2014), are making is that for every knowledge structure there is a knower structure, although an equal balance of verticality and horizontality may not be apparent. For the art and design student, it follows that the question of ‘what’ was made and said is explored by ‘what’ the artist was basing her work on, ‘who’ she was, ‘who’ were her influences, ‘how’ it was realised and with ‘what’ material.

Moore (2004), situates Bernstein’s theories as an alternative to a constructivist / positivist binary, neither relying upon the scientism of positivist views nor having to explain the relativism of constructivism. He sees Bernstein as offering a third approach, drawing upon Bourdieu’s (1984) concepts of *field* and *habitus* as traced by Moore (2004) from Durkheim (1977) and Weber’s (1966) socially constructed ‘pedagogy of cultivation’, and he proposes that a major goal of education is to promote *self-cultivation* (Moore, 2004).

In proposing the structural link between the teaching of esoteric goals and the separately conceived mundane spheres of knowledge, Bernstein (2000) adopted Durkheim’s (1966) concept of *sacred* and the *profane* discourses and hence knowledge, which is useful in understanding art and design curriculum and pedagogies. Bernstein (1990) asserts that all knowledge can be classified as 'esoteric and the mundane', as the sites of 'unthinkable' and the 'thinkable' respectively (p181). Sacred knowledge, in the educational context, can be defined as 'schooled' or 'official' knowledge' and profane knowledge is common sense or 'everyday knowledge' (Bernstein, 1999, p158).
Art and design is concerned with sacred aesthetics and everyday emotions of the individual artist (Collingwood, 1938), with ‘energy’ and ‘freedom' (Beuys 2007, p10) with the realms of ‘feeling’ and ‘reason’, and with the ‘brotherly union of men’ (Tolstoy 1995, p167). Yet as part of education, it cannot escape the role that it shares in the reproduction of ‘culture’ (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977/2000), and, as outlined previously in this chapter, is shaped by current neoliberal discourse in the continuing divide between the academic and the vocational (Wolf 2011), and between scholarly learning and manual labour.

For Bernstein (1990; 2000), schools and colleges are the sites where ‘official knowledge’, that outlined in policy documents, is ‘recontextualised’, resulting in ‘reproduced’ pedagogical knowledge. This process Bernstein defines as pedagogic discourse, which involves instructional discourse (a discourse of skills and their relation to each other) being embedded in regulative discourse (‘a discourse creating specialised order, relation and identity’) (Bernstein 1990: 183). This is illustrated below in Figure 1:

**Figure 1: The dependence of Instructional Discourse upon Regulative discourse.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional discourse</th>
<th>Regulative discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Bernstein, 2000, p32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The value of this succinct premise is that it serves as an important reminder of the structured relationship of pedagogic power, and the reality that regulation and regulators control the way in which teachers construct their materials. Whether teachers consider that they have been permitted autonomy or are constrained in their teaching, changes in regulation, for instance in the implementation of more external testing can have immediate and fundamental effects on teaching and learning.

The *production* of discourse (Bourdieu 1990) attributed to the sphere of the universities; the *recontextualisation* to official, controlling interests, for instance in this case, QCF, BTEC, Ofsted, Colleges; *reproduction* is in the hands of teachers. The delivery of teaching and learning is structured according to the principles of *classification* and *framing*. Classification refers to the boundaries between knowledge categories and framing to the processes of delivery and the relationship of instructional discourse to the everyday experience of the students.
Bernstein (2000) theorises the principal fields of knowledge as the fields of production, symbolising power, recontextualisation, symbolising knowledge and reproduction, symbolising consciousness. The first of these fields distributes knowledge, the second recontextualises it and the third evaluates it. These fields map on to various phases/education institutions, as outlined in Table 1. Bernstein (2000) asserts that as knowledge moves from one field to another ‘ideology can play’ (p32). For FE and the diverse practices of art and design, this is an important observation. FE has many stakeholders (Bathmaker 2013) and has been over-regulated (Wolf 2011) and ideological change can, consequently, be seen to be persistent, with many 'gaps' between knowledges, and multiple opportunities for arbitrary ideologies to be interpolated.

Table 1: The pedagogic device from Bernstein (2000) and Steyn (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rules</th>
<th>Distributive</th>
<th>Recontextualisation</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Field of Production</td>
<td>Field of Recontextualisation</td>
<td>Field of Reproduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic representation</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Consciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Universities; professional practices</td>
<td>BTEC; QCA; Sector Skills Councils; employers</td>
<td>Schools; colleges; teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planned courses can be seen as systems of controls, manifested in units of time-timetables which afford discipline and surveillance, and interpret their own version of the hegemony of ‘work-relatedness’ and vocationality. Such definitions mostly exclude wider career definitions of ‘vocational’ as a calling, applicable to doctor, lawyer, priest-, those who Bernstein (2000) classifies as opinion formers, more readily able to construct powerful knowledge. This is not to declare the vocational curriculum a sham which students cannot use to their own ends; they certainly do, although this knowledge may remain as a means of internally articulating the student’s viewpoints and feeling. The point to be drawn from Bernstein is that teachers and managers are also able to use the discursive gap, and develop their own controls within the school or college. It is important to remember the pedagogic agreement ‘of knowledge for (in exchange for) respect, guidance for control’ (Willis, 1977) has to be maintained, as does the power of FE dicta. Timetables need to be re-written, discipline maintained, surveillance and records need to be kept working. For Bernstein (1990; 2000), boundary maintenance, for instance the power invested in teachers, is a principal feature of the relationship of institutional practices. Features such as subject boundaries are recognised, counted, brought into evaluation, emphasised or relaxed and introjected into values and beliefs.

Firmly maintained subject boundaries, according to Bernstein (1971), contribute to a collected curriculum, as in academic, differentiated specialist subjects where delivery will be strongly framed. An integrated delivery, such as a BTEC course, is part of a weakly framed pedagogy, more often employed in conjunction with team teaching, and progressive methods which focus on students’ discovery of content, in a student-centred curriculum. Bernstein (2000) described this process as ‘invisible pedagogy’ (p72). He saw weakly framed, integrated programmes ostensibly sharing more responsibility for learning with students as concealing a hidden curriculum of control, just as traditional teaching practices more boldly declared.

Bernstein (1990; 2000) argued that subject disciplines such as physics and some forms of mathematics are examples of vertical knowledge structure, which are more susceptible to abstract distillation and paradigmatic construction. The arts, humanities and some aspects of sociology he classified as horizontal knowledge structures. Vertical knowledge structures are,
according to Bernstein (2000), accumulated, abstract knowledge, which establishes *epistemic* relations, as opposed to humanities disciplines, which are context-bound, and more dependent upon *social* relations. He noted that strongly framed, 'collected' subjects can also segue into weakly framed and integrated subjects.

The accumulated experience of students’ subjective and externally accessible knowledge, even the notion of the accumulated wisdom of the master craftsman, can be conceived as cumulative knowledge. Claims to powerful knowledge are those which affect meaningful change, and can interrupt the processes of social, cultural and, hence, economic reproduction (Wheelahan, 2010). Although Bernstein (1990; 2000), saw the arts and most of the humanities as deploying horizontal knowledge and as context-bound, later followers of Bernstein suggest vertical, powerful knowledge may occur in apprenticeships and ‘body pedagogies’, in ‘as yet untheorised ways’ (Maton 2014), and can be discerned in vocational design teaching (Steyn 2012).

Maton (2014:14) has argued that vertical and horizontal knowledge structures are integrated with ‘knower structures’, which can also be horizontal or vertical. He identified ‘knower codes’, and their legitimised construction, in the form of Legitimation Code Theory (LCT). Knower codes are ‘where attributes of knowers are emphasised whether described as innate or natural’ (Maton, 2014:76). He identified the knowledge and experience of artists and designers as both vertical and horizontal, where creative learning is as much about the personalised, subjective ‘gaze’ of the artist or designer as about the acquisition and application of ‘hard’ or vertical knowledge. LCT’s definition for horizontal knowledge acquisition, ‘knowing how’, combined with ‘knowing that’, parallels theories of *explicit* and *tacit knowledge* (Polanyi, 1967).

Maton (2014) develops the concept of knower knowledge and the artist’s *gaze* as socially determined, with varying degrees of ‘grammar’. He aligns gazes along a continuum of weak to strong ‘grammar’ from the ‘trained gaze’, the 'cultivated gaze', the 'social gaze' to the 'born gaze' (p95). He theorises that these gazes can individually develop cumulative knowledge and develop their specific canon. Maton (2014) asserts that the visual connotation of ‘gaze’ is not unique and that other senses, such as the aural or vestibular, can equally well develop a grammar. This opens the possibility that the concepts of tacit knowledge and acquired skill can be further explored via the application of a structured relationship to sensory characteristics; structuring traditional, intuitive, curriculum notions such as ‘good hands’, a
‘good eye’ and ‘trial and error, which are concepts frequently deployed to describe subjective, creative practice in art and design.

These theoretical concepts are important in the consideration of how the construction of the art and design curriculum occurs and how it is experienced by students, and they inform the analysis of data in the study. Another important influence on the construction of the curriculum is assessment, and in the next section, literature relating to assessment in BTEC qualifications is reviewed.

Assessment and the Curriculum

This section examines key aspects of assessment in the vocational domain, in which BTEC qualifications have evolved. Course-focussed purposes of assessment, including Criterion Referenced Assessment (CRA), which characterises BTEC programmes, provide information for student selection, student personal achievement and quality assurance data on course, teacher and college performance (Ross, 2000). Eisner (1993) is more explicit about the organisational purposes of assessment, which he characterises as to 'describe the organisational life of the country... to provide feedback to teachers on the quality of their professional work... the quality of the programme... sometimes to help teachers provide remedial help to students who need it' (pp 224-225). Bernstein (2000) points to the power of assessment as an instrument of control, and in the case of progressive educational ideologies, he claims that assessment focuses upon the 'intentions, dispositions, relations and reflexivity of the acquirer' (p47). This last point is important for Kelly (2004), who observes that assessment can be used 'politically...as mechanism for changing and controlling the curriculum' (p128).

There is a scarcity of relevant research in FE art and design on assessment, and difficulties found in the secondary sector may reflect characteristics in art and design across sectors. An EPPI review of research in secondary school art and design (2005) had great difficulty in establishing reliable findings from supposedly empirically based projects. The focus was upon how examinations affected classroom practice. The difficulties reviewers found were based firstly around how research studies were conceived and categorised, but in the team's opinion:
The field (was) preoccupied with visual rather than verbal modes of communication and expression, and (favored) theorising over research.

*EPPI Review 2005 (p48)*

The review team found that external testing in art and design was 'discredited' in many countries other than the USA, and most assessment by teachers was based upon course work and internally graded in categories. Clearly, art and design teachers must translate observations about sentient experience and processes they engage with in the studio, from visual (and haptic) languages into text, and ensure pedagogic materials are compliant with regulative language. Students are also charged with conducting the former, and are affected by the latter.

There is much theoretical concern with the frustrating and controlling effects of assessment regimes upon teachers (Eisner, 1991; Bernstein, 2000; Ross, 2000; Kelly, 2004). Within the performative regime of FE (Randle and Brady, 1997; Gleeson and Shain, 1999; James and Biesta, 2007), assessment of student achievement and high grades is combined with completions to determine inspection grades. Continued success within FE colleges becomes politically important. Some effects of BTEC's Criterion Referenced Assessment system are discussed in Chapter Four.

An explanation of BTEC unit structures and the ethos in which assessments are carried out now precedes an examination of key concepts and practices, which include CRA, with reference to a Bernsteinian (1999; 2000) conception of knowledge and the assessment of skills and vocational training, which includes some applications of Bernstein’s (2000) view of horizontal knowledge.

BTEC course structures use CRA, placing the emphasis on outcomes that students can demonstrate, measuring achievement against explicit, centrally devised, pre-determined statements of standards. Achievement is internally assessed and confirmed via internal verification (IV) and external verification, graded as Distinction, Merit, Pass, Referred and Fail. Previously, units were separately graded. Later, grades were also awarded for the course as a whole. Clarity from BTEC/EDEXCEL about what ‘referred’ means remains elusive (Carter, 2012). CRA is related to competence based assessment and both are considered behaviourist in conception, instrumentalising the process of learning by, amongst other things, separating assessment from learning and understanding, through attempting to objectify outcomes (Hyland, 1993).
Continuous assessment is a key feature of BTEC assessment, along with experiential learning, and the emphasis on formative assessment, with students taking ‘ownership’ of their learning within an ethos of student-centred pedagogy. Stronach (1989) points out that much of the rhetoric of the new pedagogy such as participation, ‘negotiation’, ‘collaboration’ and ‘ownership’ is congruent with humanistic ideas of change management is a characteristic feature of BTEC delivery and assessment. Learning and organisational strategies such as cross-modular assignments, unitised course delivery, core and optional course structure, collaborative working, team teaching and approval mechanisms for centre-based course content, all need to fit the ideology of CRA. This is confirmed in BTEC guidance to teachers (BTEC 1986a; 1996b; 1997). The assessment of cross-modular assignments involves the combination of assessments and their aggregation from potentially dissimilar contexts, such as evaluating learning in contextual studies and practical 3D. Unitised delivery implies assessment in separate bundles, which represents a challenge to maintaining relevance and coherence of learning. Core/optional structures require the structuring of unit assessment to maintain the primacy of principal content. Collaborative working and team teaching necessitates the involvement of all team members in the standardisation of assessment criteria and judgements. All of the above assessment responsibilities are now more focussed on centres, which requires punctilious attention to common procedures. In an environment in which innovation and diversity are nurtured. CRA also requires learning to be transparent, exacerbating its instrumentalising consequence (Torrance et al, 2005).

CRA and competence-based assessment and teaching had its origins in the USA in the 1960s, traceable to the ‘social efficiency’ movement (Wolf 1995). Hyland (1993) sees CRA as part of ‘performance based teacher education’ and as ‘reconstituted behaviourism’, providing ‘a new ideology with irresistible appeal to those seeking accountability and input-output efficiency in the new economic realism’ (p58).

CRA pursues a clarity of judgement which, in attempting to become more accurate or reliable, must rely upon narrower and narrower domain specification (Wolf, 1995) and ‘a never ending spiral of specification’ (p55). The instrumentalising effect on teaching and learning has been similar for students and teachers. These offer frameworks of accountability for both learner and teacher performance, as student performance, production of evidence and responses to internal tests all require substantial, differentiated recording paperwork which is ‘built around the minute specification of these outcomes’ (Wolf, 1995, p55). This is operated in a centralised regime of inspection and audit (Keep, 2006) described as ‘the most centrally
controlled in the world’ (Bassey, 2003, cited by Keep, 2006) and has had an unfortunate
effect in a large number of cases, rendering aspects of vocational learning less than
worthwhile (Torrance et al, 2005).

CRA is supposed to be egalitarian, but standards are based upon normatively derived
expectations from those which occupational roles require. Wolf (1995) pointed out that
teachers, as subject experts, are required to aggregate marks from a number of tasks, which
can require considerable exercise of judgment. She cites studies from the US that indicate
assessors have amended marks according to what they thought tests ought to demonstrate,
and that the tendency for such compensation increased with the experience of the assessor.

BTEC unit content is impossible to discuss independently of pedagogy and assessment
processes. This is in part due to the distinctive procedures of assessment based upon CRA,
and the ‘work relatedness’ that BTECs are supposed to exemplify. Unit content is mapped to
‘national occupational standards’ (BTEC, 2010b), yet content is locked within complicated
rules that make the successful delivery and assessment as much about compliance and teacher
accountability as knowledge and learning. Regulations are extensive, yet it falls upon
teachers to exercise a great deal of subjective, often partial judgement in applying supposedly
transparent criteria. In a review of BTEC assessment processes Carter (2012) finds that, 'In
practice, it is often incumbent on lecturers’ integrity to interpret them and so set the coverage
and standard at which to assess their students (p 203). CRA taxes teachers’ integrity and
frustrates their attempts at fair judgements due to intrinsic contradictions and problems of
aggregation and authenticity. CRA has had some positive socio-political effects in vocational
education according to Torrance et al (2005). Their review of assessment in the Learning and
Skills Sector (LSS) found:

…that the move towards criterion-referenced assessment, and its vocational sibling,
competence-based assessment... has significantly benefited learners in the LSS in
terms of the numbers of learners retained in the system and the awards which they
achieve

(Torrance et al., 2005)

The inherent difficulties and contradictions of criterion-referenced assessment have been
accommodated by BTECs in a number of ways. Firstly, the system allows an increasing
apparent autonomy to centres and latitude in the selection of optional units and their
arrangement. For example, in the Level 2 Diploma, six mandatory units and two further units can be selected from fourteen specialist units; for Level 3, five can be chosen from six mandatory units and there is a choice of thirteen units from a list of 131 optional units (BTEC 2012). Secondly, the responsibility for verification has been moved more towards centres and teaching teams. From 2011, ‘Lead Verifiers’ within centres assumed responsibility for internal verification, a job that externally appointed verifier/moderators had previously carried out. Thirdly, accommodation has occurred by allowing centres more autonomy over verification and the interpretation of assessment standards, which may encourage teaching teams to deploy more of their own judgement and individual control over professional standards. In effect, BTEC are preserving the credibility of qualifications by complying with government procedures and providers at the same time as devolving expensive moderation processes more towards the providers.

BTEC qualifications have survived despite the ideological contradictions upon which competence based teaching and assessment is based. Tensions exist around the inferring of knowledge and understanding from actions and outcomes which rest upon the interpretation of activity in specific (often synthetic) occupational domains. The separation of assessment from the learning process foments argument and dissent in many quarters (James and Biesta, 2007; Avis, 1999). These are part of the conflicting nature of tensions in FE involving flexible, innovative/compliant and accountable delivery, compounded by an increasing level of paperwork. BTECs had, until recently, concentrated on practical assignments, that is, continuously assessed coursework, which is dependent upon carefully kept, continuous reporting without end- of- course, external, ‘high stakes’ examinations. It is important to note that this system was in place at the time of conducting this study; the assessment processes of BTECs have recently been subject to further change by a government keen to increase challenge, so that, for instance, repeat submissions of work are now more tightly controlled (Pearson, 2016)

Eisner (1991) cites and builds upon Basil Bernstein’s (1971) concept of formal educational knowledge, shaped by different models of classification and framing. Eisner (1991) points out the role the curriculum has in conveying what teachers consider important, for instance the amount of time allocated to subjects and the grading practices used to evaluate performance in specific domains. By specifying the domain or occupational situation in which a skill is to be demonstrated CRA aims to ‘objectify’ the assessment process and democratise the normalising effect of graded examination regimes. As Wolf (1995)
demonstrates, attempts to make assessment criteria more specific and judgements unambiguous are inherently unachievable. The tacit acknowledgement of this may account for the relaxation of BTEC’s verification procedures by situating authority more proximal to assessors and the superimposition of another normalising, grading system onto CRA.

Unit specifications classify graded achievement as Pass, Merit and Distinction and do not specify what ‘referred’ or ‘fail’ represents; presumably, the last two judgements are totally in the hands of teachers. The Pass-Distinction continuum of Level 2 units in 2D and 3D indicate value laden hierarchy of safety to consistency to imagination / independence. As Torrance et al (2005) point out, ‘independence’ means independent from teachers and implies a traditional collected delivery (Bernstein, 2000) as opposed to an integrated curriculum, where pupils have more control over the means and operation and future action, for instance the opportunity to involve teachers or not.

According to Ecclestone (2003), formative assessment is directed towards individual learners’ needs, ‘the quality of their work and future targets’ and ‘does not contribute towards formal grading of final assessment’ (p109). Black and Williams’ (1990) findings on the effectiveness of assessment interventions identify the intrinsic effects of formative assessment, and its potential to amend and influence pedagogy and provide generalised benefit to the majority (compared to individual, higher performing students). The emphasis on future action in formative assessment is consistent with a social constructivist view of learning theorised by Vygotsky (1978), who proposed that feedback is focussed upon future potential, conceptualised as the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), as opposed to backward-looking, assessment of student deficit. ZPD, according to Vygotsky (1978), is where more effective, socially interactive, learning takes place and involves the participation of others more competent than the learner, such as the teacher or another student. This interdependent concept of learning radically contradicts the objectified relationship of teacher-student that CRA projects.

Vygotsky’s (1978) concept of knowledge as socially constructed is similar to Bernstein’s (1990, 2000). Vygotsky (1978) was concerned within a Marxist context to maintain the continuity with socio-biological traditions, relating and differentiating the process of learning from what was being explored in animal psychology: linking epistemological progress to the mediation of ‘tools’ as language and the tools of labour and the externalisation of work. He was concerned with the mechanics of learning interaction. Bernstein (1990; 2000)
distinguishes his own work as being about the structure of knowledge, and the principles underlying its composition. The application of their theories can, in the context of assessment, help us answer different questions. In Vygostkian terms, what will be the next step, the 'scaffolding', in negotiating the student’s future learning, and how will feedback structure this? In Bernsteinian terms, what access to powerful knowledge as a field of practice is being offered? And how does this fit within cumulative knowledge structures of a horizontal, or mundane purpose, and vertically arranged knowledge structure of an esoteric, special or sacred nature?

Continuous assessment of performance against formal criteria and the development of Personal Learning and Thinking Skills (PLTS) and Functional Skills, especially attendance, behaviour and attitude, represent a regime of surveillance which, with the aid of Foucault (1977), can be seen as a socially reproduced function: ‘Surveillance thus becomes a decisive economic operator both as an internal part of the production machinery and as a specific mechanism in the disciplinary power’ (p175). His overarching view of surveillance would encompass all forms of assessment, but seems to have particular resonance in the field of CRA:

Our society is one not of spectacle, but of surveillance; under the surface of images, one invests bodies in depth; behind the great abstraction of exchange, there continues the meticulous, concrete training of useful forces; the circuits of communication are the supports of an accumulation and a centralisation of knowledge …the individual is carefully fabricated in (society), according to a whole technique of forces and bodies. (Foucault, 1977, p 217)

Teachers in FE are required to maintain pastoral records to substantiate auditable Individual Learner Records (ILRs), upon which funding depends. Pastoral responsibilities correspond to mentoring and coaching ideologies, which Ecclestone and Hayes (2009) equate with, ‘A liberal humanist ethos (which) masks confession alongside self and external surveillance’ and a rise in the influence of 'therapeutic education' (p71). They cite Usher and Edwards’ view (1998) that:

This is a pastoral form of governance, which ‘enables individuals to actively participate in disciplinary regimes through investing their own identities, subjectivities and desires with those ascribed to them by certain knowledge discourses.
BTEC’s progressive assessment practice involves a dependency on self-evaluation of personal learning for students, within a systematic process of self-evaluation for teachers as part of performance management procedures. Enlisting the aid of Foucault (1977) again, such confessional techniques can be seen in part as structural controls, mutually reinforcing organisational norms such as Self Assessment Reports (SARs), which are required to be produced annually by colleges and course teams, and are the focus of audit and Ofsted’s inspection.

Some assessment processes are prescriptive, described as 'must do'- and some advisory- 'best practice', 'suggestions', 'can do' and so on. For instance, L2 Guidance advises all involved, that outline learning plans give suggestions and directions for unit delivery and assessment: 'assessment for BTEC should be undertaken within a vocational context and must fulfil the unit grading criteria'. It is important to note that firstly, BTEC specifies that unit criteria are most important, indicating clearly that content (learning outcomes) and context are subordinate. Pass, Merit and Distinction framings are aligned as though they are a continuing scale (see Appendix 1). This confuses the useful distinction between judging criteria and grading guidance; between the more transparent objective, behaviouristic, character of Pass criteria- 'list', 'use...research', 'present ...information', and directions which are more susceptible to more subjective judgements of operating functions such 'explain', 'make connections', 'present coherently' and so on, which are Merit and Distinction descriptors.

Operative verbs in criteria and grading directions all lack quantitative dimensions and contextual definitions, but critically, the opportunity to restrict such definitions to the Pass criteria, where assessment could be more easily focussed, was neglected by BTEC. The typological alignment of the two sets of descriptors confuses the ostensibly transparent, process of CRA with normative grading terminology. The contrast is between the student being required to do or fail, for instance, get it right or get it wrong, where all can succeed. This is in contrast to the normative process of grading everything against other students' performance, where classmates are graded from 'best' to 'worst', as Torrance et al(2005) imply:

Transparency of objectives' (this), coupled with extensive use of coaching and practice to help learners meet them, is in danger of removing the challenge of learning and reducing the quality and validity of outcomes achieved.
Torrance et al. (2005) were clearly concerned that frequent revisiting and re-drafting of submissions would weaken the value of learning, as students would be more focussed on grades than on the depth of understanding.

To conclude, the problems with CRA as summarised by Wolf (1995) are the separation of assessment and learning, the never-ending spiral of detail in pursuit of specificity and the tendency of assessors to compensate for students' personal circumstances. These features are in addition to the heavy administrative demands on teachers, leading to instrumentalising effects, with the requirement to maintain detailed planning and assessment records. There is also, as Wolf identifies, a tendency towards assessment as learning, as opposed to assessment for learning, and the problems of grading for 'independent learning' whilst coaching repeated assessment submissions. These create tensions between behaviouristic and more student-centred approaches to learning. Finally, in the case of BTEC, there is the complicating superimposition of a normative grading framework upon an outcome-focussed regime. These issues are explored further in the analysis of the data.

The final area that is considered in this study of the construction of an art and design curriculum is the distinction made between 2D and 3D knowledge and skills, which is a focus for study in this thesis. In the next section, the theoretical distinction between these dimensions is explored.

**Visual and Haptic Knowledge**

The art and design curriculum continues to be created in a Western, visually orientated world (Jay, 1994; 2006; Classen, 1997; Howes, 2005). In the visual arts, a common distinction between subjects is that between 2D and 3D subjects, which have different occupational associations, with defined ontological qualities. 2Dimensional space is calculated as length x height and 3Dimensional space as length x height x depth. Their perception, measurement and manipulation in film, photography and television are labelled four-dimensional or time-based subjects, which depend heavily upon visual perception. Itten's (1963) Bauhaus composition course although based on sensory understanding and craft tradition of expressions, illustrated volume, planes, soft-hard, light-heavy and so forth in 2Dimensional exercises, demonstrating 2Dimensional capacity to stand for the 3Dimensional (ibid, p10-11).
Linking concepts such as in 2D / 3D 'Communication' (BTEC, 2010), 'making' or 'Working with...Graphic Design / Textile / 3D Briefs' (p 3) elide the differentiating range of senses to be developed in these knowledge areas. In order to distinguish the nature and interrelation of the subjects, I propose to redefine 2D and 3D in sentient terms using Paterson's (2007) terminology of the visual and haptic. The visual relies upon optical perception and the haptic involves the tactile, kinaesthetic, propriocentric (balance) senses, which I outline in more detail later in this chapter. The distinction allows deeper examination of the predisposition to rely upon the visual in curriculum structures.

The taken for granted hegemony of the visual, according to Ingold (2000) underpins 'Western culture (which) has fastened on the experience of vision to signify the value of objective knowledge' (p283), as Classen (1997) supports in arguing that:

Societies which give priority to sight (pre-eminently the West) will be analytic and concerned with structure and appearance, for such is the nature of sight.

(Classen, 1997 p 404)

In analysing curriculum knowledge in art and design and visual and haptic learning, three questions emerge. Firstly, why are visual and haptic capacities important to artists and designers? Secondly, and possibly more fundamentally, why are they important to everyone? Lastly, why are visual and haptic issues important now? It is important to establish, firstly, their general significance as well as their importance to artists and designers. It is axiomatic that visual and haptic senses are essential in the instruction of future artists and designers. As part of our individual sensory capacities the highly differentiated modal facility of sight has the function of distinguishing identity and spatial aspects of location (Milner and Goodale 2006), thus allowing us to perceive our environment. Tactile and propriocentric capabilities enable us to effect the environment, to move around and explore domains within that environment.

Milner and Goodale (2008) recount that the human eye has evolved to separate surface qualities perceived as colour and is particularly responsive to movement within the field of vision and to the fluctuating presence of light. These responses to light, perceived as colour, movement, and light and shade have survival applications, for instance in identifying the colour and hence the palatability of food, the movement and of others and of the self, and for
daily organisation according to circadian rhythms (ibid, 2008). These responses have developed as existential qualities that can affect mood and feelings. Preferences for colour work for our sense of comfort at home or utility at places of work. Movement and exercise, principle expressions of the haptic, are advocated as aids to maintaining good health, and interrupting our patterns of sleep can have deleterious consequences for attention and well-being.

For designers, anthropometric and optical characteristics determine preferences for drawing and visual observation. Lawson (2004), in a study of architects’ practice, points out the specific coincidence of the eye’s foveal area with an A4 sketchbook held at arm’s length. According to Lawson’s survey (2004), Eva Jiricna prefers to use an A4 format to draw, whilst Santiago Calatrava prefers the more personal and portable A5 format. In these examples, the relationship and purpose of visual formats via haptic manipulation can personalise subjective value to the creator and determine communication modes. The A5/A6 formats can be private and personal, A4 facilitates personal, optimised visual field coverage, and A3 formats allow group display and are reasonably portable.

Haptic sensibilities are not as highly differentiated individually as those of sight, and are in some ways seen as supplementary abilities, for instance when from static viewpoints, tactile confirmation is used to determine the hardness, weight or constitution of an object. However, from naturally moving viewpoints, vision is used as a guiding confirmation for physical movement and manipulation, that is, acting supplementary to haptic functions and affordances (Gibson 1986). Paterson (2007) lists haptic senses as more extensive than that of sight, including:

- Propriocentric (regarding the position of the body, movement of limbs in space);
- Vestibular (to do with balance, head positioning, acceleration, and deceleration);
- Kinaesthetic (associated with body movement, muscles, joints, tendons);
- Cutaneous (pertaining to the skin, pressure, pain, temperature)
- Tactile (about pressure particularly from the hands).

(Paterson, 2007, p ix)
In these terms, haptic and visual senses can be seen as: (a) highly differentiated each in their own way and (b) interconnected in their functions and hence interrelated when considering their operation in the environment.

Visual and haptic senses are not only a basic connection with our animal nature (Dewey 1934), but as Howes (2005) theorises for social anthropologists, act as ‘sensescapes’:

…the experience of the environment, and of the other persons which inhabit that environment, is produced by the particular mode of distinguishing, valuing and combining the senses in the culture

(Howes, 2005, p143)

Classen (1993) asserts that the world is understood and is expressed 'symbolically by way of metaphors drawn from one of other domain the senses' (p135) and the visual or oral/aural sensory paradigms are, she argues, characteristic of Western culture. Western cultural predisposition has other implications for the kind of visual and auditory sense that is symbolically represented by Western culture such as linearity (McLuhan, 2005), and the subaltern role ascribed to tactility. However, sensory perception in different combinations, are represented in all cultures, which underlies their fundamental human value, and their importance for information, affinity and feelings between individuals. However unpredictable they are, the senses remain a principle means of sociality and establishing social identity (Dewey, 1934; Lawson 2004; Howes, 2005, Pink, 2009).

Nowhere in contemporary western societies are sensory dispositions defined, deployed, exploited more than in the advertising, distribution, manufacture and consumption of artefacts, products and consumer durables (Lindstrom 2005). Miller (2010), argues that the transient self, expressed through clothes and style, is attractive to some peoples and less subject to ‘institutional instruction’ (p35); Woodward (2007) develops the idea that objects themselves are in the service of expressivity as social capital (p135), and Postrel (2004) argues that even a superficial sensory meaning may not be ‘cosmically important but neither is it trivial’ (p121). If objects are our sensory connection to the environment, and a key aspect of individual and social fulfilment, how much more vital is the developed awareness of artists and designers who will be designing and making the vehicles for our future consumer satisfaction? As our senses are physically located in our being, so they identify us as being embodied in the environment. Art schools and the art curriculum are as much about the training of consumer taste generally as about the improvement of artefacts through
manufacture, and have been so since at least in Britain since the Great Exhibition of 1851 and the introduction of the Design Schools (Bell 1963).

The questions of why the visual and haptic senses are worthy of attention now, and why issues around them should be problematised can be developed in three dimensions: the educational, the social and the environmental. The educational reasons I propose be developed in the art and design context, which will be expounded in greater length below. At the risk of oversimplification, the social and environmental context is best understood within the conditions of globalisation, the development of the ‘knowledge economy’ and the knowledge worker (Moore 2004), the increasing reliance upon the ‘creative industries’, the renewed interest in the preservation of the Earth's resources as homo sapiens' 'creative explosion' and the exponential increase of scientific knowledge threaten to exhaust natural resources (Wilson, 2013).

Our senses locate us in material terms to our surroundings as consumers, users and makers: art and design education is moving away from the child-centred philosophies towards more subject-centred approaches of DBAE and Alison (1982). It is in this context, with a central role ascribed to the senses that, I argue, justifies this study revisiting Lowenfeld’s visual and haptic duality. In the twentieth century Victor Lowenfeld (1939; 1947; 1952) along with Read (1943), are seen by Hickman (2005) and Efland (1990) as central influences in the ‘expressive stream’ of art education, particularly dominant between 1945 and 1960 in both the USA and the UK. Lowenfeld (1952) and Read’s (1943) view was that the child be treated more as an individual and should, according to Efland’s (1990) interpretation be ‘sheltered (by the art teacher) from the repressing effects of social influence to allow self-expression to flower’ (p236).

Lowenfeld (1939, 1945, and 1966) and later his collaborator Brittain (1975) developed interpretations of the visual and haptic which they argue are of central importance in the creative growth and development of schoolchildren. A visual type’s perception is exemplified, for example, in drawing and painting as expressions of personal experience, often resulting in depictions grasping the whole structure, and then the detail of observed situations. Haptic types’ sensibilities involve more movement, the kinaesthetic and complex sensations of touch and balance as central experience. Lowenfeld (1952) proposed the former was more to do with the depiction of the world as it is seen; the latter more a subjective response as feeling and more to do with affect, than realistic representation. Lowenfeld’s
(1952) focus differed, for instance, from Piaget’s and Inhelder’s (1969) interpretations. The latter based their categories upon the drawing demonstration of haptic or visual perception, whereas Lowenfeld treated the two dispositions as distinguishing capacities or creative types.

Lowenfeld (1952) proposed a basic continuum of visual and haptic types based upon earlier empirical research with blind children and his work as a teacher at the Hohe Warte Institute in Vienna, where he began to develop theories about the therapeutic value of creativity in the arts (Efland 1990). He concluded that his findings demonstrated that visual and haptic experience of the environment were thus differentiated and possible for many without the reliance of a dominant visual interpretation.

Arnheim (1986) attributed Lowenfeld’s realignment of the haptic in creative learning as socially situated and part of a movement away from naturalistic traditions in art and design. Arnheim contrasted Lowenfeld’s explanation of visual and haptic types by citing Witkin’s experiments in 1954 which proposed that ‘haptic’ applied to the tactile sense of the finger tips, an inner hapticity, and the outer, kinaesthetic sense of hapticity. Witkin saw the contrast between the visual and the haptic as part of a much broader category of field-dependent and field-independent individuals, where, ‘field-dependence corresponded to reliance upon vision, which is an outer-directed sensory, and field independence went with kinaesthesia’ (p245). Arnheim contradicts Lowenfeld’s notion of fixed type, by concluding that young people were shown as strongly field-dependent, i.e. visually orientated, developing in adolescence towards ‘haptic’ field-independence.

Lowenfeld's (1952) theory identified the visual type with a conventional tradition of drawing or painting whereby the learner, usually a child, is expected to depict an object, say a tree, as a whole then proceed to analyse the detail, the leaves and branches as an integrated structure. The haptic learner has no need to respond pictorially in the same way, Lowenfeld and Brittain (1975) propose:

The visually minded person is one who acquaints himself with his environment primarily through the eyes and feels like a spectator. The person with haptic tendencies on the other hand, is concerned primarily with his own body sensations and subjective experiences

(Lowenfeld and Brittain, 1975, p275)
Lowenfeld's visual / haptic binary is not dispensed with by the arguments assembled by Arnheim (1986), only their origin, primacy, and purpose. Lowenfeld (1945) saw them as measurable distinctions. Arnheim (1986) suggested that haptic dispositions were a developmental feature of adolescence and whether an aspect of internality or eternality, the tactile and the haptic are distinct and remain as features of a sensory range. Even Lowenfeld's (1945) findings acknowledged a greater incidence of visual learners. His championing of the haptic learner was in the context of the total dominance of the visual in Western realisations of art.

Lowenfeld, (1952), Brittain (1975) Eisner (1972; 1991; 2001) and Gibson (1966; 1986) would look further than vision alone to fundamentally understand the perception of the environment. However, we operate in an ocularcentric society (Jay 1993; 2006) and as Gibson (1966) asserts, the haptic system:

> Is so obviously involved in the control of performance that we are introspectively not aware of its capabilities to yield perception; we allow the visual system to dominate...The perceptual capacity of the hand goes unrecognised because we usually attend to its motor capacity, and also because the visual input dominates the haptic awareness....makes more fundamental contribution to the control of motor skill than vision.

(Gibson, 1966, p124)

Caveats to resurrecting Lowenfeld’s binaries of visual and haptic types could be firstly that his theories are dated and rest upon a psychological stage- theory of development, which had some credibility in the era when child centred art was the central ideology for teachers. This was when children were to be allowed to find their own expressive voice and teachers were obliged not to interfere. Theories based upon the work of Cizek, his pupil Viola (1956) Richardson (1964)), Carlile (1968) and Read (1943) supported such thinking. Secondly, the propensity to categorise and prejudge for ‘types’ has become unfashionable; single equality legislation (Equality Act 2010) and equal opportunity policies such as Ofsted’s (2009) criteria for ‘safeguarding’ and ‘diversity’ may have had a hand in this displacement.

There is more to Lowenfeld’s approach than the visual / haptic binary. His concept is developed within a humanist ideology and a progressive approach, which chimes not only with contemporary student-centred discourse but also somewhat with the thoughts of those who espouse the importance of experiential learning (Read 1943, Bruner 1977, Itten 1963,
and Kolb 1984). The importance of doing and making is self-evident. The world is a three dimensional phenomena and our experience of it, in visual art and design, cannot exclude a three dimensional perception without artifice. The acquisition and expression of visual and haptic skills at a competent level involves tacit knowledge where, according to Polanyi (1962), ‘a skilful performance is achieved by the observance of a set of rules that are not known to the person following them’ (author’s emphasis, p49), where the connection of the visual and haptic is not obvious.

It is argued here that visual / haptic theory is linked to the articulation of the environment in sensory and perceptual terms, which may contribute in one important way. The connection of visual and haptic perception as facilities can be discretely identified and sensorally articulated, interdependently, as ‘vertical' and 'horizontal' - theoretical and contextual - structures. This provides structural, interdisciplinary links in the acquisition of knowledge in the sub-fields of art, design and craft.

As Gibson (1966) suggests, vision is kinaesthetically determined:

> Vision is kinaesthetic in that it registers movement of the body just as much as does the muscle-joint-skin system and the inner ear system. Vision picks up both movements of the whole body relative to the ground and movement of a member of a body relative to the whole

(Gibson, 1966, p183).

Lowenfeld's (1952) direction to teachers is that the experience of the process and the subject is of primary importance. Whilst information and understanding are the eventual components of memory, a differentiated sensory understanding of situation or an object of study will help to fix the experience for the student. Similarly, the size and scale of the materials and the studio can exercise the vestibular and physical orientation; tactile and cutaneous examination can extend the understanding of the qualities to be examined, and how it can be interpreted visually and in other dimensions. The point here is not that extensive facilities should necessarily be provided, but, according to Lowenfeld (1952), positive consideration should be given to stimulus and the sensory ranges exemplified in given resources and pedagogy.

Gibson (1966) adds a socio-biological viewpoint:

> The capacity of vibrissae, hairs, claws and horns to feel things at a distance is not so different in principle from the ability of a man to use a cane or probe to detect the

W
mechanical encounters at the end of the artificial appendages at the end of his hand. The use of tools sticks, clubs, rakes, to more elaborate ones like screwdrivers and pliers or even fishing rods and tennis rackets, is probably based on a perceptual capacity of the body that is found in other animals.

(Gibson, 1966 p100).

Vygotsky (1978) considered tools as language and manual tools had a similar function for him, and signs as have a similar function as mediating influences on memory and learning and the individual’s response to stimulus (the environment). He suggests that signs have an internal function and tools an external function:

The tools function is to serve as the conductor of human influence on the object of activity; it is externally orientated; it must lead to changes in objects. It is a means by which human external activity is aimed at mastering, and triumphing over nature. The sign on the other hand, changes nothing in the object of a psychological operation. It is a means of internal activity aimed at mastering oneself; the sign is internally orientated.

(Vygotsky, 1978, p55)

Research on the use of tools and the haptic exploration of the environment in education is reviewed by Minogue and Jones (2006), who suggest that ‘the capacity to process information of a haptic nature is superior to the capacity to process visual and auditory nature’ (p330). Although visual and haptic sensory information are very closely related in terms of processing and storage, they cite studies suggesting that, when vision is available and adequate for a task, ‘haptic exploration may not be evoked because of its relatively high processing cost’ (p341). The review, which was principally concerned with how digital haptic technology could be applied in education, also reports the existence of a large body of research on multimodal instructional design where the majority of interest is in visual and auditory modalities, and that ‘there is little written about how adolescents perceive objects through the sense of touch’ (Minogue and Jones, 2006, p324).

The preference for haptic or visual propensities may not be clearly inherited but learned (Arnheim, 1986), and may be considered a discredited ‘learning style’ (Coffield, 2004). As aspects of knowledge, this does not preclude them being pursued equally, and articulated both physically and conceptually as the visual and the haptic appear to be important and sensorally...
related spheres. However, research suggests that they are not isomorphic. 'It' (2D/3D) cannot be ‘all making’. Making is conceived differently, visually and haptically, with different materials, tools, contexts; visual communication is different from haptic communication, and it is not ‘all communication’. As the haptic disposition can be articulated, as not merely ‘good hands’), so can the visual disposition not be explained as merely ‘a good eye’, so the possibilities of this adding differentiated perspectives to curriculum become more necessary.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has identified the recent swingeing influences on teachers and managers in FE, known colloquially as the 'Cinderella service', which, in contrast to the schools sector, does not have central curricula, but has been massively 'overregulated' (Wolf, 2011) due to the implementation of business ideology and methods. Owing in part to the 'voluntarism' of FE (Raggatt and Williams, 1999), I suggest that vestigial remains of previous influences accrete and can reappear. In a contradictory fashion, neo-liberal ideologies have been maintained in a marketised framework within which BTEC qualifications have survived. However, BTEC’s progressive ethos of the 1980's (Fisher, 2003) has changed and now offers a complicated construction of validation and assessment around the curriculum, with expensive quality assurance processes moved to being the responsibility of providers. The effects of these processes are explored within this study.

The chapter has outlined the key theoretical tools that will be deployed in the analysis of the data. Bernstein's theories of knowledge (1990, 2000) conceive knowledge as consisting of vertical and horizontal structures, corresponding respectively to disciplines that can be more easily abstracted and those which corresponds to the arts and humanities. Knowledge, according to Bernstein (1990; 2000), is also arranged as the sacred and the profane, aligning with special and everyday language. Bernstein's (1990; 2000) approach permits examination of a number of dualities, including curriculum knowledge as that of the teacher and the student, but also the curriculum's dual role of addressing the world and the world of art and design, and curricula divisions of reflection and making. Curriculum knowledge, in Bernstein's theories (1990; 2000) is generated from remote sources in universities, he suggests, then represented in regulations which are then 'recontextualised' by teachers into curricula as lesson plans and tasks. At each of these transformations of knowledge a
‘discursive gap’ occurs where, he asserts, arbitrary, ideological interventions can 'play'. It is in analysing the role of the teacher, the relationship with art and design practice and the reproduction of cultural values in this vocational area that I believe Bernstein's theories will prove important.

The thesis explores the 2D/3D dimensions of the BTEC Art and Design curriculum. In this chapter, I explained the 2D and 3D subject division as being similar to a visual and haptic duality. The implications and effects of Western ocularcentric (Jay, 1993; 2006) preference and the privilege this offers to visual education were outlined. The theories of perception as expressed by Milner and Goodale (2008) and Gibson (1966; 1986), and of tacit knowledge developed by Polanyi (1962) were discussed in conjunction with the influential theories of visual and haptic personality types developed by Lowenfeld. The point of this development was to argue that Lowenfeld's binary was developed as a child-centred curriculum and this may have applications in current interpretations of student's foundational development, and the role that experiential learning plays in this.

In the final section of the chapter, I moved on to consider the relation between assessment and the curriculum, with specific reference to the BTEC. A principal constraint emanating from Awarding Bodies’ (ABs) regulations is the system of Curriculum Referenced Assessment (CRA). Teachers' interpretations of achievement, according to competence-based systems, are notoriously subjective and judgements are subject to many influences. The mixture of competence and normative systems that are a feature of the BTEC can be particularly perplexing for art and design teachers and, in the absence of any clear occupational link, in many ways represent the remaining characterisation of vocational art and design education. The chapter, therefore, has pointed to the need to consider the various influences on, and features of, the BTEC Art and Design curriculum, and to theorise these in ways that enable an understanding of the nature of knowledge construction and the assessment of knowledge. This is an area that lacks an empirical research base, which is a key contribution that this study makes to the field. In order to examine the nature of the curriculum as designed and experienced in a BTEC Art and Design classroom, an ethnographic study was undertaken. In the next chapter, the methodological approach and methods used in this endeavour are outlined.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In this chapter, I describe the chosen setting of my research into curriculum and its delivery in a BTEC Level 2 art and design course, and outline how the construction of the methodology, which involves interpretive ethnography, came about. The first part of the chapter outlines my philosophical approach and the adoption of an interpretive method. This is followed by a description of the site of the research. I then describe the process of sampling and data collection, followed by an exploration of ethnography as applied to this context. A discussion of ethical considerations affecting participants, managers, teachers and students precedes the final section on data analysis, and concluding reflections on methodology close the chapter.

The selected focus for the research was what teachers and students did and said within a basic art and design programme. The practical manifestations of individuals' efforts occurred in a regime characterised by BTEC as 'vocational’. This was set within an FE environment reformed since 1993 as a competitive market of ‘accountable’ ‘providers’. Data were principally collected through interviews with students, teachers and managers, participant observations of teaching and learning sessions, and the analysis of relevant documentation.

The department in which I conducted the research was situated on a site independent of the main college; the art media and design provision was regarded as successful, had grown substantially in recent years and was consistently graded ‘Good’ by Ofsted. The subject area had high status within the college and re-development was planned for the department.

Within the department, a level of autonomy was granted to the Level 2 course team, both in terms of accommodation – the main studio was adapted from a displaced engineering workshop - and course and assignment design. The studio is illustrated in the section on sampling (see Figure 2), alongside participants' details. Managers and teachers were proud of the course' high-grade status, and were jealous of their tradition in assignment design.

Four research questions guided the research. The first research question was:

- How is knowledge constructed in the BTEC Art and Design curriculum?
This question was aimed at examining the processes of curriculum design and students’ learning. The second question was:

- What are the cultural values espoused in the curriculum and how do students respond to these?

The question addressed the relation of the curriculum to the external world, and how students experienced this. The third question was:

- How far is the curriculum driven by assessment?

This question pursues issues arising from FE constraints and regulations, which are characterised by the reliance upon complex systems of assessment, as outlined in Chapter Two. The final research question was:

- What place do visual and haptic skills have in the curriculum?

This question examines aspects of experiential learning within the art and design curriculum. The remainder of this chapter outlines the processes undertaken to address these research questions.

**Philosophical Approach**

Enquiry and research in social sciences and educational research is conventionally seen as being located within the binaries of qualitative/ interpretive and quantitative / positivist paradigms, or worldviews. This research employs an ethnographic, interpretive methodology, informed by work in visual and sensory ethnography (Pink 2007, 2009; Rose 2007). Qualitative researchers, according to Burrell and Morgan (1979), have subscribed to alternative views to those of positivists, stressing the ‘subjective experience of individuals in the creation of the social world... based upon mutually exclusive paradigms’ (p32). This is in contrast to quantitative methodology, which has implicit links with the sociology of regulation, the qualitative paradigm being associated with anti-positivist, voluntarist, ideographic epistemologies and paradigms.
Michael Quinn Patton (2002) provides a definition of paradigm:

A paradigm is a worldview, a general perspective, a way of breaking down the complexity of the world. As such, paradigms are deeply embedded in socialisation of adherents and practitioners; paradigms tell us what is important, legitimate and reasonable. Paradigms are also normative, telling the practitioner what to do without the necessity of long existential or epistemological consideration. But it is this aspect of paradigms that constitutes both their strength and weakness - *their strength is that it makes action possible, their weakness in that the very reason for action is hidden in the unquestioned assumptions of the paradigm.*

(Patton, 2002, p203, author’s italics)

Thomas Kuhn (1996) uses the term ‘paradigm’ firstly to describe the ‘entire constellation of beliefs, values (and) techniques’ (p175) shared by members of a given community and secondly to denote the elements of change which can be brought about by new discoveries, as when ‘paradigm change’ is said to occur. The implication in the latter use is that a new line of thought or discovery can further work already in existence; in this case that paradigm change implies constructive progress. Paradigms, according to Kuhn, structure the ‘community’ of its adherents, contain their ‘commitments’ (and) values, which are illustrated by ‘shared examples’ and permit ‘tacit knowledge’ based upon accepted practice (pp175-187). Kuhn’s conceptualisation of paradigms seems not to eliminate mutually exclusive or contradictory beliefs.

Erickson (1986) prefers the paradigm description of *interpretive* to *qualitative* as (a) it is a more inclusive description and (b) it avoids the connotation of defining interpretive approaches as essentially non-quantitative (a connotation that is carried by the word *qualitative*). Quantification of particular sorts can often be deployed in interpretive work, and it can contribute to the key feature of family resemblance among the various approaches, for instance the central research interest in human meaning in social life and its elucidation by the researcher. The interpretive research case study reported in this thesis develops the interpretation of what participants say and are observed doing using ethnographic methodology, and it involves my own reflexive participation. The focus is upon visual and haptic learning, and the subjectivities of the participants, in constructing learning within the regulative frameworks of BTEC and FE. The study, therefore, falls within Erickson’s (1986) definition of interpretive research, as it explores the personal and subjective beliefs of staff.
and students and examines the multiple ways they have of communicating their realities, including the languages or epistemologies of art and design.

Creswell (2007) confines his definition of epistemology in ethnography to the interrelation of the researcher and the researched, based upon the concept that knowledge is dependent each on the other. This is consistent with Burrell and Morgan’s (1979) view of qualitatively defined knowledge as ‘soft’ and ‘personal, subjective and unique’, that is, unlikely to be shared except in trusted, established relationships with the ‘insider’ researcher. Eglinton (2008) contends that participatory enquiry extends epistemology to include *sensuous experience* or ‘experiential knowledge’. This constitutes a language that is knowledge-specific to ‘otherwise silenced or non-dominant groups’ and *practical knowledge* (i.e. knowing how’) capable of transforming both researched and researcher (p59).

Interpretative ethnography provides appropriate tools for examining the subjective viewpoints of teachers and students. Interpretive enquiry is also able to incorporate the researcher's likely shifting experience and interpretations, whilst not necessarily resorting to relativist justifications. Although my data collection is based on traditional approaches and includes the use of interviews, observations, document analysis and photography, the subject matter and shared understanding of what can be known includes participants’ subjective, tentatively held viewpoints, based upon sensory and cognitive understanding. Eisner (1991) refers to ‘epistemic seeing’, and his belief that all the senses are involved in perception, hence concept formation, knowledge and epistemological awareness is best understood in qualitative analysis as consideration and acceptance of bias. This requires a constant process of reflexivity on the part of the researcher in order to respect and include participants’ areas of knowledge. Eisner (1996) also contended that there is an ‘expanded view of knowledge’, in that ‘concept formation is itself biologically rooted in the sensory system’ and ‘concepts are formed not only in visual, but in gustatory, olfactory modes, the lived experiences of students and their intentions in tactile and auditory form’ (pp 32-35). I take this to mean that the research design needs to pay sufficient attention to the sensory responses of participants and researcher. In the overview of ethnography as a methodology, presented later in the chapter, I include a discussion of visual and sensory ethnography. I now move on to discuss the sampling process.


Sampling Process

In the summer of 2011, I approached twenty-three providers who had large art and design departments, with the broad request to conduct research including students and teachers, comparing visual and three-dimensional teaching and learning. Four providers did consider the proposal but the remainder rejected the request. The reasons for rejection varied and may have significance for research in FE, which I discuss in Chapter Five. One FE department agreed to take part, including the main teachers of the BTEC Level 2 (L2) Diploma in Art and Design. This was the department that I worked with in order to undertake this study.

The setting of the research was a large art department in an FE college on the outskirts of London, situated in a Victorian school building, which was about to be redeveloped. In addition to the L2 course, the department offered eight Level 3, two-year diplomas, a one-year, post-A Level Foundation Diploma, and undergraduate design courses. Most Level 2 students applied to internal Level 3 Diplomas of their choice.

As part of establishing credibility with potential participants, the Head of Department (HoD) informed parents, guardians and teachers of my research project. Subsequently, direct approaches were then possible to students and the teaching team, with the teachers’ support, and I emailed the teaching team requesting their participation (see Appendix 2). A request for individual participants resulted in six teacher participants from a team of twelve, plus one manager, and two teaching assistants; nine in total. The main teachers were Chris, the course leader whose background was fine art, and Jackie, who had a varied background in ceramics and care. Other full-time teachers were Harry, a 3D specialist, Dave, an IT teacher whose formal education was in fine art, Marjorie, an experienced print maker with managerial responsibility, and Sophie, a part-time teacher. Two part-time Learning Assistants took part, Margaret and Daphne. Imogen taught mathematics in another part of the college. In subsequent chapters, I refer to all staff as teachers. One teacher, Chris, the Course Leader (CL), was interviewed three times, the other principal teacher, Jackie, twice, and the four others once. Two teaching assistants were interviewed once. Table 2 below outlines the profile of the teachers.
Table 2: Teachers and Learning Assistant participants’ details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hours per week teaching on course</th>
<th>Specialist practice</th>
<th>Approximate years teaching</th>
<th>Full time / Fractional / Part Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fine Art, Painting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fractional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fractional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3D Design, furniture</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fractional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphne (Assistant)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fine Art</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Information technology, multi media</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fractional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Printmaking</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fine Art, painting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill (Assistant)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imogen</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The course had four groups of students; fifty-three students in total, with twenty-five of those male, and twenty-eight female. Twenty-eight students initially agreed to participate. Each of the twenty-eight students was approached with a request to be interviewed, ten agreed and were interviewed once; seven of the same ten were interviewed twice. Each of the students and teachers completed Participant Consent Forms (see Appendix 3). The sample group was self-selected and was not deliberately constructed to represent the whole course group or to claim a strict relationship to the whole programme group in terms of gender or language proficiency. The students’ details are outlined below in Table 3.
### Table 3: Student Participants' details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Years in UK education</th>
<th>Male / Female</th>
<th>Diagnosed Literacy level</th>
<th>Times interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rana</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agathe</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarjit</td>
<td>UK ( then in India)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylivia</td>
<td>Kurdistan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timo</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**College diagnosed Literacy Levels:** Entry Level 1-3, Level 1-3 (Level 2 is approximately equivalent to GCSE level). Course ascribed reading ages as Entry Levels1-3 as 5-10 years; Levels 1-3 as reading ages 11-18 (see Appendix 4 and 5).

The students came from very diverse backgrounds. Timo and Agathe were from Greece, and had attended an American school in Athens. Rana and Sylivia were refugees from Iran and Kurdistan respectively, Erik was from Estonia, and Amarjit had lived most of her life in India; all four had been in the UK for two or three years. Anna and Elaine were British, from African Caribbean families, Dave and Bill were from local schools; Bill withdrew participation during February 2012. Except for Timo and Agathe, who studied art in Greece, all had spent at least two or three years in UK schools, and had taken art and design or Design Technology to Key Stage 4. All students were aged between sixteen and nineteen years old, and English was the first language for only four of the students.

The teaching of practical classes was almost exclusively in an ex-motor vehicle workshop, measuring approximately eight by twenty five metres, which the course occupied in two
separate groups, for all but three hours of the week. The studio is depicted below, in Figure 2, set up for work on a 3D assignment.

**Figure 2: Studio. November 2011**

Tables and chairs were often changed to suit various tasks and student groupings, in lessons for up twenty-eight students. The display wall shows supporting drawings for 3D clay work. The clay work was small-scale, with basic rolling and cutting tools, and the shelves in the background were the main storage for ongoing work.

The research was conducted in a highly personalised domain of art and design teaching and learning, where validity was best achieved through interview and personal accounts. My intention was to establish as much integrity with regard to the processes of data collection and analysis as possible. However, as Schofield (2007) points out, the purpose of establishing a ‘classical view of external validity’ (that is replicability) ‘is of little help to qualitative researchers in enhancing the likelihood that their work will speak to situations beyond the one immediately studied’ (p187).

This research also has value beyond a description of teaching and learning by imparting a sense of trustworthiness and credibility in the account and analysis of interviews and observations. In expressing their preference for the use of the term ‘credibility’ in place of ‘validity’ and ‘reliability’, Corbin and Strauss (2008) suggest that:
Credibility indicates that findings are trustworthy and believable in that they reflect participants’, researchers’ and readers’ experience with a phenomenon but at the same time the explanation is only one of many possible explanations.

(Corbin and Strauss, 2008, p32).

In order to enhance the credibility of the research I undertook to engage, as far as possible, with the participants’ regular activities, taking photographs of studio settings and museum study visits. I worked with students on written work and assisted teachers with particular students, when asked. I also fed back transcripts of interviews to all participants, and contributed to some learning materials, which established a route for dialogue, and hopefully enabled reflections and outcomes from interviews to be more readily accepted. Photographic data confirmed that 'I was there' (Pink, 2007) and illustrated the development of students' learning reflected in portfolios and interviews. My experience in FE enabled me to make appropriate contributions, but provided barriers to 'bracketing' feelings and preconceptions. I express below, in the section on Data Analysis, my principal expectations and assumptions in approaching the data analysis in order to acknowledge potential bias in interpreting the data.

Saukko (2005), in discussing methodologies for cultural studies, proposes three forms of validity: contextual validity, emphasising the social context of interpretation; dialogic validity (Foley and Valenzuela, 2005) with its origins in ‘classical ethnographic and hermeneutic(s)’ and ‘seeing the native’s point of view’; and self-reflexive validity ‘how social discourses and processes shape or mediate how we experience ourselves and our environment’ (Saukko, 2005, p350). These forms of validity, trustworthiness and credibility emerged in the research, contextually as the experience of art and design teaching and learning within FE and dialogically in the analysis of data from a number of viewpoints. Further, the presence of self-reflexivity was evident as the analysis evolved through various phases of involvement in the participants' experience.

In this research study, I paid attention to a range of sensory experience – textual, visual and others such as tactile – in order to develop a comprehensive understanding of students’ experiences. This orientation towards physical and experiential learning was part of my positionality as a teacher and maker, which shaped my general participatory approach in lessons where I looked for opportunities to be involved, usually following a teacher's direction. This formed a basis for arranging student interviews. My methodological approach was informed by an understanding of ethnography, which I discuss below.
Ethnographic Method

Denzin and Lincoln (2005) outline three characteristics of qualitative research which present issues for ethnographic methodologies. They list these as three crises: firstly representational crises in that the qualitative researchers can ‘no longer capture the lived experience’, as the principal experience is that of the researcher. Secondly, concerns of legitimisation occur in that validity, generalisability and reliability need to be re-evaluated in the case of the current ‘moment’ of the evolution of qualitative research. Thirdly, there is the question of applicability, that is ‘the potential for change as a result of research when it remains as text’ (ibid p67). These issues are discussed below in terms of my positionality and the rigour and transparency with which data were collected and analysed.

The case study framework emerged, as the groups to be studied were to some extent ‘discrete’ or ‘bounded’ both physically and temporarily. Creswell (2007) describes case study as providing, ‘in depth study of this (bounded) system' based on a diverse array of data collection materials, and the researcher situates this system...within its larger context or setting’ (p244). Denzin and Lincoln (2005) offer a description of the qualitative researcher as a ‘bricoleur’ or quilt maker, dealing in multiple images; a filmmaker who assembles images into montages, deployed to fit the circumstances, prioritising the experience over automatic allegiance to a research methodology. Boys (2000), in an examination of the BTEC GNVQ curriculum, describes the researcher uncovering ‘an underlying mosaic of the form of life’ (p335).

I adapted the anthropological tools of interview and observations to analyse an enculturisation process, rather than a discrete culture, for which latter purpose ethnographical methodology was originally defined. Similarly, phenomenological understanding, if not traditional phenomenological enquiry, is pertinent to this research in that a great deal of staff and students’ work was about the nature of the personal experience, as lived experience in painting, drawing, observing and making art. This was implicitly, if not explicitly, based upon aesthetic enjoyment, in turn dependent upon visual and sensory associations.

Pink (2007) suggests that visual and sensory material in ethnographic research is: (a) relevant to the situation of the researched participants; (b) related to the researcher's own reflexivity as well as (c) enabling the means of representing findings. I used photography in a number of ways to collect data and stimulate observation and, as she says, ‘hand back’ the visual to participants. Pink (2007) makes inevitable comparisons with text-based representation and
exegesis, and argued a circumstantial case for the parallel existence of text and sensorally-based methodology. The introduction of visual methodology is not made automatically easier to justify in this research because the subject is, for instance, visual teaching and learning. However, it is hard to reject the case made for visual ethnography given the context of art and design education if one subscribes at all to Pink’s (2007) argument for establishing visual methodology.

The reasons expounded by Pink (2007) for including ethnographic methodology, and its existence alongside, if indeed it does not supplant text-based methodology, includes its ‘relevance for local people’ (p5). Other reasons include visual language’s ability to extend reflexive interpretation and the transformative potential of images to ‘destabilise(s) notions of truth’ (Hall, 1997, p16). Pink (2007) argues that photography extends the power of participants’ inclusion by using their photographs of their own situations- especially as new technology makes photography more accessible. She charts the first uses of photography as a recording method for a word-based discipline and acknowledges that there remains a challenge for visual ethnography in establishing its contribution to the mainstream anthropological debate. She goes on to point out the problematic relationship between images and experience, which can be just as contested as the relationships between text and knowledge:

The idea that subjective experience can be translated into objective knowledge is itself problematic for reflexive ethnography. Therefore, an analysis that simply produces written academic knowledge from visual data has no relevance. Instead, ethnographers need to articulate the experiences and contexts from which their field notes, video recordings, photographs and other materials were produced, their sociological or anthropological understanding of these ethnographic contexts, and their relevance to wider academic debates.

(Pink, 2007, p120)

Photographs can also authenticate ethnographers’ claims to firsthand experience. As Pink (2007) points out, it can provide a privileged source of knowledge, or proof of the researcher's presence. She reminds us that visual images are not by definition material and their deployment is best understood as part of the ethnographer’s experience. In this research study, photographs were used to record work executed by students, some of which were then used in interviews as a reflective focus. Photographs were taken to record a visit to a
museum, as preparation for visits to museums and as records of studio situations. I also used drawing (which Pink does not develop as a reflexive tool for the researcher) of studio situations to supplement field notes.

Photographs can reveal many assumptions and personal viewpoints of the photographer. The more skilled the photographer, the more she has the potential to project personal attitudes and content. Drawing, as linear depiction, and marking of shapes and images, can perform the simple task of recording for recollection; before the advent of photography, military cartographers were expert in landscape drawing. The more skilled the draughtsman, the more choice they have whether to plainly record observed events or reveal a more expressive interpretation. However, for the less adept, or for convenience, a photograph with an average camera or camera-phone can record a great deal of detail with a show of verisimilitude often accepted in lieu of a more personal or objective record. Drawing engages the drawer, processing the perception and translating even the most inept marks into a record that stands for a personal involvement and ownership, a kind of subjectivity in assembling personal imagery.

Marcus Banks (2001) outlines multiple uses of images in ethnography:

Thus the visual sociologist or anthropologist adopts a dual perspective on visual media. On the one hand, they are concerned with the content of any visual representation; what is the 'meaning' of this particular design motif on an art object? who is the person in the photograph? On the other hand, they are concerned with the context of any visual representation; who produced the art object, and for whom?; why was this photograph taken of this particular person, and then kept by that particular person?

(Banks, 2001, p1)

Pink (2007) is largely in accord with Bourdieu (1990), who practised photography extensively and considered even the most trivial photographs able to express the schemes of perception, thought and appreciation common to a whole group. Hall (1997) thought images could be used to emphasise the 'contested nature of meaning and representation'. Although Pink (2007) discusses a range of reasons to include the visual, her rationale amongst the three categories that Banks (2001) identifies are: (a) the use of photographs as part of the participants’ reality; (b) related to her preference and reflexive purpose and (c) pertinent to the accepted modes of representation amongst ethnographers. She is most persuasive in
relation to (a), that is the use of images as part of the studied reality of participants. As Pink (2007) suggests, ‘Photography can inspire people to represent then articulate embodied and material experiences that they do not usually recall in verbal interviewing’ (p26).

Pink (2009) expands the scope and role of the physiological senses to develop reflexive notions of place as in *emplacement*, and space as in the *embodiment* of ethnographer and participants ‘to understand other people’s experience, values and identities’ (p45). She accepts that ‘sensory knowing’ can be serendipitous, messy and lacking explicitness, but rejects the criticism of Atkinson, Delamont and Housley (2007), who claim such methodological diversity leads to lack of rigour and validity. Just as Pink (2007; 2009) encourages us to look beyond the hegemony of text-based knowing in advocating a visual ethnography, so she claims that sensory ethnography can search assumptions underlying the ‘ocularcentric’ reliance upon the visual.

The justification for a sensory epistemology is not incompatible with social and technological developments, where individuals’ sense of place, identity and being can rest upon dreams that shape individual’s lives in the consumerist, ‘post electronic world’ (Appadurai 1996). Within this research, sensory ethnography became an important guiding methodology, which connected both visual and haptic epistemologies. Visual and haptic sensibilities are clearly connected, yet as Paterson (2007) reminds us, there is a 'Western cultural and historical bias of opticism...recognizing the primacy of the visual image...whereby touch is routinely debased and ignored' (p6). The examination of this relationship of the visual and the haptic leads Paterson (2007), Howe (2005) and others, in our ocularcentric world, to consider the dominant role of vision and what Paterson (2007) calls ‘The forgetting of touch’ (p59). He argues that:

That optical (insistence upon) consistency collapses three-dimensional, lived and embodied knowledge into two dimensional representation or inscriptions on paper... in order that they may join that same form of universally consistent, universally translatable organization as geometry.

(Howes, 2005, p68)

Paterson (2007) proposes the interconnectedness of the senses and in particular emphasises the role that tactility and the tangible plays in confirming and embodying experience, citing Husserl’s (1997) observation that tactile-spatial perception occurs through the ‘aesthetic body’, that is the way the body unifies the various senses in space’ (p80). Paterson’s (2007) w
phenomenological comparison of the relationship of the senses extends Pink’s (2007; 2009) definitions and applications of sensory ethnography into a tactile sensibility in parallel with, and contested by, a visual hegemony.

Should we accept that the visual and the haptic are related and are linked, that does not stop the dominant ‘ocularcentric’ preference from usurping the roles that touch and haptic sensibility occupy. For example, this can happen when too much emphasis is placed upon standardised flat (2D) formats, where the representation of materials substitutes for a more thorough examination of an artefact or experience of the material itself. This is the point that Paterson (2007) promotes and interestingly Pink’s (2007) lines of enquiry do not seem to contradict. Pink (2007) hints at the contest between sensory experience and text-based research suggesting that, in fact, sensory and text-based research work to similar ends. Paterson (2007) takes the examination further by arguing that the abstraction of the senses, from 3D to 2D to paper-based, is for the purposes of ‘geometry’, order and bureaucracy, adopting the kind of linearity that Marshall McLuhan (2005) suggests ‘invaded every kind of spatial organization from the sixteenth century onwards’ (p51).

For the ethnographer of visual learning, this re-drawn emphasis upon the totality of the senses has implications for the experience of the participants, as a possible emphasis on the (taught) visual could constrain the embodiment of experience in both tactile and propriocentric senses (movement and articulation). This also has implications for reflexive observation by the researcher, as consideration of space and place are characterised by sensations not easily translated into text-based observation. The ethnographic implications for representation pose equally if not more significant problems, due to the potentially irreconcilable paradigms of the linearity of text-based representation and the multi-spatial nature of lived experience. I became absorbed in the development of students’ learning and staff’s reflections, as the chronological, temporal linearity of timetables and participants' availability contrasted with the accumulation of spatial and sensory experience. On my part, this was alongside an increasing awareness of students’ and teachers' individuality, inducing at times what Bourdieu (1996) called ‘a forgetfulness of self’ where ‘the interview can be a sort of spiritual exercise’ (p 24) in data collection. I will now move on to outline the methods used.
Methods

The key methods used in this study were interviews, participant observations, the use of photographs and drawings, and documentary analysis, which are discussed below.

Interviews

Twenty-eight students expressed an interest in the project. Following a subsequent explanation of the likely commitment, ten students agreed to participate. It became clear that opportunities to gather all the students together were complicated, if not impossible, due to students’ complex timetables and personal study commitments. Questionnaires were very unpopular and would require more time than students were prepared to commit. It was necessary to focus upon individual interviews, audio recorded, to assemble data in sessions of 30-40 minutes. This first set of interviews took place in January and February 2012, with follow up meetings in May, June and the autumn term of the following year. The autumn meetings were brief confirmatory meetings to check images. Meeting dates are illustrated below in Table 4 (see also Appendix 6).

Table 4: Interviews and observations January to December

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Later</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16/01;18/01</td>
<td>29/02.</td>
<td>07/03;26/03</td>
<td>28/03</td>
<td>02/05;09/05;</td>
<td>21/05</td>
<td>18/06.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18/01;25/01</td>
<td>01/02;08/02;</td>
<td>21/02;</td>
<td>26-Apr</td>
<td>03/05;16/05;17/05</td>
<td>25/06;27/06</td>
<td>02-Jul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews with Students

| L5 | 25/1/12/ |
| L2 | 01/02/2012 | 03/04/2012 | 10/12/2012 |
| L7 | 01/02/2012 | 02/05/2012 | 12/12/2012 |
| L8 | 01/02/2012 | 21/03/2012 | 13/12/2012 |
| L1 | 25/01/2012 | 25/04/2012 | 12/12/2012 |
| L3 | 25/01/2012 |
| L6 | 25/01/2012 | 28/03/2012 | 10/12/2012 |
| L4 | 18/01/2012 |
| L9 | 18/01/2012 | 25/04/2012 | 10/12/2012 |
| L10 | 18/01/2012 | 21/05/2012 |

L = Learner, T= Teacher, A = Assistant Teacher
The purposes of the first interviews were to explore students’ responses to one piece of work they considered 'good'. The basis of selection for a good piece of work I left to the student. The outcomes of the interviews were a transcription from the digital recording and a 'synthesised' first-person composition both of which I handed back to the individuals for review and feedback (see Appendix 7, 8 and 9). My intention was to be as useful to the student as possible, hoping that the synthesised account would give them some ideas about alternative ways of developing reflection, description and annotation of their own work. In further consideration of their cooperation, I also deposited a small amount of cash for named students with the departmental materials shop. In retrospect, I should not have been surprised to have both transcription and synthesised account accepted mainly without comment. The latter were included in portfolios for the Awarding Body’s assessment sample and the small amount of deposited cash sometimes was forgotten by ostensibly hard up students.

There were two interviews planned with each student, intertwined with teachers’ interviews and regular observations in practical classes. A planned sequence of students’ / teachers’ / students’ interviews quickly became unfeasible due to teachers’ unplanned responsibilities and students' forgetfulness. After this round of interviews, nine of the ten students were interviewed individually with an extended array of their artworks between May and October. Transcripts of second interviews, containing multiple images, were fed back for verification during follow-up meetings with seven students (see Appendix 8 for an example).

Participant observations were planned to track the progress of students through the spring and summer terms, and became a means of arranging interview times and protocols. In the initial stages of my contact with students, I ensured first interviews took place with at least one other student in the room. Interview arrangements were often complicated for students, as in
many cases they were constructing their personal timetables for the first time in their lives; they had to maintain schedules from whole and part-day college units with part-time jobs and potentially heavy private study demands and valuable social lives. Being able to engage with students during studio times enabled practical assistance, which included arranging interviews.

Engaging with teachers was no less complicated. Teachers were very busy, and interview arrangements fitted into departmental duties time, offered in off-site venues, were often cancelled or re-arranged due to other departmental commitments. Research observation times were 'threaded' to coincide with the attendance of students I wanted to engage with, and at key moments of assignment delivery, encounters resembled 'hide and seek', not unlike teachers' pursuit of erratic attendance.

Interviews were semi-structured, sometimes conversational in style in an attempt to encourage sharing of feelings and recollections; my questions did not always exclude my opinions or ideas, especially where explanations of questions were needed. Wellington and Szczerbinski (2007) describe semi-structured interviews as more flexible, not needing always to be predetermined and potentially sharing control with the interviewee. They also contrarily, describe a ‘good interview’, by which they mean an interview format that gathers ‘rich data’, begins with easy, closed questions progressing to more open, difficult questions. The interviewer should, according to Wellington and Szczerbinski (2007), avoid double barrelled, leading, restrictive and loaded questions. Questions to students and teachers were all about visual and practical skills and interviews started with simple questions but did not always follow the above ‘good’ guidelines. The main interview questions designed to explore the research questions are outlined below in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Question Bank for Teachers' Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are your main priorities in teaching this curriculum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What are your main values in teaching art and design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What do you identify as the visual skills you want your students to develop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How do you plan for this learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What are the main characteristics of a good outcome?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What do you identify as the making skills you want your students to develop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How do you plan for this learning?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Where do you get your ideas from in relation to the teaching of visual and making skills?

The questions allowed a broad examination of the curriculum, including aspects that were delivered and created mid-way through a course. They were intended to capture the experience of teachers and student participants of the course, to include reference to managerial and FE Sector topics. I include an example of a teacher's interview in Appendix 10.

The BTEC L2 qualification was composed of six units selected from a range of thirteen units (BTEC 2010), with three units considered as ‘core’ or essential. The thirteen units are ‘given’, although their local interpretation into meaningful learning situations depends on teachers and their institutions. Interpretations may differ according to teachers’ experience as art and design practitioners and their own understandings of what was wanted, and in this case, their own personal experiences of education. On this course teachers were allowed some autonomy by departmental managers as long as the ‘success rates’ remained good. Not unexpectedly, teachers had differing views about key issues. It was the CL's, and another principal teacher’s job to manage the variety of knowledge and attitudes, once senior managers had allocated the team.

One of the research questions addresses the place of visual and practical / haptic skills in an introductory art and design programme, where the visual is mainly about perception, observation, aesthetic appreciation, and the haptic is about tactile senses, manipulation and making, associated with balance, movement and spatial articulation. An associated issue is about the students' experience and understanding of visual and haptic skills and the relationship between student and staff's experience of the curriculum.

It was the teachers’ job to create meaningful and successful experiences for their students, taking account of constraints, their understanding of students’ needs, drawing upon their own experience of art and design, and their training as teachers. Teachers’ ideas, personalities, preferences and ideologies will inform students’ concepts of visual and haptic skills as will teachers’ concepts of the knowledge they will be assessing. These are taken as principle factors shaping students' responses, which I explored through the research questions.
In this research, students selected work to be discussed in interviews. Interview questions to students are listed below in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: Question Bank for Students' Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is your main priority in attending this course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What do you think the teacher’s priorities are?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is the main value of learning about art and design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do students get involved in planning own work or assignments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What visual skills are you learning on the course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are you involved in planning for learning visual skills?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What are the main practical skills to develop – tools, materials etc?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Are you involved in planning for learning practical skills?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What were the aims of a lesson you had recently?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What visual/making skills were you aiming to develop in this session and how do you think the lesson went?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What visual and making skills were you asked to develop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How do teachers decide what is good?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopting a formal approach, as Wellington and Szczerbinski (2007) suggested, would maintain a separation of interviewer/interviewee; implying an outside control or scrutiny that might, in students’ eyes, seem too controlling and, in teachers’ minds, be arrogantly assuming an end or purpose to a creative process. My concern was to move towards a balance or better use of what Fontana and Frey (2005) refer to as the ‘problematic of power’ and the ‘asymmetric nature of the interview’ (p639).

Kvale (2006) compares the interview relationship of interviewer and interviewee to that of Grandmother and Little Red Riding Hood, with no assumption of a redemption, that is, a happy ending. He argues that ‘a research interview is not an open and dominance-free dialogue between equal partners, but a specific, hierarchical and instrumental form of conversation’ (p486). He urges us to avoid the ‘qualitative progressive myth where dialogic interviews are in themselves (seen as) good and emancipating’. He cites feminist researchers, for instance, objecting to such assumptions as may exist as ‘social lubricants to elicit unguarded confidences’, which may ‘instrumentalise human relationships’ (p482). Kvale
(2006) urges us to recognise the power dynamics of the interview, because in overlooking them we ‘may seriously impair the validity of the knowledge constructed’ (p486).

My awareness of such imbalances was more acute when interviewing students, most of whom were almost fifty years younger than me; of the ten student participants, seven were female. I was able to partly counter an imbalance by initially interviewing students in small groups, and secondly by offering, rather arrogantly in retrospect, a suggested re-structured version of the interview in the(ir) first person. A critical, but receding, sense of power imbalance remained with teachers, as my previous work as an Ofsted inspector probably created an initial, critical sense of suspicion. I was able to mitigate some of the tension that this may have caused by holding off-site interviews with coffee supplied, and leading a session for the department on preparation for inspection. This was in addition to offering my services in studios, as directed by teachers.

I attempted to mitigate differences by shaping teacher interviews towards what Kvale (2006) calls ‘dialogic’ interviews, and student interviews towards a curiosity in their work. The recurrent feeling was that I moved towards a student sensibility when talking with students, towards a teacher’s when talking with teachers, and a managerial outlook when talking with managers. Smith and Osborn (2003) conceptualised the attempt to makes sense of another’s personal world below:

Thus a two stage interpretation process, or double hermeneutic, is involved. The participants are trying to make sense of their world; the researcher is trying to make sense of the participants trying to make sense of theirs...(which) combines empathic hermeneutics and questioning hermeneutics...(and) can also involve asking critical questions of the texts of participants.

(Smith and Osborn, 2003, p51).

As indicated above, it quickly became difficult for students and staff to keep appointments for interviews. Interviews were usually scheduled to take place within college hours. Teachers might be called away to cover at short notice for staff absence and students found it difficult to balance college commitments with personal circumstances and having to remember to engage in additional thirty or forty minute conversations about their work. Consequently, cancelled appointments and ‘no shows’ sometimes became short observations in the hope of more extended future contact. I could attend lessons to observe and participate
as I wished. My participation in teaching sessions was supplemented by contributions to museum research on behalf of teachers.

**Participant Observations**

Initial observations were to generally observe students, to introduce myself to staff and students and to following up any interest that might be shown towards participation. Attendances were timed to coincide with the agreed dates for interviews with students and visits to galleries, and enabled me to observe a staff meeting and collect planning information. Observations aimed to observe key stages of the course, such as the introduction of an assignment, assessment and feedback sessions, gallery visits or a staff interaction. Class attendances were rarely non-participant observations, as I was inevitably drawn into assisting students, initially with reading, comprehension, writing and their reflections upon work, and later assisting materially with constructions.

Teaching sessions were often hectic; my field notes were frequently interrupted and in other cases remained as brief notes of main events. I was able to use rough drawings and photographs to record the layout of the main studio and took photographs of main physical features in the studio and of students’ work. Lessons were mainly in the studio but also in computer suites and occasionally in the main departmental building when the studio was too cold for classes. I took part in museum visits to the Tate Modern and the Victoria and Albert Museum and was able on both occasions to create handouts for students about available exhibits. Observations also took place in and around the college, during individual student assessment feedback sessions, a summarising quality assurance meeting, at the end of year final exhibitions and during the preparation for exhibitions - for example preparing and painting display panels.

Students had plenty of guidance and ‘how to’ handouts to progress assignments through numerous tasks, and handouts about artists to be researched. Where progress with practical tasks was halted, students were encouraged to complete ‘annotations’ and ‘evaluations’. Later in term three, as I became more familiar with studio routine, my presence began to resemble an 'inattentive drowsiness' which I may have induced 'by illusions of déjà-vu and déjà-entendu, in order to enter into the distinctive personal history and to attempt to gain the understanding of…each life story' (Bourdieu, 1996, p23). My attention was drawn increasingly in these sessions to the physical characteristics of the environment; the W
arrangement of the tables, the temperature and sound of the ‘workshop’ atmosphere, the sink, the materials cupboards, lockers, the intrusive sound of the heater (see Appendix 11). I refer to this stage as Phase Two in data development. The controlled seating of students became increasingly significant and student activity in the studio was sedentary; students usually remained at the same worktable throughout a lesson. Tables were arranged by teachers to reflect the nature of the learning in hand, for instance when set for specialised groups as part of Final Major Projects (FMPs) (see also Appendix 12).

**Photographs and Drawings**

The main body of photographs I took were of: (a) students’ work; (b) the studio and its main features such as display, storage and equipment and (c) external visits. I photographed work for reference, for use as prompts in interviews and the final A3 portfolios and exhibition were photographed extensively. Some students undertook a late exercise in photographing a journey, with variable results. I was not granted permission to video, nor aurally record lessons. Drawings during observations were made to record room layout in use, the relationships of students in informal sub-groups, alterations in the managed room, for instance to accommodate a changed studio use, and to record a feature such as an unusual student group or posture. In complying with my agreement not to photographically depict students, I refrained from drawing students as I considered drawing to be personal and subjective relating to the subject and felt this would have been unhelpful and intrusive. The principal format for the presentation of students’ work was A3, arranged as portfolios of transparent sleeves. The more productive students produced five or six of these portfolios, each containing fifty sleeves of work. These contained designs, drawings, photographs and written annotations to their work.

**Documentary Analysis**

Course and college planning documentation was extensive. The academic year was framed over three terms through four college-devised integrated assignments (see Appendix 13): *Me Myself and I; 3D Vessels; Still Life* and *Natural Forms*. The last led to a Final Major Project (FMP). FMPs were based upon the students selected specialised pathway –either Fine Art, Graphic Design, 3D Design, Fashion Design or Photography- and their preparation for
progression to their chosen next Level 3, two-year Diploma course. Assignment briefs were based around BTEC units, between two and three units each with unit content, grading criteria, associated guidance, and material referenced to national occupational standards. These were also accompanied with task sheets, handouts and prompts created by teachers, often illustrated with images, which became primary learning material; teachers produced extensive and varied supplementary materials to assignments. These materials were also analysed in relation to the research questions. A content analysis of these was undertaken in which evidence of: (a) approaches to knowledge construction; (b) cultural constructions within the curriculum; (c) assessment shaping the curriculum and (d) approaches to visual and haptic learning were identified.

The principal data sets created from interviews, documents and observations were:

- Twelve interviews with teachers.
- Seventeen interviews with students.
- Sixteen observation and field notes, including sixteen photographs of work situations.
- Course planning documents and assessment records (see Appendix 14)
- Visual records of student’s work including ten portfolios each with an average of eighty works
- BTEC units, guidance.
- FE documentation and Ofsted’s Common Inspection Framework.

Documentary analysis was also based on BTEC frameworks and guidance, the units' content, the Common Inspection Framework (CIF) and the College Inspectors Handbook (2011). Unit specification and guidance for the course and publications was reviewed from formative periods in BTEC’s history. Documents were analysed from four perspectives: as the specialist curriculum, as sources of the broader curriculum content, as regulative boundaries, and as indicators of visual and haptic knowledge. The college management and participants were aware of my positionality and the purposes of my research, which I go on to discuss below.

**Ethics and Positionality**

In accordance with The University of Sheffield’s requirements, all prospective participants were informed of the purposes of the research via a Participants’ Information form approval.
and consent was sought and obtained early. This was to allow lengthy open-ended contact with participants over the course of an academic year, and in the likely withdrawal of cooperation in the fast changing world of FE, should the college team's initial interest be postponed. Access was negotiated with significant constraints, in compliance with the ethical considerations of the college (see Appendix 15). These shaped the research towards an observation and interview-focused project, with restricted permissions to make visual records. Access to personal details about students was limited and any visual recording of students was denied as was, initially, entry to staff rooms where individual student records were kept. The Head of Department (HoD) informed students’ parents of the research project, and permission to work in the college was obtained from senior management. I was known to the previous HoD but not to any current staff in the department.

I introduced myself to staff and students, and with the help of the teachers, gathered expressions of interest from twenty-eight students as a participant observer intending not only to undertake research but also to make useful contributions by assisting with written and practical support for students, teachers and managers. My positionality was based upon my experience as a teacher of 3D and sculpture, and a manager in art and design in FE, my practice as a curator of a modern sculpture collection and part-time Ofsted college inspector (see also in Data Analysis below). The choice of topic and research decisions, involved, but was not exclusively about three-dimensional learning, was influenced by my education as a sculptor and from working with sculptors from many different cultures. In my professional experience, I had worked through several phases of FE’s development, from Local Education Authority control, to it being centrally administered via successive, complex funding mechanisms subject to control in a centrally administered system (Wolf, 2011). As the art and design department was large and successful, I expected that students on the L2 course would have access to a range of specialisms, that much of the curriculum would include practical learning, and that record-keeping and compliance with BTEC's and other regulations would be a characteristic of the college's organisation. None of these expectations remained intact; some were overlaid with deductive and emerging themes from participant observations and data analysis, which I discuss in the Data Analysis section below and in Chapter Four.

The danger of my becoming a curmudgeonly researcher was mitigated by my belief in the restorative and positive influence that looking, doing and making had in the lives of young people when immersed in art and design education. As a kind of education, as well as part of education, I saw that art and design education has positive value in relation to the
economically vital ‘creative industries’ (DCMS 2014), all of which have visual and tactile dimensions. Despite material restrictions and swingeing impositions of central initiatives, art and design education still 'worked', that is, it remained popular at all levels of accredited qualifications. This potential contradiction fuelled my curiosity and formed a basis of my positionality, and my concern to mitigate any imbalance of power that may occur. Murphy and Dingwall (2009) outline these key ethical principles for participant observers, which I attempted to observe:

- Non-malfeasance: the researcher should avoid harming participants
- Beneficence...research on human subjects should produce some positive and identifiable benefits rather than simply be carried out for its own sake
- Autonomy or self-determination...the value and principles of participants should be respected
- Justice: the people who are equal in relevant respects should be treated equally

(Murphy and Dingwall, 2009, p339)

With respect to potential harm and benefits, it was clear that staff to be interviewed were anxious, perhaps about commitments of time. I attempted to alleviate concerns by limiting interview times to thirty to forty minutes at times to suit them. One member of staff refused to take part for undisclosed reasons, one accepted then withdrew, and I made it known that such decisions would not be questioned. It was made clear that comments would be anonymised as far as possible. One participant was concerned that her comments could be identified, and withdrew consent for me to use her interview. She subsequently reversed her decision.

My feedback to teachers was firstly via transcription, later including any amendments, although few were suggested. Secondly, an abridged set of findings was constructed, referenced to individual teachers’ interviews and their responses were included and responded to in my findings. All participants had an opportunity to read their feedback and meet with me to discuss findings. I felt it important to feedback any issues identified in my research, which might inform future practice, and to do this in a way that was supportive. My intention was to contribute to the understanding and delivery of the curriculum at a local level, in focussing upon teaching and learning of visual and haptic sensibilities and skills that students used in their reflective portfolios. In response to potential negative reactions from teachers I summarised and discussed a list of observations with the HOD who agreed that she
could reasonably assume that these observations were valid, i.e. that they were not necessarily controversial (see Appendix 16). This list of general observations was fed back to all participant teachers. Two teachers replied, one, Chris with a partial response, the other, Harry felt he could not pursue a dialogue.

At all times, I attempted to include participants’ concerns in interviews and avoid my role being one of ‘narrative persuasion’ (Murphy and Dingwall, 2009). In attempting to master ‘the distortions’ and imbalances of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1996) that are a constant danger to authentic interpretative accounts, I also took account of Bourdieu’s (1996) advice that ‘active and methodical listening’ helps us ‘reduce... the ‘symbolic violence which is exerted through (interview relationships)’ (p19). It was apparent during interviews and especially during analysis of both staff and students’ transcripts that the ‘imposition effect’ that Bourdieu (1996) refers to produced answers that risked ‘rebonding on the analyst... whose interpretation is always liable to take seriously (as) an artefact that (he) has manufactured (p20).

**Data Analysis**

As outlined above, data were gathered from interviews with teachers and students, and from participation in sessions mainly during a period of seven months of fieldwork between January - October 2012. Originally, the scope of the research was broad and included a focus on curriculum, pedagogy and assessment as planned by teachers and experienced by students. All of these areas were of interest as I entered the field and collected the data. However, as the empirical aspect of the study was nearing completion, and analysis was under way, it was clear that data collection had become more complex producing a lot of data in multiple modes, and I needed to narrow the focus of analysis if the task was to become manageable. Therefore, I decided to focus on the curriculum, which was locally constructed to a significant extent and revealed mainly in teachers’ course planning materials, which the first question explores:

- How is knowledge constructed in the BTEC Art and Design curriculum?
The second question is based upon the assignments and course planning materials, which are both scaffolding for learning and bridges to broader social values, explored in the question:

- What are the cultural values espoused in the curriculum and how do students respond to these?

The FE framework of external controls includes a complex assessment system, which requires strict compliance, subjective judgements and interpretations that affect the nature of curriculum knowledge, which led to the question:

- How far is the curriculum driven by assessment?

2D and 3D subjects are the principal specialist subject classifications. Their reconstruction as visual and haptic learning allowed an exploration of experiential learning, as accumulated knowledge, which the following question was used to examine:

How far is the focus on the development of visual and haptic awareness embedded in the curriculum?

Three phases of analysis developed. The first was shaped by the sequence of interviews and participation in the field up until the end of October. The second phase was marked by the concurrent assembling of data from teachers' and student's interviews as tensions emerged between my expectations, my involvement and affinity with participants, and the critical distance required to articulate various immanent themes from analysis. In the third phase I returned to the principal questions of the teachers' interviews, which I summarised along with emergent, grouped inductive themes. I illustrate the relationship of the various elements of data collection and analysis, and the stages of applying the principal theories, in Table 7 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary</th>
<th>Phase One</th>
<th>Phase Two</th>
<th>Phase Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Teachers' Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocols</td>
<td>Students' Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissions</td>
<td>Participation, observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>TDA1</td>
<td>TDA2</td>
<td>TDA3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>TDA4</td>
<td>TDA5</td>
<td>TDA6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Planning Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My expectation was that interviewees' positions could be aligned with my own relatively easily. At the start of the interview process, I had little idea of how arrogant this latter expectation might eventually feel, nor how complex the responses to apparently simple questions might become. The approach to analysis of the different data sets varied as my position shaped my participation towards that of collaborator with teacher or student, in parallel with that of researcher.

I used Nvivo software to construct open coded data and subsequent axial coded themes, in the manner of Grounded Theory after Glaser and Strauss (1967) (see Appendix 17 for the codes developed in this process). I have identified this stage as TDA 1. At the TDA 2 stage, I established an initial range of themes from: (a) the research questions, (b) responses of interviewees, as coded in Nvivo and (c) ongoing analysis of implicit and explicit meanings. This method was very time-consuming and had potentially unlimited parameters. This was unsupportable in the research period, within which I needed to contact and feedback to participants. Feedback was important, as my intention was to maintain a dialogue with teachers and students for as long as possible, and in this way participate and encourage...
reflection upon the curriculum. Marjorie had been able to engage in an exchange albeit by email and the main teachers were each interviewed again, Jackie twice and Chris three times.

Nvivo proved to be unstable on my computer, which twice had to be rebuilt; however, I was able to build upon initial codes for categorising and grouping of initial themes drawn from the literature and emerging, inductive themes. This initial approach, despite the mechanical problems encountered, was useful in alerting me to the complexity and richness of references in the data, and the potentially unlimited scope of analysis based upon grounded theory. However, for my purposes, grounded theory pursued incidents and observations, which implied my being 'bracketed' from the researchers' awareness and experience, which Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009) refer to as 'a process of repression to external 'neutral' things and relationships' (p 66). Whilst this approach was a useful beginning, it assumed a distance from professional and personal motivation that I soon felt would be impossible to maintain and would assume the suspension of my essential belief in intrinsic values embedded in art and design teaching and learning.

I carried out four further rounds of analysis, TDA3-TDA6, and aligned deductive and inductive themes, based on the work undertaken in TDA 1 and 2, and employing alternative visual images of data (Creswell, 2007) (see Appendix 17). I sought to identify topics in 'common sense' understandings, and based in the 'everyday experience' of participants, in order to provide an 'iterative and reflexive process' (Fereday, 2006, p83) of analysis towards interpretive meanings (Denscombe, 2007).

It is important to note here that I was not conducting this research and approaching the identification of data without 'prefigured codes' (Creswell, 2007) and a wide experience of the issues around implementing the curriculum in FE, especially for art and design. These are outlined and summarised in Table 8 below as Initial Themes. The second important aspect of this research is my commitment to conducting an ethnography, as 'learning by doing' (Dey, 1993), which reflects a principal learning tenet associated with experiential learning (Kolb, 1984). As data-gathering progressed, I was therefore simultaneously commencing analysis and searching for a framework to capture significant moments, issues and viewpoints. The complexity of this position reached a peak of conflicting priorities, a kind of contra-epiphany around May of the empirical process. Not only did I find my own views and suggestions deflected and avoided, for instance with regard to the primacy of visual and haptic knowledge, but also I was falling into an implicit collusion with an instrumental view of the
L2 course's purpose. Interpretive paradigms presented themselves prematurely, before I had adequately considered in detail the data I had amassed and would go on to collect.

In order to provide a focus for data analysis I employed a process of code selection described by Creswell (2007) as those that:

- represent information that researchers expect to find before the study;
- represent surprising information that researchers did not expect to find;
- and represents information that is conceptually interesting or unusual to researchers (and potentially participants and audiences).

Creswell, 2007, p 153

Based upon the sequence of data analysis proposed by Wolcott, (1994), Dey (1993), and Creswell (2007), as 'description, analysis, interpretation and representation' I labelled the data in the modes in which it was collected: (participant) observation, interviews, and documented material and visual images. These groupings formed the initial framework for data categories. This is illustrated in Table 9 below. The selection of labels came from a variety of sources, not only from events', 'actions' and 'shades of opinion' that seemed to be significant (Denscombe, 2007) but also, behaviours, commonalities and differences, recurrent references and tensions. The division into modes of data allowed an initial categorisation outlined in Table 8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation (theory, hypothesis)</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
<th>Visual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialising function of art and design - making. Learning by doing as foundational principle. Internal subjectivity and external language. Articulation vertical</td>
<td>Teacher as practitioner. Focus on individual realisation. Constructivism and relativism. Knowledge as societal entity.</td>
<td>Curriculum as vehicle for cultural reproduction. Coaching and progressive pedagogy. Expert and specialised (teacher's) knowledge expressed as distant / academic</td>
<td>(Acceptance of) ocularcentricity. Low tech, improvised isolates; supports the centrality of the learner's needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation (meaning)</td>
<td>Dependency and the 'pedagogic contract'. Control. Socialised relationships. Inclusivivity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caring ethos associated with identity development. Relationship of art practice to pedagogy. Trade off acceptance of instrumentality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance with regulative discourse. Belief in value of traditional exercises. Energetic production of supplementary materials to support students. 'Good' work defined with context of student folio.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis (why)</td>
<td>Forming relationship with participants; observing their relationships / influence; Anthropometric understanding; normative behaviour, student (sexual) attraction; passivity and uncertainty; control; instrumental acceptance. ability range; implicit acceptance of poor literacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tutorial / pastoral relationships; Need for intrinsic belief in art = 'good'; weak relationship to employment skills; enjoyment and motivation connected (intrinsic); controlling effect of paperwork; sense of autonomy limited; acceptance of insecurity and trust in management; personalisation of belief;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legitimising knowledge; tending towards quantified definitions of authenticity; belief in progressive approach; reliance upon strict task completion; intuitive / subjective understanding of good work / standards; assessment flexible both in interpretation and in specification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Degree of) Autonomy; management supply - outsources delivery; regularity not questioned; limited technology accepted as 'cuts'. Alienated and dissatisfied reactions; cultural reproduction; productive energy and shared excitement in work; ambiguous purpose of summary exhibition and assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Tracking participants; dictation of material surroundings; student groupings; sedentary working; compliance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restorative value of art and design education; focus on individual value/ benefit; business; fragmented time; fragmented space; variety of viewpoints;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complexity; strong legitimation process; weak specification. Creative for students, tension with compliance for approval; degree of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studio; furniture; materials; equipment; display. Tate, dispersed groupings; new groupings; absence of some students. Work extensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data categorisation in Table 8 outlines different types of data and related issues. They also had, in my view, different 'power', or significance for labelling. The visual work of the students was remarkably energetic and displayed varied and expressive, observational work, which I believe is evidenced in Appendix 18. This work was also evidence for individual achievement and to a large extent justified the internal praise for the course. The observations and participations were telling, as I was often drawn into helping a student with written reflection (for example with Sylivia), or practical realisation of maquettes or techniques (with Amarjit), rolling clay (with Anna) and other students, and expanding on teachers’ input (at the Tate Modern). Interviews, which were planned as a series of dialogues, became stand-alone evidence except for the contribution of three main teachers. Documentation was voluminous, especially from BTEC, and from the college was based upon Ofsted-type regulative planning procedures. BTEC documentation, which I detail elsewhere, was 'open' as Jackie said, which was interpreted also as being vague and unspecific, but allowed the creation of much more informative material - the assignments. This was the material the students referred to and identified as progress in second interviews. This was documentation originated by teachers and was more specific, committed and explicitly shaping of the students' experience.

In revisiting data to categorise and aggregate themes I acknowledged the requirement to test if data 'fitted' the abstracted interpretation (Denscombe, 2007) and to check for bias and foregrounding of personal, deductive themes. For example, whilst my intention to explore 2D and 3D categorisation was fundamental to the research project, I had not anticipated the extent to which haptic experience was more essential to both visual and making, and how this involved the consideration of tacit knowledge (Polanyi, 1962) and ecological perspectives Gibson (1986). Accordingly the concepts of tacit knowledge, ecological affordances and dispositional knowledge (Maton 2014) captured and articulated the heuristic notions of 2D and 3D.
My concern was also to represent the views and feelings of the participants who had distinct evaluative frameworks towards the teaching and learning. Students praised the supportive teachers and produced a great deal of work. Their primary purpose was to progress to Level 3 courses and to gain the qualification, preferably with Distinction grades. Teachers had personalised responses to questions about their values and the value of the curriculum, and they rarely reflected official discourse. However, I found that students largely reflected the views of teachers, reflected in language and direction (which I compared with teachers' views in TDA4), which led to my concentration of analysis on teachers' interviews in TDA6.

The data analysis was framed in an ethnographic process which I had commenced with a belief in the naturalistic process of discovery through observation and interview, which Denscombe (2007) describes as 'going into the field to witness events first hand' (p70). Whilst I maintained my intention to get as close to participants as possible to explore initial themes from the literature and the research question, the more significant data about powerful knowledge in art and design, as I saw it, was within a visual and sensory ethnography (Pink, 2007; 2009).

The other two lines of influence from the literature were managerialism and the de-professionalization of the FE profession (Elliot, 1997; Gleeson and Shain, 1999; Robson, 2006; Keep, 2007; Randle and Brady, 1997) and the regulative control of curricula, from Discipline Based Art and Design, DBAE (Eisner, 1988) to the National Curriculum and centralised control of FE (Allison, 1982; China, 1986; Steers 1995). The latter development coincided with a withdrawal of resources, principally time, space and expertise, as well as material resources from vocational art and design education. Consequently, I retained a measure of critical advocacy for teachers' interests and control of the curriculum. I suggest a hybrid 'critical sensory ethnography' best describes my approach.

My data analysis was also informed by Lowenfeld's (1952) binary of the visual and haptic as perceptual tools in the discussion of the teachers' curriculum. I applied both these and Bernstein's theories (1990; 2000) on the classification and framing of knowledge and the acquisition of powerful knowledge, as outlined in the previous chapter, to the data. The data analysis process was, therefore, both inductive and deductive. I illustrate the relationship of initial and inductive themes below in Table 9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Initial Themes</th>
<th>Inductive Emerging Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA 1 (Nvivo)</td>
<td>Curriculum; Pedagogy and Perception / Conception; learning / Identity; Processes / Technology; College / Further Education</td>
<td>Artist references. Change short-termism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The FE and BTEC regulative environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiential learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructivist knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social reproduction. / interruption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment and verification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA 2 (Teachers)</td>
<td>Curriculum; Assignments; Visual and Haptic (learning); Pedagogy; Assessment;</td>
<td>Perception /Conception, Learning/Identity and Processes/ Technology; Power and Control;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA 3 (Students)</td>
<td>Vision and seeing.</td>
<td>Other formal terminology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haptic, doing, tools, movement, 3D</td>
<td>Own ideas, innovation, and inspiration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sources, references.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA 4 (Students, teachers)</td>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vocationality; Planning; Design, process; Basic skills; Visits; Perspective; Hard work; Teamwork Control; Control of studio; Work skills; Social action; Support, for deficit; Relationships with student; Reduced resources; Compliance, increasing pressure; Surveillance; Student diagnosis; Emotional response; Individuality; Teachers learning; Boundaries; Terminology; Instructivist; Construction, constructivism; Others cultures; Writing; Accommodation; Student motivation; Gender stereotyping.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assignments-structure, cultural transmission</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Power and control-cultural, social reproduction and interruption</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA4</td>
<td>Deficit model - second chance in the 'Cinderella Service'</td>
<td>Suspension of realisations- as Foundation: freedom from high stakes and expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Impressions</td>
<td>Concentration on process, task completion, portfolio material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom not workshop</td>
<td>Visits- loose external purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very busy- student task completion; teachers, record keeping, supporting prodigal student relationships, reassured by good work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDA 5</th>
<th>Vocational reflection five year planning period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Teachers' questions -Snowball themes)</td>
<td>Sequence of learning Function CL’s Autonomy / effectiveness shared ownership of ideas technical / creative types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum, 2D and 3D skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational skills</td>
<td>Relationships teacher/student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Individual pedagogies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider cultural implications in the curriculum</td>
<td>Control ( studio) design cycle disagreement with management Pedagogic contract teachers learning – contrasted with own learning staff disunity staff availability practitioners getting students on side broad range of skills control shattered backgrounds management directives importance of general skills what works formal language of art and design student passivity prejudice in choice of artists all making – conflation of 2D and 3D workplace lack of technical support practising artists – taking chances financial purpose of art education Team cohesion identity Practitioner background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in regulations Constructed learning-teachers and students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students' dispositional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TDA6</th>
<th>'Design process'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(From Interview questions)</td>
<td>Problem solving / seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum, 2D and 3D skills</td>
<td>Recruitment, Different personal restorative evaluation of art and design, Practitioner background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Students' dispositional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider cultural implications in the curriculum</td>
<td>Technical /creative 'types'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in regulations</td>
<td>Non- integrated team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructed learning-teachers and students</td>
<td>Intrinsic foundational of art and design low-tech skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of resources</td>
<td>Student dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western ocularcentricity.</td>
<td>Photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical thinking, external language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gendered curriculum Tools, technology, Tentative Autonomy, Good Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As stated, the interviews with teachers and students were short and inserted into valuable college time, between lessons for students or in administration time for staff. I revisited data to expand and discover my reflexive viewpoints, which inevitably changed during the period of research, indicated in the snowball themes emanating from sequential interviews (see Appendix 19, TDA 5). At an intermediate stage in analysing and expanding interpretations, I found it useful to remove questions and consider the transcripts as first-person interviewee accounts. This allowed me to consider responses more independently, as well as to develop my own reflexive approach. I developed a conversational method with one teacher, Marjorie, revisiting feedback with comments, to which she then responded in two further exchanges. Only one teacher was able to engage with this approach.

Sullivan (2005) sees the researcher’s experience as an asset in inquiry and reflexivity ‘as a form of critical constructivism that affects the researcher and the researched’ (p52). Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009) go further, suggesting that the reflexive process is ‘deconstructing, destabilising as well as reconstructing and representing’ (p305) in the process of trying to reach non-reductionist, high reflective social science’ (p283). Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009) link reflexivity to stages and levels of reflection and interpretation where all data construction is a result of interpretation; researcher and interviewee have to interpret questions and responses and impressions need to be interpreted, which is also described as the interpretation of interpretation. They see reflexivity as a ‘particular specified version of reflective research, involving reflection on several levels or directed at several themes’ (p8). My analysis and interpretation was guided by the four levels of interpretation outlined by Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009, p273) (see Table 10):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10: Levels of interpretation; from Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspect / level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with empirical material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection on text production and language use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As outlined in Table 9, a large number of themes emerged from the data. It was not possible to address all of these issues within the word limitations of this thesis. Therefore, themes were clustered into larger units which directly addressed the research questions, and are discussed in the Findings and Analysis chapter. These units are:

- Classification and Framing
- Cultural Reproduction/ High and Low Culture
- Assessment Shaping the Curriculum
- Visual and Haptic Learning

In the data analysis chapter, excerpts from the data have been used to illustrate these areas.
Data were selected based on the extent to which they represented substantive elements of the datasets.

Conclusion

This chapter has presented my philosophical approach and choice of ethnographic methodology, before moving on to examine the methods of data creation. I discussed the nature of ethnography and my preferred classification of the study as interpretive rather than qualitative ethnography (Erickson, 1986), as an interpretive approach is not necessarily exclusive of potential quantitative methods. However, I did not employ quantitative methods in this study, instead relying on interviews, observations and collection of visual data and documentary records. Various constraints about access to staff rooms and the inability to photograph students shaped the nature of my participation, which though reduced in scope nevertheless permitted substantial contact with teachers and students. The ethnographic methodology I employed acknowledged the importance of visual, embodied and emplaced knowledge (Pink, 2007; 2009) and sensory and haptic awareness (Howes, 2005; Paterson, 2007). By the beginning of the autumn term the feasibility of my philosophical approach,
sampling and ethnography had been collectively refined and confirmed through discussion with the department staff.

I did encounter challenges in the research process, as outlined in this chapter, but I was able to address them. Whilst plans to interview students and teachers were frequently changed, I was able to adapt interview methods to suit participants whilst being sensitive to their viewpoints, and developed my role further as an 'insider' role (Hickman, 2008). Although I was not permitted to photograph students in college, I did photograph their work for reference in interviews and take photographs of groups at the Tate Modern gallery. Similarly, I was not initially allowed into staff rooms but was subsequently allowed sight of student assessment records and substantial course planning materials. These two sets of data, along with BTEC guidance, formed principal empirical sources for the analysis of both the formal and 'hidden' curricula.

Throughout the fieldwork, I was alert to ethical issues. I took steps to ensure co-operation and limit the potential harm that my research may cause. I attempted to avoid 'narrative persuasion' (Murphy and Dingwall, 2009) by participating in lessons and external visits and enhanced, as far as possible, potential benefits to participants and positive involvement by feeding back interview transcripts promptly and inviting comment.

The process of data analysis I have outlined in this chapter was extensive, and recursive, and the triangulation of the various sources of data enabled me to build up an in-depth understanding of this BTEC Art and Design FE studio. In the next chapter, I outline the findings of this ethnographic study.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter explores the curriculum in a foundational, L2 BTEC art and design course. It draws upon the theories of Lowenfeld (1939; 1945; 1952), Bernstein (1971; 1990; 2000) and Bernstein’s successors, including Moore (2004), and Maton (2014), to explore the assignments, course planning, assessments, and views of student and teacher participants. Bernstein’s (1990; 2000) theories of classification and framing and horizontal and vertical knowledge structures are applied to foreground visual and haptic learning, and to consider the development of learners’ dispositions. These findings are also related to Lowenfeld’s (1952) w
binary of visual and haptic learner capabilities, which are developed as interrelated sensory dimensions. The chapter is explored in four sub-sections which relate to the clusters of themes emerging from the data analysis process, as outlined in the previous chapter:

- **Classification and Framing.** This sub-section analyses knowledge content and delivery.
- **Cultural Reproduction/ High and Low Culture.** This sub-section investigates 'special' and everyday meanings in course content.
- **Assessment Shaping the Curriculum.** This sub-section considers how far the system of criterion-referenced assessment (CRA) affected the curriculum.
- **Visual and Haptic Learning.** This sub-section expands on the subject categorisation of '2D and 3D'.

**Classification and Framing**

Classification refers to subjects' content and boundaries, and framing refers to how they are delivered (Bernstein, 1971). Subjects can be strongly classified, that is pursued separately from other areas, and strongly bounded, each with domain-specific meanings, and weakly classified where subjects are pursued with interchangeable meanings and contexts. Strongly classified curricula are those which are more instructional, based upon what Bernstein (2000) termed the 'grammar' of the subject and the authority of the teacher. Weakly classified curricula are those which Bernstein (1990; 2000) saw as progressive, where discovery and students' disposition is of greater importance. This differentiation is also linked to Bernstein's (1990; 2000) concepts of vertical and horizontal discourse, where verticality is equated with theoretical and abstract knowledge, and horizontal discourse is about everyday, commonsense understanding.

The concept of weak boundaries and weak subject grammars is useful in analysing the shape of assignments on the L2 course, which shaped the curriculum, as well as in understanding the overall course structure. The weak classification of tasks in assignments facilitated three important things: students' dispositional development, their affinity with studying art and design, and task completion. The disposition of students was directed towards fluent productivity, evidenced in their extensive portfolios. Student enjoyment and liking for art and design was emphasised as a reason by Chris for selecting 2D assignments and avoiding 3D
assignments, which she said, “they struggle with”, and task completion was constantly emphasised through continuous and formative assessment. These goals were prioritised over the extensive development of practical skills and the external applications of skills such as refined drawing skills, problem solving or work experience. There are many reasons for the above priorities. However, Bernstein (2000) associates the integration of weakly classified subjects with potentially problematic teacher relationships, imbalances of power and hidden curricula, which I discuss here and in the section ‘High and Low Culture’. For the moment, I wish to address the issue of classification in assignment design and curriculum knowledge.

Curriculum knowledge, as represented in the assignments, was classified in two principal ways: between assignment themes, and within assignments as tasks. In each case boundaries were weakened, in the sense that potentially powerful, bounded subject identities were subordinated to connectedness in order to encourage student initiative and acceptance of what teachers referred to as the ‘design process’. This process did not contain problem solving, but resembled a study process of comparing their own work with that of artists, and genres of art movements. Comparisons between assignment themes, and Assignment Submission Sheets which listed tasks to be completed, revealed how discrete subject matter boundaries and themes were weakened.

The four main assignments, *Me, Myself & I (MM&I), 3D Vessels, Still Life and Natural Forms* addressed four very different domains. The *MM&I* brief directed students to issues of identity and the self. It stated:

*Artists have often used themselves as inspiration to create work. For this project you will use yourself as inspiration...Who are you?*

The brief for *3D Vessels* asked students to tackle 2D drawings for 3D realisation, in scientific contexts, such as from observational study in the Science Museum, to the production of a saleable item in the museum shop. Students' portfolios did not exhibit good observational drawing skills from this stage of the course. They were also asked to make artefacts in clay, plaster and card from their drawings. Students would have to make 'a series of maquettes... (Which) will inform the designer on how they will construct the final outcome on a larger scale' (*3D Vessels* brief). This indicated that students would have to create an informed designers' brief for manufacture. This assignment overran beyond six weeks, and many students either did not complete their artefact or could not locate it. The reason for non-completion could have been that there was no timetabled access to ceramics workshops, and
clay design was restricted to rudimentary hand forming in the general studio (see Figure 2). However the point being made here is that the assignment was strongly classified in relation to MM&I, yet the inner structure of the assignments emphasised a weakly classified achievable, similarity with 3D Vessels. Still Life addressed a refined, fine art domain which, according to the brief, sometimes focussed on 'religious symbolism' and had origins in 'ancient Greek/Roman art'. In the Natural Forms brief the topic of recycling and the promotion of a Royal Park masked serious issues of ecological destruction, human exploitation and implied Romantic opposition to human mistreatment of the environment.

These very different, powerful subject areas were linked by internal common, repeated emphasis on: drawing, A3 image making, colour, artist references, the use of formal terminology, the production of portfolio material, the repetition of tactile use of paint in MM&I, ink and bleach and subtractive charcoal drawings. Graphic Design, 3D Design and Fashion Design were elements which were accommodated within the boundaries of the assignments, although they could have been developed as discrete languages, with incommensurable properties. I argue that this was intended to facilitate the primary purpose of making connections easier, allowing students to develop confidence in their studies and engage good relations in the studio. Chris said that the sequence of the assignments was not specific, that is, they were not sequentially arranged. For instance, presumably Natural Forms could have preceded 3D Vessels. According to Chris, MM&I was first because (in the past), “Students enjoyed it”. Each of the assignments could have concentrated on producing one high quality item, a portrait, a vessel, a still life, a recycled object. Instead, by repeating multiple tasks within assignments, students produced hundreds of separate outcomes, mainly as A3 imaged evidence.

The second evidence of weak classification was within assignments; tasks were itemised on Submission Sheets as separate activities. MM&I had eighteen such tasks, 3D Vessels, nineteen, Still Life twenty and Natural Forms required twenty eight in eleven categories. None of the tasks were particularly difficult. As Jackie said, for much of the time she would be encouraging students to, “...pick up a pencil”, such was the low level motivation amongst some students. The ease of passing from one exercise to another was a feature of assignment design; they did not appear to be sequentially arranged to improve skills, but to move between different materials, revisiting some previous ways of working. The effect was to familiarise students with assignment completion, and the importance of working independently to supplement supervised work.
Students were expected to relate their own work to that of artists and designers’ work. Most observations were made in the studio or the college, where the movement between weakly classified subjective coursework was evident in individual responses and open-ended explorations rather than more challenging problem solving or calculated measurement.

Assignments were arranged to develop art and design practices and foster students' dispositions. The sequence of assignments was, according to Chris, not methodically arranged. The four main assignments repeated a sequence of study, which teachers referred to as 'the design process'. Jackie defined this as, “the process of being given a question, a brief and then doing the research on primary and secondary sources”. The term 'design process' is repeated throughout BTEC unit specifications, qualified with descriptors such as graphic (design process), fashion, 3D and so on (BTEC2010). Jackie's definition does not take account of key distinguishing parts of design, such as problem solving/seeking and specialised contextual settings. In effect this is a generalised study process, which is worthy in itself but which dilutes and de-contextualises the subject boundaries, legitimising weakly classified task completion.

The relationship between tasks was for students to pursue, the emphasis being on the development of their disposition or 'gaze' (Maton, 2014), based upon subjective choice such as Sylvia's liking for order, Agathe's not liking 'messy', or Anna's aversion to clay. Despite, or more likely because of, the weakly classified tasks, assignments were productive and valued by students. In interviews all except one student participant, said they enjoyed the MM&I assignment, and chose a page from the self-portrait assignment as 'good'. Anna, a student with Afro-Caribbean heritage, commented:

I found the composition of the colours quite interesting because this piece of work that I have done is to relate towards Andy Warhol so within (an) ICT lesson they told us they wanted us to create something similar to Andy Warhol because he does colourful portraits ...he re-themes then and uses different colours.

For Agathe, a European student, the assignment signalled the time she started to enjoy the course:

Yeah, it was important for me because that was my first tonal drawing with my face and I think it was effective I like it I really enjoyed it... Because it was first tonal drawing and I like it and I will keep it... Yeah with my face, I have done a collage with recycling but I haven’t done a ...

(portrait)
Figures 3-6 illustrate below the variety of ways in which students represented self-portraits.

**Figures 3-6 A3 portfolio presentation books, pages from ‘Me Myself and I’ assignment.**

**Figure 3: Monoprint and Collages**

![Monoprint and Collages](image)

Agathe, a highly productive student who eventually gained a place at a prestigious London university to study fine art, presented 17 double A3 pages of work.

**Figure 4: Monoprint and painting**

![Monoprint and painting](image)

Anna, a student from Afro-Caribbean background who later had difficulty completing and presenting work on time at this early stage produced seven double A3 pages.

**colour analysis**

**Figure 5: Drawing and colour analysis**

![Drawing and colour analysis](image)

Amarjit, an enthusiastic student who ‘goes with the flow’ and wanted to eventually study 3D design, produced 16 A3 double pages of work.

**Figure 6: Portrait comparison and collage**

![Portrait comparison and collage](image)

Dave, who had serious family difficulties to contend with at the start of the course, eventually gained a place to study a Foundation Degree in photography; he produced seven double A3 pages.

The works revealed a guileless representation of self-image – none of the respondents were concerned about the lack of an individual likeness. The work did not require advance technical competence and resulted in confident involvement. Secondly, these self-portraits
showed how a diverse range of techniques, weakly framed, such as typographical layout, mono-printing, colour theory and text-supported research of artists can be inserted into a collective theme, because processes are clearly rudimentary. The subject classification was weak, even if their framing, that is the directive to complete, was strong. Tasks were relatively simple to grasp and complete, justifying the insistent pressure by teachers for their completion.

/MM&I/ was a complex and condensed vehicle for a lot of subject matter, which students enjoyed. For some it signalled the beginning of their confidence in their learning, principally their disposition as art and design students. Chris expressed the content and curriculum value as follows:

“They had to produce a monotone painting and I wanted them to consider the tonal values of the face of their portrait but also to consider the structure of the portrait, so what (I) encouraged them to do was to shut their eyes and to touch their face so that they could feel the structure, and then I wanted them to translate that touch... so I showed them examples of Freud’s work and then I wanted to use the same sort of techniques... so for example if they would brush down their nose that they would brush with the brush down then they would brush with the side. I think it worked well.”

(Interview, 30 January)

/MM&I/ introduced students to multiple techniques and ideas through demonstration, encouraging experiment using:

Pencil tonal drawings and techniques, colour theory, typography (with stitching as montage), Photoshop imagery, generating (design) ideas, selecting and producing final portraits in monotones and complementary colours, evaluation of their own work

(Assignment Submission Sheet)

This framework contrasted with tightly specified exercises and tasks, and thus corresponded to weakly framed content, as contextualised, horizontal knowledge structures (Bernstein, 2000). Some aspects of these subjects had the potential to be developed vertically, for instance through the technical elements of portraiture, and its hierarchical ranking in different cultures and historical periods. Other vertical knowledge structures were not emphasised, for
instance the technical analysis of photography, the material application of paint, the psychological understandings of ‘self’ and so forth; the focus being on personal choice and students' confident, personal development.

Maton (2009) describes 'authentic learning' which here equates with BTECs and the L2 definition of vocational learning, as more focussed on students' ‘habituses rather than on explicitly articulated procedures' (p 54). He underlines the consequences of neglecting in-depth contextualised learning:

Drawing on constructivist ideas that emphasise the learner’s role in constructing their own understandings of practice, such authentic learning environments typically emphasise students drawing on personal experience and imagining themselves within the case being studied, and downplay the role of direct instruction about the procedures to be used or the principles of knowledge to be learned.

(Maton, K. 2009. p51)

Maton (2014) attempts to codify and identify the principles of weakly classified subject knowledge by examining the nature of horizontal knowledge structures in developing approaches to contextualised, cumulative knowledge. This is expressed by proposing semantic gravity, which is knowledge bound and defined by its context, and relating this to more abstract knowledge, which he termed semantic density. For example, designing a garment is contextually rooted in the understanding of textiles, body shape and their sensory understanding; more hierarchical knowledge is required to produce the item in quantity, and to then distribute and market the product. Subsequent feedback from marketing can inform further re-designs of garments. Maton (2014) proposes that such 'codes' of learning can configure as a 'semantic wave' where contextually bound learning leads to abstracted, transferable knowledge, vertically and hierarchically arranged, leading back to related contexts, and subsequently repeated. It was possible to see such 'waves' in more motivated students' work, where practical exercises led to individual, ideas-based research, producing extensive portfolio representation (see Appendix 20, for an example).

Contextually bound processes such as two-dimensional composition and colour structures in MM&I can clearly have some verticality. For example, composition has a transferable value, as an analytical language, or tool for viewers, commissioners and artists. Seen through a sociological lens, colour differentiation is perceptually constructed and when related to optics
and photography has, for artists, many applications and opportunities. Similarly, in *Natural Forms* the use of natural materials substituting for ecologically pernicious, synthetic materials can inject theoretical enquiry into contextualised study. Fashion, Graphic, 3D and Multimedia Design could have been introduced as specialised languages earlier in the course - but they were introduced as such at the end of the course. The ostensible purpose of the course was to introduce students to a wide range of media and disciplines to inform their selection and application to specialised art and design courses. The secondary, barely hidden, curricula aims were, according to Marjorie, to form a coherent cohort, with essential study skills, and affiliations to the field art and design, as well as to the department.

Weakly classified, team-taught curricula permit transference between subject classification, where teachers share ideologies and operate with high levels of cooperation, and hence, according to Bernstein (1971; 2000) are less likely to develop hierarchical, specialist and hence, ‘powerful knowledge’. Cumulative knowledge (Bernstein, 2000; Maton 2014) and powerful knowledge (Wheelahan, 2007) allows meaningful transference across boundaries. Bernstein (2000) also implies that movement away from specialist knowledge advances towards more progressive ideologies, which Moore (2004) argues:

> Serves the best educational interests' for 'working class, ethnic minority and female pupils' and encourages teachers to approach students in 'therapeutic / compensatory rather than an academic mode...(which preserves) privileged access of the social elite to ...powerful knowledge.

(Moore, 2004, p178).

This interpretation of powerful knowledge problematises the 'default setting' of progressive ideologies, such as those that employ weakly classified subjects, and suggests reliance upon hidden, personalised, subjective authority in knowledge, which is imposed through the influence of the teacher and is reliant upon the 'pedagogic contract' (Willis,1977). It was a feature of the pedagogic contract in this classroom that the students’ dispositional development was foregrounded in contrast to, and possibly prejudicing, the experience of harder, cumulative, experiential knowledge. An example of this omission, noted by the absence of workshop experience in resistant materials, is discussed below in the section on Visual and Haptic Knowledge. Material experience was provided through using basic craft materials, with limited utility and undeveloped tool use, as materials were almost exclusively non-resistant. It is also possible to see in Maton's (2006) explanation of ‘legitimation codes’,
discussed in Chapter Two, an explanation of the subordination of 'academic' or even experiential knowledge (know how) when foregrounding dispositional development in horizontal knowledge structures. Maton (2006) associates horizontal knowledge as a measure of status, depending on 'who you are' (knower code) as much as what you know (knowledge code) (p 50). I now continue to discuss the wider cultural implications of curriculum construction.

**Cultural Reproduction, high and low culture.**

The work of cultural theorists and sociologists can be drawn upon in an understanding of how a curriculum can reproduce cultural values. Williams (2006) offers a general definition of culture as: a 'developed state of mind, the process of this development and its means' (e.g. works of art) (ibid, p11). Bourdieu (1977) deploys cultural analysis, amongst other things, to develop his concepts of the distribution of capital. Bernstein (1990) develops Bourdieu's theories of the cultural reproduction of field, class, power and resistance, to explore the 'principles conferring legitimacy...within a hierarchy based upon privileged taste / texts' (p 177, author's emphasis). On the L2 course there were two aspects where such stratification emerged. One concerned broadly sociological definitions, the other related to the practical exercises in the studio.

Students on the foundational L2 course were about to be exposed to the special language and status of artists and designers. The specialised discourse of art and design was contextualised in accessible learning materials based by teachers on artists' and designers' 'masterworks', illustrated via the internet, textbooks, handouts and museum visits. The themes and meanings for the assignments were set apart from the commonsense or everyday experiences that students encountered. The 'vocationality' of themes and exercises was implicit as discrete disciplines, through the identity of the artist or designer, for example, as graphic designer, sculptor, painter, product designer, typographer, or painter.

Students enrolled on the L2 course in order to progress to Level 3 Diploma courses within the college. In acquiring the identity of artist or designer students are, according to Bourdieu (1996), enlisting in the tradition of 'liberty and critique', within 'loose hierarchies' and 'loose institutions' (ibid, 257). In the uncertain fields of FE and art and design, such acquisition of habitus highlights the attractions and risks of the artist's, craftsperson's and designer's disposition. The status of artist or designer, although regulated by the bourgeoisie, is
nevertheless sanctioned by them (Bourdieu, 1986) and represents access to special or sacred knowledge (Bernstein, 2000). For Bernstein (2000) sacred knowledge is embodied in vertical discourse, such as the natural sciences, physics and mathematics, and some fields of sociology. These are contrasted with horizontal discourses such as everyday language and the humanities, which Bernstein (2000) proposed were less amenable to rationalisation, and are characteristics of profane knowledge.

Students were provided with a glossary of Formal Elements (see Appendix 21) as descriptors, which also acted as conceptual frameworks, such as 'line', 'tone', 'colour' and 'texture', and used to analyse artists' and designers' work. This constituted a special or sacred language, focussed on the rarefied world of art and design, and compositional analysis, and not on everyday functional language or social critique. Specialist articulation of materials, with functionally specific tools such as drawing instruments or power tools, was not included in the main part of the course. Such 'special' language as the Formal Elements differed from everyday functional discourses, found in problem solving for application to everyday situations, until the Final Major Projects (FMP). However, this seemed to facilitate learning in dispositional, horizontal knowledge structures, that is it offered students flexibility in switching between forms of 2D representation, albeit at the expense of cumulative, context-bound specialist skills.

Steyn (2012) cites disciplines such as marketing, materials science, and production design as examples of vertical knowledge structures, compared to horizontal knowledge structures such as presentation, styling, fashion and drawing and painting. Horizontal knowledge structures have, according to Bernstein (2000) 'strong' and 'weak' grammars, equivalent respectively to epistemic and social relations of meaning. Strong grammars create meaning which is non-arbitrary and weak grammars meaning which is arbitrary (Wheelahan, 2010). The latter depends more upon how the viewer construes the meaning of an event, the former depends upon an epistemic relationship, and its legitimation depends upon the objective nature of the knowledge. Within the L2 course epistemic, curriculum knowledge was available, in learning materials and internet sources; immediate, tangible experience of material's behaviour -was not always developed. Maton (2014) conceptualises all knowledge as having epistemic and social dimensions. Table 11 below illustrates a simple topology which outlines a relatedness of knowledge grammars, and hence the relationship of contextually bound to more theoretical knowledge.
Table 11: Relationship of Academic and Practical Visual, Haptic Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set work</th>
<th>Academic, visual, written, verbal</th>
<th>Practical, visual, haptic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic, objective knowledge</td>
<td>Artists' lives, works, collections; reported views; relatedness to assignment.</td>
<td>Materials' properties / limitations / compatibility with other materials; cost; comparative physical qualities- tactile, mass, size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social, subjective knowledge</td>
<td>Critical status, influence, appeal, thematic affinity, own reflective insights</td>
<td>Response to sensory qualities; ease of personal use; personal associations; (deployment in ) problem solving, seeking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bernstein (2000, p30) draws attention to the unequal distribution of powerful knowledge, which he argues is esoteric and potentially powerful because it is the site of the 'unthinkable' and the 'yet-to-be-thought'. Wheelahan (2010), in underlining the importance of disciplinary boundaries, argues that:

The capacity to recognise and navigate boundaries allows (students) to choose how they will engage with (subject disciplines) as well as the capacity to maintain or transform them

(Wheelahan, 2010, p8)

In art, design and craft, practice disciplinary boundaries are also defined in terms of materials, technologies, traditions and occupational identities.

Weakly classified subject boundaries deny the propensity for extended study and hence their **verticality**. Vocational L2 students were being denied access to deeper, critical material and the tacit understanding of materials through the relaxation of boundaries, as suggested previously. How much are they being also denied access to the extended study of materials and technologies in art and design, because of the study of reified art from a distant culture, that is, post-war USA? A difficulty in considering the acquisition of tacit, experiential, knowledge as cumulative, is that Bernstein (2000) and successors (Steyn, 2012; Wheelahan 2007) caveat the acquisition of tacit, making skills, as contextually-bound, which relies on the
contextual definition for meaning and value (Bernstein, 2000, p30), consequently less capable of verticality.

There is space in Bernstein's (1990; 2000) conceptualisation of vertical and horizontal knowledge structures to consider forms of contextually-bound, cumulative knowledge as capable of articulation and hence stronger 'grammars'. Maton (2010) argues that all knowledge is constructed both of epistemic relations (vertical) and social relations where the latter is formed from the disposition of the agent and the 'gaze' of the knower. Maton (2010) in referencing inherited or 'born' ability such as a musical 'gift' conceptualises a continuum of knower grammars and gazes. Maton (2010) proposes a heritable interpretation of born 'gaze' and theorises that this occurs in vertical discourses at the opposite end of the continuum, illustrated in Table 12 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12: From Maton: Knowledge-grammars and gazes (Maton, 2010, pp165-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stronger knowledge-grammars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to anyone willing to be trained in specialized procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maton (2014) uses the analogy of visual 'gaze' which suggests to me that 'smell', 'touch' or 'feel' in the arts, in constructing a sensory horizontality, is capable of analysing contextually-bound, 'specialised procedures'. This offers a critique of culturally limiting assumptions of ability, such as 'good hands', a 'good eye', and 'trial and error'. This framework is important for L2 students, firstly, who are likely to be located at the 'Trained gaze' point on the above scale. For students attempting to understand influence in the world of art and design, to understand if the above scale represents stages of acquisition of cultural capital, then different social frames of mind may be appropriate. Another way of looking at progress from trained to born 'gaze', would be to consider knowledge as socially stratified, becoming less susceptible
to rational processes; from knowing that, to knowing how, to knowing who, to being known (that is being more of an instigator). Maton's (2010; 2014) concept of gaze as not necessarily confined to the visual opens up parallels to other sensory knower scales of taste, such as tactile and spatial skills. Referring again to Table 12, the progress from left right could illustrate the student journey from instruction to professional status, progressing through the subject matter and affordances of her surroundings.

The power of subject matter may no longer be socially and hierarchically arranged as in previous centuries. The 'pure gaze' of aesthetics and the Academy may no longer be in fashion, yet the acceptance of the art work as sacred, and by extension the sanctity of the Museum, created tensions when the L2 students visited the Tate Modern, a visit which I discuss below. In an era of pluralism, the social and aesthetic selection and status of subject matter remains a valid basis of discussion. Efland (1990) cites a ruling from seventeenth century France of traditional academic versions of fine art subject matter:

Still Lifes were placed at the bottom, landscapes above Still Lifes...Then...into the human realm, people were more important than animals, nobles more important than peasants’...At the top of the scale was the portrayal of important historical events.

(Efland, 1990, p38)

Andrew Graham Dixon (2014) cites ‘drama’ as the top category prior to the nineteenth century. Whilst the comparison of outer London teenagers with seventeenth century French artists is a little contrived, the point being made here is that subject matter has a value and power, which Bernstein (2000) would claim is socially stratified. The choice of subject matter reinforces in the minds of students a specific view of valid subject matter and practitioners, and excludes others. The particular choice of these assignment themes – self portraiture, vessels, still life and landscape - can be considered ‘accessible’, non-threatening, and reifiable in an accepted canon. The L2 emphasis upon dispositional development suggested progress towards the status of artist/designer/craftsperson via imitating the styles of Warhol, Craig Martin, and Morandi et al.

It is arguable that the portfolio studies of these subjects may have lacked ‘drama’ or critique, and were unrelated to contemporary discourse that students may be exposed to. However, it was clear in interviews that successful students greatly valued their paintings and drawings. Students, who no doubt were aware of highly spiced computer and TV entertainment and exposed to anarchic street art and graffiti, accepted and personalised curriculum ‘special’,
formal, subject matter. In Bernsteinian (2000) terms, the sacred was left undifferentiated in relationship to the profane; as the curriculum was conceived independently of everyday discourse.

Assignments had other common, cultural features. The majority of the artists referenced were male, white, not all dead, but a majority were from the USA. Chris said this was not intentional and offered no explanation. BTEC support materials (BTEC 2010, Unit 11) suggested seven artists to research: Robert Rauschenberg, Andy Warhol, Stuart Davis, Jim Dine, Larry Rivers, Jasper Johns and Claus Oldenburg; all were male, all from the USA, four were dead, all were fine artists, all but one were painters whose careers had been born following the post-war, cold war, US / CIA, patriotic, promotion of abstract expressionism (Independent, November, 1995).

The choice of artists may have guaranteed information via the internet for students to pursue, nevertheless a question remains about how the black and minority ethnic students (both UK and international) in the cohort would access the cultural values and materials compared to their white student colleagues. Perhaps more disturbing, for the female students, was the exclusion of female artists and designers in many briefs, although the majority of the teachers on the course were female. The recontextualised BTEC unit content had been pedagogically translated, and the 'ideology at play' in the 'discursive gap' that Bernstein (2000) predicted, might explain the arbitrary cultural imposition of US, elitist subject matter. This also raises questions as to why it was not translated into potentially less charged material according to statutory legislation with regard to inclusivity and gender equality. Students may not have fully comprehended the cultural hegemony they were perpetuating in the study of USA practitioners and art movements. It was not clear that teachers were aware of this cultural imbalance. The conclusion must be that the social situatedness was unimportant. It was more worthy to conform to BTEC guidance, and the suggested artists were included.

The implicit pressure on students was to accept the sacredness of the artistic canon, and its standing for 'vocationality'. Bernstein (1971; 2000) cautioned against ignoring the implicit power arrangements revealed amongst dominant and dominated cultural groups, which construct hidden curricula. This cultural divide was the context for a further, more material divisiveness where, in the first four L2 assignments the development of personalised learning
was preferenced over technical and more vertical knowledge structures and problem solving, which I discussed above in the previous section on Classification and Framing.

The cultural tensions involving the juxtaposition of personalised, studio learning and its externalised representation were evident in a visit to the Tate Modern Gallery, outlined in the next section.

External study in the form of museum and gallery visits were built into the course and exhibited distinctly different balances of power and control. Teachers mediated, through well-established personal relationships and trust, complex art and design contexts, and a 'discursive gap' (Bernstein, 2000) between the private, internal atmosphere of the college studio and the externality that was museums. This was the case in a visit to the Tate Modern. Prior to an eventful visit to the gallery I agreed to reconnoitre the collection and produced a handout which related exhibited works to the Still Life assignment (see Appendix 22). The contrast in students' behaviour and attitudes between the familiarised, controlled and controlling studio, and the powerful, public presence of the Tate Modern Gallery could not have been more pronounced. The context for the visit was as follows:

About fifty percent of the students gathered at Waterloo Station and gradually set off to walk the Thames route at 11.15. The visit was late and short-staffed. At the Turbine Hall, which was cold and dark, the agenda was very loose. There were no questions from students and no specific instructions to look at specific works. The handout list I prepared was distributed and the students were asked to walk through the galleries, noting the works that were still lives or related to the still life genre.

(Field notes 16 January)

The gallery represented an external reality to the L2 course. On this vocational course, the inclusion of the visit implied the legitimate social value of the museum and its artefacts, and its relevance to course work was sanctioned. It was also a 'test' of the efficacy of the teaching and learning, and a legitimising context of students' previous study. Students were encouraged to draw from the work of Cubists and others related to the theme of 'Still Life'. This task was weakly framed, as students could largely choose their own pace of observation and method of recording of exhibits. The paintings and sculptures were of course strongly classified, exhibited mostly to distinguish and differentiate the viewpoints and categorisation of artists. The structure of the visit was not unlike the shape of assignments - involving
weakly classified exercises, within strongly classified content frames. The difference was that
the guided, set tasks, which characterised the content of the assignment, were not echoed at
the Tate visit. Students seemed to find the 'ill-defined' (Schön, 1983) study tasks hard to
structure for themselves, where they had neither the tolerance nor the expertise and
motivation - the 'mystery (nor) the mastery 'of 'reflective practitioners' (ibid. p227).

The visit appeared optional and many of the works were unfamiliar to students, which could
be seen as having an arbitrary status in students' eyes. Half of the student group did not
attend. Students who had been explicitly encouraged to develop subjective responses in
previous assignments had great difficulty in working from the exhibits. The majority of
students did not have a developed 'gaze' (Maton, 2014) nor had yet acquired
'connoisseurship', which Eisner (1991), describes as epistemic seeing, 'the means through
which we come to know the complexities, nuances and subtleties of the world in which we
have a special interest' (ibid, p68), nor did they have the tightly-guided task completion
schedules, all of which, combined with high staff student ratios, prompted a rapid dispersal of
many students. I talked to students and observed the following:

Some students started to draw quite promptly, others walked through the galleries,
taking photographs and / or looking briefly at works. One student at the head of fast
moving group was emphatic, saying, “Not my kind of thing”. Initially many students
spent less than a minute inspecting a work, and some students were angry about being
there. Another student, from a black Caribbean background, was very angry and
rejected all the work and any reason for being at the Tate.

(Field notes January 16,)

Here a 'discursive gap' occurred between knowledge structures, for instance between the
recontextualised knowledge as state-approved taste, exemplified as the Tate's paintings,
drawings, photographs and sculptures, and studio knowledge. Between the two knowledge
domains, the tightly framed portfolio-completion regime of the studio, and he arbitrary
selection of works at the Tate, was inserted the ideology of individual, optional choice. It was
up to the inexperienced students to justify the relationship of the two knowledge fields. Some
of the disaffected students may have felt that there was too much of a distance between the
reified items, and their own work created via the tacit 'knower-knowledge structures' (Maton,
2014). Perhaps then the students asserted their own ideology as consumers, and did not buy.
Some students argued about being there, illustrated in Figures 7 and 8. This was the only time I witnessed serious challenges from students.

**Figure 7: The debate starts**  
**Figure 8: The debate continues**

Eventually, a small group were directed to draw from Cubist works, seen below in Figure 11:

**Figure 9: Students gather to draw from Cubist works**

My field notes captured further responses:

Following lunch, some students were still walking about and eventually gathered as a group in the Cubist display, where Chris took charge and directed a group of seven or eight students to draw from Picasso, Gris and Braque pieces. Some students preferred to debate about the value of the work, contradicting judgements from a teacher about the ‘good art’ in front of them. They seemed to enjoy the debate. Oddly, they accepted
the opinion of the teacher but did not want to explain their reasons, nor analyse their responses to pictures. Another group sat down near the explainer sections and videos references and looked exhausted (see Figure 10).

(Field notes, January 16)

Figure 10: Students tired and waiting at 3.00pm

The issue here is not so much how the visit could have been better organised, but the difference between the power of the studio and the gallery. The studio was, by term two, a space of carefully negotiated and sometimes shared control, where mainly sedentary activity was focussed upon primary sources of study, such as still lives, faces, and, later, local parks, supported from tertiary sources of art sourced via the internet. There was a degree of student independent direction, even in the internet searching for references and quotations. This contrasted with the physically and socially challenging context of a state collection; a totally different, impersonal, architectural context, requiring propriocentric, vestibular and kinaesthetic activity - but, as visitors, proscribing tactile exploration. The contrast with the digestible, tangible contents of assignment references and the radical and intellectually challenging work of the Tate's modern collection clearly disturbed some of the students. During lunch, teachers expressed disappointment about students' lack of interest and desultory responses.

Fyfe (1998), drawing upon Bernstein’s theory of classification and framing, outlines the shaping power of museums' terrain:
First the display of artefacts is a relationship. The subject of the meaning of a museum collection is the web of people and artefacts, which constitute its institutional life. Second, museums are constitutive of groups. The Museum along with other cultural agencies such as schools, pays its way by articulating identities. Thus, aristocratic, bourgeois, proletarian, gender, age and ethnic identities can be, in part, museum identities...The museum is partially constitutive of the very social order that it might be thought to express in that it organises and disorganises identities. Third, museums do not receive art, they make it...art and the museum are dialogic counterparts to each other: they form a developing partnership

(Fyfe, 1998, p326).

The relationships of artist, dealer, collector, connoisseur, curator, teacher, with social hierarchies of class, gender and ethnicity, was a complex one for the L2 students to contend with, and was not easily reducible to drawing abstracted images of state sponsored power. Fyfe goes on to argue that:

The selection and combination of acquisition and display is a recontextualisation of artefacts from other places, an abstraction from other spaces: ...from households, exhibitions and artists' studios...Museums are agencies not only of artefacts but ways of apprehending artefacts and ordering the heterogeneity of the artefactual world


Bernstein (2000) argues that theories and knowledge structures must, to be coherent, have an outer language by which knowledge structures can be recognised. The BTEC L2 course as a vocational course required an outer language, an externality or vocational justification. In the past, work experience (WEX) had been 'strongly recommended' in guidance (BTEC, 1986b), although WEX was substituted more recently as an optional outcome in 'realistic scenarios' and 'preparation for work' in industry (BTEC, 2010). It is not surprising, in Bernsteinian terms, that the inner cohesion of language collapsed at the Tate, and a disjunction occurred between the inner, studio language of study, which was without an orientating intermediate relationship, and the external power of art as a cultural arbitrary. It was unsurprising that some students threatened to leave the course as a result of the visit. Students’ dispositions as students of art and design were being carefully developed in the studio. Their insights into the contexts and value of artists' work were managed through the warm relationships with W
teachers and the physical enjoyment of material exercises. The sacred had been more accessible and proximally framed than at the Tate where the distant, expensive, mysterious, curated state choices remained the exemplification of a cultural imposition. The studio situation was managed to present a more shared atmosphere of control, with less sharply delineated boundaries of knowledge within assignments. Assignments represented the curriculum, which was recontextualised through the teachers' specialised knowledge into assessable knowledge, through the BTEC assessment and verification system. This is a theme, which I now move on to discuss.

Assessment shaping the curriculum

Assessment on the L2 course both shaped the course and characterised key features of the teachers' and students' relationships. Assessment significantly affected the year, the term, assignment design and teachers' time. There were a number of ways in which assessment influenced teachers' and students' relationships and the broader curriculum which I discuss below, followed by an examination of other salient features of how assessment operated.

Formal assessment weeks occurred termly, and overall in five weeks of the thirty five week year and for the final two weeks of the year, when students' work was on public display. In addition, diagnostic tests were set in the induction period. There was an obvious, timetabled separation of assessment from lessons, that is, learning time. Staff acknowledged that there was a direct relationship between the recording of achievement marks and the high 'success' of the course, of which the department was very proud. This success contributed to freedom in designing assignments and assessment, which Jackie acknowledged. Marjorie replied to a question about teachers' autonomy by noting:

We allow our staff the flexibility and discretion necessary i.e. (management are) focussing more on areas for concern, based on results, student retention, LO (Lesson Observation) grades etc. within the constraints of everyone's time and availability.

The relative autonomy of the team was a key feature of how they operated. This also allowed the substantial allocation of time for staff to assess and examine individual students’ collated portfolios. In these times, mostly free from normal class supervision, teachers compared marks and concentrated upon recording achievement against complex unit criteria and verification requirements. However, this also led to the apparent passive involvement of
students in assessment, and the burden of judgements falling upon the two main teachers. The way that assessment was planned introduced students to the separation of learning from assessment. A principal aspect of the broader curriculum is the encouragement of students to take responsibility for their own learning. If assessment be separated from learning, the more it becomes 'assessment of learning' rather than 'assessment for learning' (Black and Wiliam, 1998; Torrance et al, 2005). This may have been planned to simplify the inherently confusing CRA system, which was overlaid with normative grading processes, together with complex verification processes that attempted the objectification of subjective judgements. This appeared to encourage students' dependence in keys areas of learning.

BTEC guidance is very specific about the active involvement of students in assessments. Students should:

- Check the validity and sufficiency of the evidence with the assessor
- Review opportunities for achieving grading criteria
- Participate in self and peer assessment activities where appropriate Participate fully in learning
- Produce work for assessment
- Receive assessment recommendations and feedback from the assessor
- Plan next steps with the assessor

BTEC Guidance (2010)

The guidance is consistent with the evident responsibility the students accepted for maintaining their portfolios. All work was designed to fit A3 format display books which, for many students, were extensive. Scrutiny of portfolio work was the principal evidence teachers referred to in one-to-one assessment meetings, which led to feedback and action plans. Other forms of achievement evidence, such as observation notes, witness statements and students' testimonies, which verification procedures include, did not appear to be used directly in assessments. When I was allowed access to assessments, none of these records were present. The avoidance of other forms of evidence underlined the relative freedom from potentially complicated administration and the reliance that teachers placed on assessment of portfolio work from which to infer achievement. Learning within assignments was broken down into multiple tasks, listed in Submission Sheets, which firstly emphasised productivity and was also an attempt to produce evidence of achievement unequivocally, though this ran the risk of being a 'never ending spiral of detail in pursuit of specificity' (Wolf, 1995).
In February I observed an assessment session, when students presented (mostly substantial) portfolios. I noted:

The second assessment week, there were very few students in studio, some were in the library. There was no clear start to the lesson. Students continued working on their portfolios whilst others were interviewed individually. In a gentle and supportive atmosphere teachers prompted and coached insights about each student's portfolio and sought for gaps in task completion.

There was a new part-time teacher learning on the job; she was looking at folio work and being instructed how to grade. The process appears to be passive i.e. the teacher finds evidence for a task completion, then the student accepts the judgement, as students were mostly not offering comment.

The focus for teacher appears to be on the appropriate completion of forms to allow an audit trail / verification. The assessment process appears to be one stage i.e. student is not encouraged to do more / better work under own steam to improve grade – left to next assessment point.

It was not clear how higher grades were determined, this seemed to depend as much on quantity of work – and ‘hard work’ seen as praise. There was not much challenge either way.

(Field notes, 21 February)

In an interview with Jackie in May, she explained the final assessment process towards the end of the year:

I: *What do you actually do here in these 15-minute assessment slots?*

J: *They are getting feedback and we tell them what is missing*

I: *I have heard you telling them how to do it as well, a lot of handholding isn’t there? So the next process is to assess it without them?*

J: *Yes it’s a shame really that they are not here because there is that final feedback, which would be nice for them*

I: *Why cannot you get them here?*

J: *It takes too long*
I: So how much time do you spend?

J: Half an hour to 45 minutes for each student and we do it together with other lecturers so we are constantly...whoever we have got on the timetable we would be checking our grading so it's kind of IV'd as we are doing it, but we do sit down and IV it afterwards really.

(Interview, 5 May)

The above exchange was about interim and summative, end of year assessment. Jackie admits that summative assessment was not for the students’ benefit, but had to take place for organisational reasons. The point being made is that the collective reconciling of judgements and the CRA process itself is very time-consuming and, for this team, was irreconcilable with students' active learning.

There were other kinds of informal assessment. Verbal feedback in team-taught sessions was extensive and usually delivered with concern for the student's stage of understanding, but apparently not recorded. At least one of the two main teachers, Chris and Jackie, were always timetabled into practical studio sessions. They had pastoral roles and no doubt had in-depth knowledge of students' attitudes and dispositions. They had the main responsibility for maintaining auditable attendance, assessment and progress records. Jackie and Chris led formal assessments with, as Chris said, "Whoever else was timetabled". It appeared that a great deal of how students performed was reliant upon Jackie's and Chris' memory. This also explained the importance of having extensive portfolio work to seek and interpret evidence for achievement.

Multiple portfolio representations produced a quantitative basis for registering achievement, or at least one kind of achievement. These were the kind of tasks that the whole class could achieve, for example, to create a drawing 'in the style of Morandi' or make a composition 'in the style of Michael Craig Martin'. Students could either do or not do such tasks. The tasks to be done were at 'pass' level, which was not difficult to achieve. Two telling statements of Jackie's, cast light on the ideological contradictions that teachers had to manage. During an interview about students' general cultural disadvantages she remarked:

*I find that 50% of them to pick up a pencil and the other 50% you are encouraging them to develop their work. But I find that the 50% who you are encouraging to pick
up a pencil are quite frustrated because I want to encourage them to develop their work you know but that's (not?) what we are here for.

(Interview, 6 February)

There may well have been fifty per cent of the kind of students she mentioned, such as the less motivated, less confident or less able. Jackie was, in my opinion, expressing the multiple standards of judgements that are called into play when teaching students with a very wide range of abilities, and trying to implement fair and unequivocal judgements via CRA. In passing, when we were casually talking about assessment, she said, I thought ironically, “Well if you get the quantity, you get the quality”. This was a clearly an incorrect and almost heretical statement. The irony was that, as task non-completions were the principal reasons for 'R' (referred) or 'F' (failed) in assessment records (see Appendix 23), accordingly in some situations, for some students, Jackie believed extensive evidence would represent satisfactory achievement.

All of this indicates that the CRA assessment system had the effect of separating students from the judgements of their work and tended to emphasise quantity and effort above high quality, although some students, whom I will discuss later, made high quality work. It also demanded a great deal of time in the year to administer and to record individuals' achievements. As in team-taught sessions, leadership in assessments and quality reviews was concentrated, or ceded, by the ten or eleven strong team, to Jackie and Chris. They had in-depth knowledge of students' dispositions, which seemed essential to arrive at qualitative judgements about 'good' work. In the first interviews with Chris, she could not identify students' work and was reluctant to identify pieces as creditable, without knowing whose they were, or seeing the rest of the student's work. Chris said, “I would have to remember what the rest of his work was like to be honest with you and I can’t.” It is quite reasonable to require context to understand the quality of work, but the point is that due to the complexity of the recording processes, and the reliance upon a 'community of practice' to arrive at difficult decisions, the work was concentrated in the hands of two teachers.

Team teaching is complex. With weakly classified curricula, to maintain cooperative efforts, it is incumbent upon staff to share approaches, information and subscribe to similar ideologies. As Bernstein (2000) asserts, in describing curricula based on weak classification it requires:
Staff (to be) part of a strong social network (or it must be strong for the transmissions to work) which should be concerned with the integration of difference. And this is no easy activity...Further the relations between staff within a weakly classified system cohere around knowledge itself.

(Bernstein, 2000, p11. author's emphasis)

The important effect here of this complicated assessment system is upon team cohesion and identity. Although it was understandable that some staff had differing values and views, some teachers were not included in assessments. Chris said Dave's IT class was not assessed, that is, Dave did not subscribe to assessment, and Imogen said her Functional Skills lessons were not integrated into assignments. The energy of this successful course relied upon various teachers' specialised input, in painting, drawing, 3D (although limited), graphic design, IT and latterly in fashion. Students were clearly happy in the studio and positive attitudes were a feature of staff-to-staff and staff student relations. Assignment designs were attractive and culturally complex productions and masses of supplementary learning materials were produced during assignments to illustrate and prompt effort and ideas. In other words, the relative autonomy of the team, the intense and collective, creative, efforts of teachers and learning assistants, depended to some extent on the burdensome CRA system being shouldered by two teachers. There are three remaining issues which analysis of assessments raised. The first of these concerns the overt emphasis upon high grades, and the others are concerned with assessment, or the way this system operated, denying learning for teachers.

Inspection high grades depend initially on 'success' measured as completions / starters, but also the percentage of high achievements, that is Merit and Distinction grades. Chris said, “For distinction grades, and I try to push the students to get highest grades; looking at assessment criteria it's all about imaginative and independent enquiry”. There could be no objection to teachers' aspirations on behalf of students. In assessments for terms one and two, it was clear that assessments were re-visited to amend grades, and movements were all upwards (see Appendix 20). Grades in term one were later amended towards 'D' grades, consistent with students’ overall Distinction grades. In a conversation with Chris about Sylvia's proposed overall Distinction grade, I questioned Sylvia's conceptual grasp of tasks and portfolio work, mainly because her English language skills were very rudimentary. Chris consulted with Marjorie, the department's internal verifier, who said that grades could not be marked down. Presumably if verification procedures were effective and revealed a weakness
in grading, marks could be legitimately amended in either direction. Apparently this was not the case. Their interpretation was that internal pressure was on upward grading, somewhat independently of reviews about students' achievement.

In an interview with Marjorie she remarked that, “All grades were summative” (she meant formative) because they could all be revisited at some time in the future. This raised the question of assessment in contextually-specific situations. If a student failed to perform a task in studio, and produced the completed task a few weeks later, beyond a deadline that others have adhered to, and with facilities outside the college to which other students may not have access, does the product count as legitimate evidence? The issue was not an apparent concern in the busy assessment schedules. The response about revisiting assessments was echoed by Jackie in the second term, who stated, "We are very lucky with the BTEC, we do get time to re-submit so we give the feedback, we guide them, there is support there for them". Whether or not teachers understood the difference between formative and summative assessment was not an issue for me. Assessment did fulfil formative purposes in many ways. However, staff could learn from teasing out the differences, which may well have been valuable for future course design.

When I asked if assessment was rigorous, Chris said she thought it was. When asked about marking she said:

    C: I always make sure that there is a correct validation occurring.

    I: Is it cross-marked?

    C: Yes it is randomly picked...we work together it is supposed to be systematic

    I: Do you assess blind?

    C: What do you mean, blind – we don’t do it that way we work together to discuss it. But sometimes we are not 100% sure about the grade we are giving to that particular student because there might be strong outcomes but a few gaps here and there, we may discuss with more than one member of staff.

Here I am not recommending blind and double marking as a matter of course. Teachers have individual approaches and differing values underpinning their approaches to teaching and hence what counts as valid knowledge and what can thus be assessed. Elkins (2001) cites the 'truncated conversations in the staff room' as an example of how different ideologies have to
be reconciled on art programmes. CRA and its extensive verification processes drives out the possibility of identifying key ideological differences, which inevitably are visited upon students. However difficult it may be, the elucidation of differing views can only strengthen team cohesion and creative productivity. The contextualisation of their experience is valuable knowledge from which students may benefit, and has wider cultural significance, which I discussed previously in the section on High and Low Culture.

Teachers may not have had enough time to reconcile different assumptions and tackle the grading of two different types of achievement that BTEC's CRA / normative schemes require. The first types of achievement are the passable tasks, those multiple exercises that are designed to show students' knowledge, of knowing how; for instance ink and bleach drawing is different to subtractive drawing. The second is akin to 'knowing that', for example that some artists use these methods, which can be used to innovate and to foster the use of imagination to build upon tacit knowledge. This latter is where the normative application of grades occurs, and is based upon a basic assumption about the value of traditional craft subjects supporting higher level learning and cognitive skills. Tickle (1983), in a comparative study of three art teachers approaches, observed that they subscribed to this assumption, and most of their time was spent encouraging and 'showing how' underperforming students could complete set exercises. More able students, having completed set tasks, who knew what was wanted, or in Bernstein's (2000) terms had mastered 'recognition rules', were free to experiment and work unsupervised. It is not the place here to discuss the potential inequality inherent in such categorisations, only to point out that course design may in the future have benefited from clarifying such assumptions, one consequence of which may be the difficulties in providing craft materials for all students in times of resource reductions. The above describes important ways in which CRA drives the art and design curriculum, which is a time-consuming mechanism that moves teachers away from considering the wider curriculum and its purposes.

The final aspect of the curriculum as designed and experienced by students in this BTEC art and design course is concerned with making and looking, which I proceed to discuss below.

**Visual and haptic learning**

The dualism of 2D and 3D is a convenience and limitation, which refers to the boundaries of genres or practices, such as between graphic design and ceramics, photography and
silversmithing, sculpture and printmaking and so on. There was an intention on the part of BTEC and the L2 course to provide a balance of 2D and 3D content. The summary below, in Table 13, taken from unit specifications, compares the key aspects of making, and identifies the relevant range of resources for each. The emboldened content illustrates the emphasis on two-dimensional content, which is repeated in Unit 13: Working with Visual Arts Briefs and Unit 11: Working with 3D Design Briefs.

**Table 13: Units 2 and 3 content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 2: 2D Visual Communication</th>
<th>Unit 3: 3D Visual Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be able to use 2D mark-making techniques</td>
<td>Be able to use 3D making techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D mark making: disciplines e.g. drawing, painting, photography, printmaking, digital (drawing, painting, manipulating) Techniques: general e.g. touch, control, style, method, procedure, facility; specific e.g. drawing (stipple, smudge, sgraffito), painting (blend, wash, scumble), digital (clone, transform), printmaking (etch, silkscreen), photography (dodge, focus)</td>
<td>3D making techniques: e.g. cutting, joining, shaping, forming, carving, weaving, 3D digital techniques, model-making, experiments, finished pieces, laminating, fusing, casting, slotting, piercing, sanding, polishing, finishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit guidance employs conditional phrases and options and adopts an advisory tone:

The techniques and processes selected will **depend on the equipment and materials available in each centre**, learners **should** have access to appropriate 2D resources such as photography, printmaking; painting, drawing and digital (2D Visual Communication, 2010).

This unit **should** be delivered in the most appropriate workshops: for example, wood, metal and ceramics (3D Visual Communication, 2010).

Tutors **should** deliver a presentation that shows examples of 3D design work across a range of disciplines (Working with 3D Design Briefs).
A directive places responsibility on students to identify and select specialist resources:

Learners will need to have access to a range of 2D, 3D and time-based media, materials, techniques and processes to realise their ideas and respond to briefs.

(Unit 11, 2010).

There is a substantial lack of specificity on resources throughout the unit guidance. The average length of each unit is approximately 5,000 words and information on resources is minimal. Illustrated below in Table 14 is a comparison of the entire descriptions of ‘Essential Resources for units 11 and 13’. This insufficiency of specification is repeated in units Unit 2: ‘Visual Communication’ and Unit 3: ‘3D Visual Communication’:

**Table 14: Units 2 and 3: Essential resources.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 11: Working with 3D Design Briefs</th>
<th>Unit 13: Working with Visual Arts Briefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery of this unit will focus on learners exploring research through an initial assignment. This will be followed up with ideas development and practical production against a set or self-generated 3D design brief.</strong> Learners will need access to specialist 3D design studios, depending on the range available in the centre. They will also require access to specific technical support within the 3D area. Learners should incorporate safe working practices into their learning as part of the practical work in the unit.</td>
<td><strong>specialist workspaces</strong>: e.g. studios, workshops, computer suites, video and film editing suites. <strong>materials, equipment and tools</strong>: e.g. for 2D, 3D, time-based and associated materials, equipment and tools across all specialist areas. <strong>access to a learning centre</strong>: e.g. for books, periodicals, journals, videos, CD ROMs, the internet. <strong>specialist staff</strong>: e.g. for the different specialist pathways; this might necessarily include technical support staff. Visits to galleries, exhibitions, film reviews, plays, performance and live art, workshops, studios and advertising agencies could play an important role when designing assignments for this unit. Alternatively, bringing in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BTEC’s (2010) equivocation on the provision of material resources may have permitted autonomy for teachers, but disguised serious shortcomings for learners. The general disadvantage in sensory perception and experiential learning this condones is part of a reported general withdrawal of practical facilities in UK education as whole (Wolf, 2015; Miadownik, 2014). The points emphasised here is that BTEC elided domain contexts, inhibiting articulated, specialist knowledge. Secondly, I argue that this affected haptic, tactile and three-dimensional domains disproportionately.

Delivery, and especially information on resources, was subordinated to complex BTEC guidance and rules. The BTEC L2 Specification (2010) consisted of two hundred and ninety two pages of direction; Unit 3 itself had twelve pages. Procedures for validation and assessment and grade calculations are highly prescriptive, compared to content. Resource specification was optional, advisory, and was variable, which Marjorie reluctantly accepted depended on the centre's provision. She said, “I think we have to accept that standards vary quite widely across providers (schools)” . Chris despaired of some L2 BTEC work in school applicants' portfolios, saying:

There was no way they (applicants) would have coped on a Level 3 programme that’s why although they had the grades...we interview students for Level 3 programmes but they don’t ... their quality of work (is poor)... I find that quite often that comes out of school ...so they might have a Level 2 Merit or Distinction grade and the quality is shocking.

(Interview, January)

A BTEC officer I communicated with during the course of the study rejected the claim of disparate standards, although admitting that FE colleges disagreed, noting:
This perception is voiced by FE Colleges and is based primarily on the fact that work coming from schools’ Level 2 programmes is not as broad. I said that despite what FE Colleges may think that the ‘standard’ is the same.

(BTEC communication, 2012)

It was apparent in set tasks and from observations that the L2 course focussed on 2D provision and the visual, which reflected a narrow range of learning and provision, expressed in portfolios and the absence of resistant materials. The BTEC officer clearly accepted that the important schools market accepted even narrower provision. The complexity of BTEC guidance focussed teachers' attention on procedural compliance and the vagueness of resource requirements implied that narrowly resourced providers could deliver a L2 programme. The impression given to teachers was of a pick and mix curriculum, favouring 2D, that is image making, and ostensibly offering choice and autonomy for teaching teams. These choices were situated in fine art practice, that is, not in design or craft traditions. Craft processes and design challenges extend the contextuality and hence the grammar of visual and haptic processes as powerful knowledge.

The conclusion is that the L2 course emphasis was on the visual / 2D rather than the making/3D, which was partly understandable given Western ocularcentarity. However, 'Essential Resources' are very lightly specified, but general guidance for resources states:

Physical resources need to support the delivery of the programme and the proper assessment of the learning outcomes and should, therefore, normally be of industry standard.

(BTEC, 2010, p13, my emphasis).

Here, where 'Physical resources... should therefore, normally be of industry standard' there was implied permission not to provide resources of industry standard as there was no imperative where centres must provide contextually defining resources. This is most important for the differentiated understanding and acquisition of skills and dispositions for all disciplines, for example, between graphic design, 3D design or craft skills. The question occurs that although the enjoyment of study and immersion in visualising processes may well be a way of capturing students’ affinity, is the visual / 2D emphasis unconsciously reinforcing a social prejudice and inadvertently disadvantaging some students? For instance, those students more interested in problem solving and resistant materials may lose out.
This potential lack of experience for 3D education raises concerns with Frayling (2011), who pleads for craft in education to be 'allowed to breathe' (p123) because there is a danger of the transformation of design into a 'briefing process'. Heskett (2002) aligns the understanding of design, its objects and artefacts, the acquisition of tacit knowledge and the discovery of materials' qualities to their manipulation (ibid, p48). In discussing the process of design, he emphasises the role of the hand:

A crucial instrument was the human hand...In their origins, tools were undoubtedly extensions of these functions of the hand, increasing their power, delicacy and subtlety ... (showing) the capacity of the human brain to understand the relationship between forms and function.

(Heskett, 2002,p 9).

Contact with a range of materials was, and is, especially important for student designers and makers, as new materials and uses for existing materials are 'growing at an exponential rate' (Miadownik, 2014, p4). For foundational students, learning about initial stages of design is especially important, as Laughlan (2010) points out:

In this first instance the designer may turn to swatches of materials samples that can be easily thumbed through to find a material that is suitable for their design, and liaise with manufacturers to discuss processes and materials solutions... the selection of a material is to be an integral part of the inspiration for the item it creates.

(Laughlan, 2010, p29).

Materials can stand for qualities and ideas, although 'encounters' with them is the key to their possibilities or affordances, as Laughlan (2010) argues:

The practitioner’s relationship to materials is still largely driven by use, manipulation and appreciation of materials on the macro level, from encounters with haptic, aesthetic analysis at the human scale.

(Laughlan, 2010,p 42, my emphasis).

Other reasons reinforced a cultural bias towards the visual and the use of softer materials. For example, enrolments for courses with 'Industry standard' 3D resources, for instance in engineering, may be more difficult for the college to anticipate and provide; the L2 studio had...
taken over a workshop for a motor vehicle course that had been withdrawn. In addition, departmental staff expertise may be in short supply. Chris and Jackie said they saw 3D as a male domain, and Harry, who only taught tool skills to Level 3 students, taught very few hours on the L2 course. Further, teachers may have found it more challenging to teach 3D. Marjorie remarked that teachers had a problem with declining standards of applicants' abilities and as Chris remarked, students, “Struggle with that (3D)”’. This may ultimately lead to a lack of teachers with those skills. Basic (freehand) drawing and painting is common to many teachers’ experiences, which may be easier for staff to teach rather than, say Euclidian geometry, and specialist, integrated assignments. The L2 was a large team, which Jackie pointed out was hard to manage and it was difficult for staff to attend meetings, producing a pressure to regress to common, expedient understandings in a very busy environment.

Significantly, keeping work 2D, simple and largely flat, allowed latecomers and poor attendees in a mixed ability group, to catch up and to take work home to complete and store easily. The studio generally represented a physical restriction on the size of work through the size of tables, which accommodated only two A3 workspaces, and with the size of plan chests for storage and shallow storage shelves (see Figure 2). In addition, virtually all tools and equipment were stored in two stationery cupboards.

Portfolio work was almost all presented flat in A3 presentation folios. This was a useful but limited convention, reinforced by providing students with shallow plan chests for work, and metal shelving, only 400mm high, for the general collection of three-dimensional work (maquettes, clay and card models). For first interviews, students only presented self-portraits, drawings of tools and ink and bleach paintings, and one student a card relief, as ‘good’ work. There were no 3D constructions of clay or Plaster of Paris. The 'message' that the course was transmitting was that 3D was subordinate or optional to visual learning, evidenced as early as January in the academic year.

A measure of the limited range of materials provided was the limited range of tools required, as outlined below in Table 15:
Table 15: Material themes in Assignments 1 to 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( in almost all cases, photos and information about artists and designers work was accessed from handouts and internet sources, i.e. college computers and included as annotations about tasks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Me Myself and I</strong></td>
<td>Pencils; paper; card and ink (drawing); coloured paint, brushes; collages; photographs; Digital -Photoshop - images; notes (annotations); canvas; ink (monoprint)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3D Vessels</strong></td>
<td>Charcoal, paper; pencil; ink and bleach, brushes; card (relief); Plaster of Paris; clay; wire; pliers, knives; notes (annotations);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Still Life</strong></td>
<td>paint, paper, brushes, pencils; photocopies; collage; oil pastels; mixed media (collage, montage); notes (annotations);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Forms</strong></td>
<td>pencils, paper; bamboo (ink); ink (lino print); lino (A6); cutters, rollers; notes (annotations); Modroc; tracing paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students' technologies were not highly specialised, except for computer-based access to Illustrator, Photoshop and Cinema 4D. The last application is potentially a 3D tool, but images remained 2D, and were not three dimensionally realised, for instance from digitally printed files. When I visited in December, I met Harry in the refectory area. I asked about the possibility of 3D printing:

The studio is too cold to work in; Harry was concerned about the workshops space in the new build, which would be inadequate. He is working more on Level 2 (maybe 3D was going to feature more in the future) but was disappointed to have been taken off foundation and Level 3, where he has worked hard to develop 3D over previous years. I asked if they had a 3D printer – they did have one delivered but it was delivered to Engineering by mistake (art and design took over Engineering workshops in previous years) and has since gone missing.

(Field notes, December 2012)

The images below in Figure 11 could have been translated into three dimensions had the digital printer been identified as legitimate art and design technology.
Material experience, for the moment considered as 3D, was not as well-articulated in the vocabulary of the team's Formal Elements. The Formal Elements handout contained critical terms of description, which Chris agreed also acted as categories of visual classification, and tended not to include technical terms appropriate to 3D. Terms such as 'Line, Tone, Texture, Colour' are applicable to describe two-dimensional composition, compared to qualities of materials such as 'ductile', 'malleable', 'tensile' or 'elastic'. Teachers were open to reflection on the possible 2D bias of the Formal Elements. During a lesson and discussion of conceptual boundaries, I suggested, in a response to Jackie, a list of three-dimensional elements, which she accepted without comment, listed below:

**3D Formal Elements / associated qualities and terms**

**Wood** – sheets, blocks, grain, pliable, fibreboard, Medium Density Fibreboard (MDF), particle board, deciduous, coniferous, hardwood, softwood, pine, oak, ash, mahogany, teak, plywood, insulating, jointed, dovetailed, glued, laminate, cut, drill, resistant

**Metal** – hard, ductile, malleable, alloys, cast, extruded, folded, rolled, welded, spun, shiny/matt, stamped, pressed, flexible, tensile, cut, drill, dense, heavy, resistant, engineered, machined, bolted, riveted

**Plastics** – moulded, synthetic, poisonous, recyclable, non-biodegradable, biodegradable, oil-based, natural, cellulose, polystyrene, polycarbonate, fused, bonded

**Ceramics** – mouldable, cast, coiled, rolled, earthenware, stoneware, porcelain, tiles, tableware, insulation, glazed, biscuit, compression, resistant, burnished, slip,
Glass - moulded, blown, slab, float, transparent, opaque, tinted, mirrored, silica

Textiles – print, knit, weave, knotted, yarn, warp, woof, dyed, natural, synthetic, tensile, non-resistant

Components – modular, assembled, mass-produced, handmade, multiples, static, mobile, articulated, electrical, mechanical, ergonomic

Joining – welding, fusing, screws, nuts, bolts, glued, laminated, bonded

Structures – tensile, compression, stiff, flexible, elastic, modular, functional, decorative.

The course's Formal Elements list illustrated a distinct language and semantic structure for aesthetic analysis and focused on 'beauty', 'function' and so forth. There was less evidence of a material and artefactual language with its own ontology and semantic structure. The question occurred, should the tools and materials supplied be commensurate with the 'sacred' language of celebrated artists? For example, Warhol’s and Hockney’s printing and camera technologies, Dine’s access to tools and hardware, or even the ordinary, everyday household stuff like wood, metal and plastics?

'2D' and '3D' 'formal elements' express typologies which can serve an essential, strongly bounded conceptual framework, and in their systematic, hierarchical articulation provide a bridge between domains, for instance in the theoretical exploration of measurement, both anthropometrical and Euclidian, and in considering movement as physical articulation and stop-motion animation. Drawing, as the coordination of hand and eye, had, on the L2 course, tactile and visual expressions, for example the ink and bleach drawings, and subtractive charcoal drawings had strong tactile and sensory qualities, which contributed to their compelling attractiveness. Whilst bearing in mind the role that drawing had in extending the visual, for the moment it is important to examine a dual purpose of vision.

Milner & Goodale (1998) remind us that 'vision evolved in the first place not to provide perception of the world per se, but to provide distal sensory control of the many different movements that organisms make' (p2). Separate, but related neural pathways exist to cope with different patterns of behaviour, from 'catching prey to avoiding obstacles' (para. 2). They argue that two broad kinds of vision exist: vision for action, for the 'here and now' (for the immediate haptic control of objects) and vision for perception (the identification and recognition of objects and the ‘parsing’ of relevant qualities) which is more amenable to
cognitive constructions, that is, conventional knowledge. Milner & Goodale (1998; 2008) emphasise the multiple connections between these two functions; goal-directed action might depend upon the control of vision for action and the selection of appropriate objects and the action to be performed depends upon vision for perception.

These independently identified but closely related functions of vision might explain the connectedness of visual to sensory perception that Howe (2006) explores, and the greater haptic reality that Paterson (2007) outlines. ‘Haptic’, according to Paterson (2007), relates to the sense of touch, and includes:

- **Proprioception**: “the state and movement of the body in ... space”. It includes cutaneous, kinaesthetic and vestibular sensations.
- **Vestibular**: to do with balance, acceleration, and deceleration.
- **Kinaesthesia**: movement of the body and limbs relating to muscles tendons and joints.
- **Cutaneous**: pertaining to the skin as a sense organ and pressure, temperature and pain.
- **Tactile**: pertaining to cutaneous but more to do with pressure.

(Paterson, 2007, p ix)

To dismiss the ‘here and now’ that is embedded in vision for action as not being able to contribute to knowledge and awareness and its perpetuation is, I believe, misguided. This may be significant in understanding a developed view of the transitory, ephemeral and haptic as having less value than the abstracted information, which is, according to Milner and Goodale (1998) more available to propositional, refined thought. This is also echoes Bernstein’s (2000) distinction between *sacred* and *profane* knowledge. Milner & Goodale (2008) associate vision for recognition as being more easily associated with propositional, rational conceptualisation, and reinforces (for them) the advantage or superiority of abstract thought in comparison to the more transitory, spatially embodied, proximal nature of ‘location knowing’. In a way, the former relates objects to objects, the latter, objects to subjects, sometimes evident in approaches to drawing.
The Haptic in Drawing

When Jackie encouraged students to ‘disconnect from their memory’, she was directing students to a particular function of vision; the vision for recognition, as well as their personal memory of how to depict the object of attention. In talking about the drawing below, in Figure 12, which was a part of a tactile examination of a tool, in the manner of Jim Dine, a student, Elaine, said:

E: (This) is an attractive drawing he used done by charcoal from my project start art of the level 2 course... from the 3D Vessels project so that when we observing during that project and making it look realistic

I: So is it why good?

E: I like the fact that I am looking at here now and I could literally imagine I feel as though I could pick it up and the fact that it is realistic

I: How long did it take you to do?

It was a very frustrating task it took me maybe half an hour did it ... it was a very frustrating task though, it was like switching your brain around to keep rubbing out to get the dark areas light shade of areas because...used to using charcoal and paper but this using charcoal and you had to rub out

Well mainly the task the whole of that task was mainly called observational drawings but this is (in) the style of Jim Dine the fact that he uses everyday objects mainly he uses tools and stuff like that so and I had to compare this with my other drawings I did but I found this the most effective.

Figure 12: Elaine's subtractive charcoal drawing
This subtractive drawing starts from an applied black charcoal surface and line is drawn by subtracting black to achieve an edge; very much a tactile, felt approach. Elaine says she 'could pick it up', but as a kitchen utensil it lacks a functional appearance. She said it was 'effective' and she had 'switched her brain around', two phrases that teachers used to identify good work. Drawing, for Elaine, was doing many valuable things. It was linking significant imperatives from the course: observation; the application of 'formal elements (light, shade, tone); research on artists (Dine); the use of various materials, ink /bleach, charcoal, paint, collage; museum study, and concentrated study. Significantly, it maintained her attention, as for her 'half an hour' was a long time to work on a piece.

Importantly, when a tactile aspect was included in a drawing process, with time to understand materials, then Elaine achieved good results, for instance in the tool drawing and in the MM&I project. Later, when Elaine was asked to use card, Plaster of Paris and clay, the results were not as successful (see below Figure 13), and there was less evidence of involvement in these materials in her portfolio. In interview, she said she could not locate her 3D work:

I: So in terms of making skills, using your hands, what are the other making skills you have learnt?

E: Clay yes but I they have broken in pieces

I: There is this plaster piece, so you have made things in plaster, card, clay...

E: I have some things in my drawer... I have some card here; I have found the clay these two are reliefs and that is something I am working on now... This was knit, this was one of the knitting tools I used big wooden ones.
Simply put, drawing, for Elaine, became useful and satisfying or 'effective' when a tactile, expressive purpose was present (and enough time allowed) and when it was required to visualise or record her personal progress: Below, in Figures 14-18: three are pages from successive assignments over an academic year from Elaine’s portfolio, indicating nominal increase in drawing ability. When her drawing uses tactile characteristics, the expressive quality improves the strength of the image.
In lessons in which I took part, sustained, observational drawing did not often occur, nor was it evidenced in folios, but students were comprehensively returned to drawing in many different contexts as a recording tool. Time was not allocated to achieve rigorous observational skills. There was a concentration upon familiarity with drawing as a common means of portfolio construction, as a benefit in itself, and as an activity of dispositional familiarity to which the student would naturally return.

**Visual and haptic learning as powerful knowledge**

Visual and haptic learning was legitimised as curricula knowledge in a series of horizontally arranged exercises. The question emerged, 'To what extent could this be considered powerful knowledge?' As shown above, two dimensional substance and genres were preferenced over three-dimensional content on the L2 course. This was reinforced by the limitations of resources, specifically resistant materials, with a corresponding restricted access to tools and technologies. For the current analysis, it is important to consider the distinct character of each domain as well as their potential associations. This had implications for how each can be the location for theoretical and tacit knowledge, as well as 'deep understanding'. These can be considered as respectively, conceptual and procedural knowledge, each with explicit and *tacit* dimensions. (Polanyi, 1962; Schön, 1983; Wenger 1998). I take the sensory expansion of 2D as focussing on the visual sense, and 3D as involving motor skills, the manipulation of construction materials involving, primarily, tactile sensibility. According to Polanyi (1962), each domain of knowledge is susceptible to learning based upon tacit or 'subsidiary' awareness, separate, but linked to 'focal' or explicit awareness. Steyn (2010) cites research by Cross (2004) and others who contend that the two types of learning or knowledge 'cannot be done at the same time'.

Wenger (1998) suggests that relationships between tacit and explicit knowledge are revealed when boundaries of learning are encountered. He suggests learning can be shared, that knowledge is transferable and potentially enhanced when competence is recognised across boundaries in adjacent fields (p140). Competence, within contextual domains, can be conceptualised as one form of cumulative knowledge, which can be vertically arranged, subject to abstract and theoretical arrangement. For example, competence in manipulating images can progress from hand-drawn to magazine presentation, employing the skills of colour analysis, scaling and measurement. Similarly, making a chair would start from
sketches from observation, to materials analysis, scaling and measurement. Manufacture and production would have parallel, 'soft' skills of teamwork and 'hard' skills of distribution and marketing. In comparing the intrinsic properties of art and design domains, it is important to revisit and possibly reinforce the boundaries, the difference of the domain, in order to make domain comparisons more meaningful. Domain purposes may remain distinct, for example sitting in a chair is different from reading a magazine. Competence, as expressed on the L2 course, was more about the accumulation of portfolio evidence and task completion, than exploring the situatedness of materials' domains.

Haptic, tactile learning in assignments used clay, Plaster of Paris, flat card in relief, wire, string and glue guns, but rulers were used as straight edges than measurement. Chris was hesitant about 3D, and hence specifically haptic content, basing the choice of content on students’ previous preference, saying:

Well I designed that (3D) project and I quite enjoyed it but I haven’t got an architectural background whatsoever so you know you have to research it all yourself and make sure that sure that you are barking the right tree with it but it was an exciting project but I find that generally the students tend to struggle with the 3D element. There’s not many that are strong in 3D making or designing skills, which is quite interesting.

(Chris, 26 April)

Haptic learning, as tacit, haptic knowledge subject to an anthropometric or 'human scale', was also controlled by the material environment in which students were learning. Although tables and chairs were moved according to the assignment, students almost always sat down to work. A3 folios 'fitted' approximately two students to a table. Occasionally students stood during a lesson, to work or to collect materials. The sedentary positions of students was so prescribed it was with surprise that I saw an African Caribbean student work on a painting from the side), illustrated in Figure 19:
One teacher expressed affinity with the distinctness of 3D disciplines as powerful, that is, boundary-transcending knowledge. In discussing distinguishing features of 3D design, Harry suggested that:

(There are) two basic ways of designing for the workshop and that’s to understand the materials or designing for a problem ... the two basic ones ... very much at this college thrown in with units we teach for, they put them into small scale, human scale and large scale it’s about manipulating shape and form for the hand - small scale; about sitting against, sitting on – human scale; and it’s about spatial awareness and large scale physicality on a large scale

(Harry, 27 February, my emphasis)

Harry’s consideration of scale was essentially specifying three-dimensional boundary characteristics. With reference to Paterson's haptic typography of tactile, cutaneous, kinaesthetic, and vestibular, Harry's categories of scale corresponded to a haptic range or continuum and can, with the aid of Paterson's (2007) concept of haptic skills, be set in art and design contexts as:

Small scale, as jewellery, ceramics which depends upon tactile and cutaneous sensitivity.
Human scale, as in furniture, product design, textile design and automobile design depends upon the above and an understanding of kinaesthetics and bodily articulation, and vestibular (motion and balance) capacities.

Large scale as in architecture, theatre design, interior design employs all the above internal capacities as well as predominantly external propriocentric senses.

As visual and haptic sensibilities cannot be entirely separate and are best considered as complementary to the haptic categories, they can be related in types of visual expression, for instance in drawing, which can fulfil different purposes, such as:

**Tactile** - small scale drawing:- medical illustration, personal sketchbooks, diagrammes for construction, maps.

**Cutaneous** - life drawing, pattern cutting for garments, product design, often carried out in 1:1 scale.

**Kinaesthetic** - drawing to describe moving articulated parts, engineering drawing.

**Vestibular**- larger scale:- architectural drawing, theatre design, mural design.

Haptic sensibility as material reality can also be expressed through the comparison and contrasting of materials, as Laughlan (2010) researched in an examination of materials libraries. She proposes that a fertile field for artists, engineers and scientists can begin with the handling and the sensory exploration of materials. Laughlan (2010) is more concerned with non-resistant materials, but her approach in assembling 'swatches' of materials for comparison is drawn from the standard practice of artists, engineers and craftspersons, textile, fashion or interior designers. Swatches are packages of dissimilar materials, arranged systematically with some common arrangement as the basis for contrast and comparison. Laughlan cites Dormer's (1997) support for tactility, asserting:

Materials used in many crafts are encountered with immediacy and tactility, selected literally by the hand, as opposed to specified over the phone or agreed on in catalogues, meaning that feel is at the heart of the craftsperson’s relationship to materials.

(Laughlan, 2010,p35)
In addition, arguing for the physical presence of materials for selection in educational or professional situations, not necessarily to displace technical data, but to supplement its use, she suggests that:

The human senses are highly attuned and sophisticated measuring tools for a vast number of non-technical material properties, be they perceptual, cultural or experimental. To derive understanding from doing, from making, from asking and testing with one’s own senses affords learning in a fashion not supported or promoted through simple database searching. For this reason, materials are required to be present as the focus of a haptic enquiry and physical testing

(Laughlan, 2010, p272)

For all of the reasons discussed on this section, it can be seen that the curriculum as designed and experienced in this L2 studio privileged 2D experiences. However, visual and haptic learning are interrelated and their essential power lies in their differentiated articulation. Further potential exists between these domains, to 'think the unthinkable (Bernstein, 2000), and there is an important role for of all the senses to articulate understanding of materials, which is especially crucial for designers and artists. The implications of this finding for the teaching of art and design is discussed in the concluding chapter.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have analysed the construction of the BTEC L2 curriculum delivered in an FE college by a large teaching team. It could be seen that the setting of many essentially achievable tasks within assignments was designed to facilitate confident enjoyment and a sense of personal discovery, and knowledge, thus, could be viewed as weakly classified. The approach on this course may avoid the development and articulation of abstract development or stronger subject 'grammars' (Bernstein, 2000). Such progressive approaches may nevertheless rely upon strong framing, with the imposition of the teachers' authority foregrounding the importance of teacher and student relationships (Bernstein, 2000).

The development of special terminologies and an internal language for art and design was then discussed in relation to issues of cultural hierarchy and cultural reproduction in the
I examined the implications of selecting artists and designers to study who are remote from students’ culture and represent gendered stereotypes of artistic achievement, and thus reinforce inappropriate cultural distinctions. This prejudice is also found in BTEC assignment guidance. Maton's (2010) concepts of 'knower codes' and his theories on structuring otherwise intuitive concepts of 'gaze', attempt to articulate the development of contextualised, horizontal discourse and knowledge structures. These concepts can help in an explanation of the cultural conflict in evidence when students visited the Tate Modern Gallery, where the personalised experience of students with the Still Life assignment clashed with their experience of the Tate. I argue that the college-based focus on the subjective experience of the students did not provide the students with an external language, which may have helped them to relate their work to the Tate collection, and it exposed the students to uncomfortable, arbitrary impositions of taste through the curriculum.

There are numerous concerns raised in this chapter in relation to assessment. The evidence from this ethnographic study indicates that the L2 curriculum was framed by a demanding assessment and verification system of criterion referenced assessment combined with a normative grading of Pass, Merit and Distinction. These two systems presented confusing ideologies for teachers to administer, which resulted in reinforcing student dependence and encouraging passive relationships to their own learning. There was reliance upon multiple tasks within assignments to provide alternative evidence for pursuing the departmental emphasis on upgrading students' achievement. Further, the CRA / normative assessment regime contributed to an excessive system that was difficult to administer across a large team and it resulted in excessive workloads for just a few members of staff.

The study also found that the curriculum privileged visual learning at the expense of haptic learning, which is reinforced by BTEC’s vague specification for the material contextualisation of unit knowledge. There is a need to refocus the curriculum upon sensory knowledge, which should include a wider articulation of the haptic according to Paterson's (2006) theories and Lowenfeld's binary categories. The teachers' assumptions about 2D and 3D expertise revealed an unconsidered gendered bias that 3D is a male preserve. However, it was clear from some of the students’ work that haptic learning can be powerful knowledge, as haptic qualities improved some of the 2D drawing work.
Given these findings, there is a need to consider the way in which the BTEC curriculum can be constructed in such a way that it mitigates against some of the issues raised above from occurring. In the final chapter, I revisit the research questions and identify the implications of the findings for future research, policy and practice in this field.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

This case study contributes to the understanding of the BTEC Art and Design curriculum as designed and experienced, and to the place of research in Further Education in England and Wales. Returning to the research questions, I will outline the main findings against each of them before moving on to discuss the wider implications of the study. The findings have implications for researchers, course designers, students, college managers, Awarding Bodies, government funding and inspection bodies.

The FE Context

Whilst this is a study of only one BTEC classroom, the findings support the view that the FE art and design course in the provider college has maintained FE distinctive characteristics to deliver practical learning by practitioners, although the vocational or specific occupational purpose is vague. From an ethnographic viewpoint, it was not possible to determine the extent of trends in performative pressure on staff (Avis, 2006; 2009) or a departure from BTEC's principal of progressive education (Fisher, 2004). However, a great deal of time was devoted to assessment, as assessment of learning (Black and Wiliam, 1998: Torrance et al, 2005). This was, together with staff members’ declared uncertainty about their contracts, and manager's controlled parsing of teachers' autonomy, which teachers still value (Huddleston and Unwin, 1997), strongly implied the threat of performative control. Together with the pressure to maintain Ofsted's version of 'success', and conformity to complex assessment verification, FE art and design survived in this college partly due to the large size of the teacher 'community of practice'. The Level 2 course' purpose was more to provide applicants to Level 3 courses and there was an acceptance of a curriculum akin to 'education through art' (Read, 1943), with a basic fine art ethos, than to provide specialist, practical art and design. I will turn now to each of the research questions, summarising the key findings of the study in relation to each.

How is Knowledge Constructed in the BTEC Art And Design Curriculum?

Level 2 BTEC Diplomas in Art and Design, can represent in FE 'second chance' and' second best', for the 'less able' (Torrance et al, 2005) learners. According to the Course Leader, W
many students often come from 'shattered backgrounds', with diverse experiences of school education. In this study, teachers designed courses therefore to restore the confidence of learners in education and art and design, as defined by BTEC. Teachers were jealous of their assignment designs, and proud of their students' portfolio work, displayed at the end of year exhibitions.

From BTEC L2 Unit Specifications (BTEC, 2010a) the department allowed teachers latitude in choosing Visual Arts and 3Design optional units around core units of Contextual References, 2D Visual Communication and 3D Visual Communication. The nature of unit specification or content was vague, presenting multiple alternatives, especially in defining material resources. Demonstration and practice, followed by students completing multiple tasks, was a characteristic of the course, although so little time was spent in practice that the course resembled the national curriculum as defined by Allison (1982), China (1986) and Steers (1995), rather than featuring the principles of Discipline Based Art Education (Eisner, 1988). However, the course was effective in progressing students to Level 3 courses, albeit at 'novice' level (Dorst, 2008).

As suggested in the previous chapter, motivation was often low, and most students were diagnosed with literacy levels below Level 2. Rather than design a sequence of learning with sequenced progression towards specialised achievement in design (Steyn, 2012), students were set multiple tasks within assignments which were weakly classified (Bernstein, 1971, 2000), and in general were not well-developed. Assignments revealed an acceptance of ocularcentric preferences (Jay, 1993; 2006) and portfolios contained mainly painting and drawing. However, whenever haptic processes (Lowenfeld, 1952; Howes, 2005; Paterson, 2007) were introduced in image making, often, original and startling images resulted. The assignments were built on basic traditional craft skills, which implied a belief in their intrinsic value to precede higher, cognitive research learning (Tickle, 1983). The practical aspect of the course was a focus for assignments, which were set in a wider curriculum context, which I will now summarise.

It can be seen, therefore, that the curriculum was constructed through a process of the teachers negotiating the prescribed curriculum as defined by BTEC. As identified in Chapter Two, Hickman (2005) drew on Allison’s (1982) conception of a sequential, developmental curriculum model in four domains (the Expressive / Productive domain; the Perceptual Domain; the Analytical / Critical domain; the Historical / Cultural Domain) in identifying key
components of the art and design curriculum in contemporary times. In this BTEC class, all four domains could be identified, with an emphasis on the Expressive/ Productive domain.

**What are the Cultural Values Espoused in the Curriculum and How do Students Respond to These?**

The broader cultural values that students gained were exemplified in the practical realisation of portfolios, through controlled study. The students gained insights into and experience of the world of art and design, which, supported by the initiation into a special or sacred language (Bernstein, 2000), supplied an introduction to the disjointed fields of horizontal knowledge structures (Bernstein, 2000), and 'knowing how', conceptualised by Maton (2014), and 'knower codes'. In Bernstein’s and Maton's (2014) terms, learning tasks were weakly classified and weakly contextualised, and were concentrated on painting and drawing skills, which allowed student to become familiarised with moving between representations and generate extensive portfolios.

A distinct transmission of cultural values was exemplified by the choice of artists and designers for study. The majority were white males and many were dead, and the examples in BTEC exemplars were all drawn from the US and Western canon (BTEC, 2010b). The unquestioning acceptance of this Western, male-dominated hegemony was significant, in that the majority of the teachers and Learning Assistants were female, and many students came from Middle Eastern and continental European cultures. A stereotypical identification of males for 3D and digital expertise, expressed by tutors, was consistent with the view of Coles (2012) that successive generations of school art teachers providing 'soft media' has produced a regression towards painting and drawing standing for the range of art and design skills. This is to be set alongside a decline in the teaching of some craft skills (Mason 2004). This had the effect of disadvantaging some students, and providing a partial view of subjects that would be studied at L3, in particular those requiring resistant materials and some design subjects.

The choice of artists and designers facilitated study, but made the cultural connections more tenuous; students could see some of the works in museums but could not touch, smell, lift up or encounter works at close quarters. This explained some students' experience at the Tate Modern Gallery. The studio was very different from the Tate Modern, where many students reacted negatively when asked to relate their studio experience to public displays of works. Artworks, behind alarm systems, and were not to be photographed, and certainly not to be W
touched. In this situation, a substantial number of students rejected the common sense, cultural acceptance of the museum curators' proxy selection of 'good work'. Chris said that the students’ response to the works was optional, which for society of course it is not. The selection criteria are not available for public scrutiny. The arbitrary power of the museum was apparent in the uncomfortable responses to the fine art work in the Tate (Fyfe, 1988). In Bernsteinian terms, the inner experience of the studio lacked an external language such as would be developed in work experience (BTEC, 1986), successful interaction with museum collections or live problem-based design projects.

How Far is the Curriculum Driven by Assessment?

Ross (2000) and Kelly (2006) argue that assessment procedure is used politically as a performative control of teacher performance, and a tool of audit and inspection (Keep, 2006). In this case study, teachers were allowed considerable autonomy both in lesson planning and internal assessment, although the CRA assessment system tended to extend and multiply passable tasks, divorce students from ownership of their learning, and prompt compensatory and subjective assessment judgements. The compliance with the extensive legitimation process was consistent with performative control and the surveillance of teachers.

A principal indication of vocationality was in the CRA system, which was originally designed to prioritise 'knowing how', compared to 'knowing that' (Wolf, 1995). The system attempts to objectify outcomes (Hyland, 1993) although in pursuit of authenticity can result in 'a never-ending spiral of specification' (Wolf, 1995, p55). BTEC CRA is overlaid and complicated by a normative grading system (Rowntree, 1987; Ecclestone, 2003), which employs non-specific statements to mark achievement. To ensure an objectivity in passable tasks, teachers devoted a great deal of time to operate formal assessment, separately from taught sessions divorcing students from this aspect of their learning (James and Biesta, 2007).

The division of the timetable and the division of assignments into many tasks supported the quantitatively based assessment of pass / refer / fail, although BTEC definitions of the last two criteria were solely in the hands of teachers (Carter, 2012). Teachers interpreted 'formative' in a way that enabled them to re-visit assessments many times, corresponding to a concern made by Torrance et al (2005) that practices of 'coaching' and instrumentalised learning were common in FE. There was pressure to progress marks to higher grades according to the Course Leader and a senior teacher.
Assessment was via a complex process of the verification of achievement that required summative termly marks, which were aggregated and revisited. Teachers relied upon discussion of criteria to confirm judgements and then record marks with a formality emulating a legitimisation of knowledge (Eisner, 1991; Bernstein, 2000). It was unclear if teachers took steps to objectify judgements to avoid judgement 'compensation' (Wolf, 1995; Ecclestone, 2003). Assessment and in-depth knowledge about student's achievements relied upon the pastoral knowledge of the two teachers in the large teaching team. The CRA system is time consuming and was conducive to neither team coherence nor reflection.

It could be seen, therefore, that the assessment processes embedded in this BTEC programme were significant drivers in shaping the curriculum. Indeed, the two were so inter-linked as to be inseparable, as Bernstein (1977) pointed out in his description of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment as being three inter-locked ‘message systems’ of schooling.

What Place do Visual and Haptic Skills Have in the Curriculum?

Art and design curricula, including craft, would be meaningless without the inclusion, in experiential learning (Bruner, 1977; Kolb, 1984), of the visual skills of perception and presentation, and skills in the manipulation of materials, here described as haptic skills (Lowenfeld, 1952; Howes, 2005; Paterson, 2007). In plain terms, to a greater or lesser extent, individually or in combination, they characterise and differentiate courses from academic routes and other specialised creative programmes, such as dance or music. Visual and haptic skills are fundamental to the nature of art and design courses. Inasmuch as curricula can concentrate upon either 2D practice, as in painting or graphic design, or 3D as in furniture or product design, they can establish distinct languages, practices and ontologies (Frayling, 2001).

Timetabling for practical classes was divided into one hour and two hour bundles, which further divided multiple assignment tasks. Weekly timetables remained the same, except for Assessment Weeks, throughout the year, which restricted the ability to develop a haptic or tacit familiarity with materials (Polanyi, 1962). Similarly, the use of the studio space remained focussed on sedentary, table-based working, which relied upon static conceptions of viewpoint, rather than propriocentrically varied, physical affordances, which would stem from workshop settings (Gibson, 1986; Paterson, 2007). The scale of measuring time, space and students' material environment remained regular and narrow and remained, as 'control of
the studio’ (Chris, Course Leader), a constant in pedagogic control (Bernstein, 2000). The exceptions were museum and park visits, which not all students attended, and a dynamic print class, which required revisioning of space and processes.

The curriculum preferred visual image-making based on hand skills. This preference subscribed to the visual hegemony of Western cultures (Classen, 1997; Ingold, 2006), in addition to subordinating study of the artefactual (Woodward, 2007; Miadownik, 2007) and the study of everyday meaning (Postrel, 2004). Three-dimensional work was less developed for reasons discussed, however more successful two-dimensional work occurred when tactile qualities were emphasised, such as stitching into self-portraits, simulating stroking the face when painting self portraits, charcoal subtractive drawing (as opposed to linear depiction), and collecting objects trouvé from local parks. The articulation of verticality (Bernstein, 2000; Maton, 2014) in art and design has traditionally been via theory and the development of physical technologies, which have been circumscribed by resource allocations, and which have been severely reduced (FEFC, 1996). A reconstruction of curriculum knowledge, for instance as the visual and the haptic, provides a lens to revisit the principal reliance upon physical resources for experiential learning in art and design.

This study, therefore, identified a series of complex processes at work in the curriculum as constructed and experienced. There is little doubt that the curriculum provided students with the skills and knowledge they required to progress to further study and, in that regard, the approaches were successful. The teachers were highly dedicated to the task of preparing students for their next stage of education and, as outlined in the previous chapter, worked tirelessly to offer a curriculum that appeared to them to meet all the necessary requirements and standards. The points raised in this thesis in relation to the dynamics at work in the curriculum are not intended to present a criticism of this particular group of teachers, but instead offer a critique of the BTEC system in relation to the teaching of Art and Design. Inevitably, there were challenges faced in the process of identifying these issues and these presented limitations to the study, which are discussed in the next section.

**Limitations of the Research**

The principal limitation to the study lies within the characteristics of case study ethnography. Generalisability could not have been assured as neither the course nor the participants (who were self-selected) could be assumed to be representative, respectively, of the FE sector and W
the whole L2 student group. I could have spent more time piloting various forms of interaction with participants and negotiating wide permissions. However, I judged the FE environment to be extremely cautious of observation, and delay could have diluted the college's enthusiasm, so I accepted the limited nature of participation as agreed with the college. It is important to note that whilst the nature of the study limits its generalisability, it was conducted in a manner intended to ensure ‘transferability’ (Denscombe, 2007). That is, through a process of methodological, analytical and theoretical rigour, the findings may be such that they could resonate with researchers and practitioners involved in BTEC Art and Design courses. As Dey (1993) suggests, a 'valid account is one which can be defended as sound because it is well-grounded conceptually and empirically' (p 236), and thus the findings may be applied more broadly than within this single case study.

As a case study using ethnographic tools, this research was a 'managed ethnography', because, following considerable negotiations about a year-long involvement, my start was delayed, video and photographic recording was not allowed, and access to staff rooms was initially not possible. There was less time for interviews with teachers and students than anticipated. Whilst this presented organisational challenges, these were overcome during the research period, as I was able to contribute to lessons and gain the confidence of teachers and students.

The original focus for the research was on course content, in particular the distinction and relationship of 2D and 3D skills and knowledge as commonly conceived in specifications. The general absence of a range of materials and technologies in the course, which I had not anticipated, was part of a historical withdrawal of resources from vocational provision. The shift in focus from visual and haptic skills as tools to the consideration of visual and haptic knowledge, connected as sensory knowledge, was a disjunction, but allowed the continuance of the research.

The changing agreements and protocols with the participant college required changes to my initial approaches, and the adaptation of an intended dialogical approach to a reflexive - interpretive analysis. This allowed the retention of a broad empirical character to data collection and the adaptation of theoretical lenses. The importance of theoretical direction to analysis was maintained, whilst foregrounding the experiential, reflexive nature of the ethnographic case study as methods and methodology were adapted 'in the field'. Previous professional experience such as mine, and knowledge of the sector, could be attractive to
some providers, and need not impair impartial observation and the 'bracketing' of emotional and personal positions. My response to potential bias was to employ alternative methods of data analysis and organisation, which contributed to deeper examination of my deductive assumptions.

**Implications of the Study**

The study has a number of implications for research, policy and practices, which are discussed in the following section.

**Implications for research**

The study has a number of main implications for research in FE and vocational art and design. Colleges may well be averse to observation, no matter how 'participatory' it is intended. The application of researchers' professional and educational skills can be shaped or be included in a reciprocal purpose or exchange of skills, mutually commissioned for directed, quantifiable purposes, such as measuring informal assessment and feedback in class, or more open ended, time-limited exercises. Further Education is an under-researched and over market-tested sector (Gleeson et al, 2005; Elliot, 1987; James and Biesta, 2007). Knowledge in FE can be extended by further research despite the constant organisational changes, which are likely to continue in the sector. Obstructions to empirical research may continue to be providers' default response to propositions for independent research, especially for those that bring no immediate or financial gain to providers. This study indicates that through a process of negotiation and the implementation of a policy of reciprocity, it is possible to negotiate access to the sector and to conduct research which is of value to all parties.

There is an acknowledged decline in the provision of workshop space in education in general (Crawford, 2009; Wolf, 2015; Miadownik 2015) and in art and design education in particular (FEFC 1996; Coles, 2012). Following Karl Maton's (2014) *knower codes*, based on Bernstein's concepts of horizontal and contextualised knowledge, there is research potential in the relationship between contextually grounded, experiential learning, as strongly classified knowledge, and its translation into weakly framed (taught) delivery. As Maton (2014) observed, Bernstein (1990; 2000) left many of his theories undeveloped, inviting
others to pursue further empirical research. Bernstein (1990; 2000) considered that practical experience was contextually bound and less capable of 'verticality', with 'weaker grammar'. Visual skills can be extended as cumulative knowledge through systematic progression through optical technologies; haptic skills can be explored in parallel, by the artefactual and anthropometric exploration of the environment. Research to pursue the above cumulative knowledge domains and their interrelatedness in the context of declining resources is vital to foundational education in art and design.

**Implications for policy and practice**

The context for this research was art and design teaching and learning in a vocational setting for foundation students. Governmental policies have successfully increased the number of enrolments and the range of qualifications in Further Education centres (Torrance et al., 2005). The substantial withdrawal of resources since the incorporation of colleges has resulted in weak vocationalism, and a conception of practical education that is overly susceptible to academic expression and overly dependent upon written outcomes and students' unsupervised, independent work. Sector goals of social inclusivity and widening participation are laudable, and justified the application of art and design education for second or last chance opportunities. However, over-reliance upon short-term funding formulas and Ofsted 'success' as completions / registrations prevents centres with specialist resources and expertise providing smaller classes in workshop / studio skills. As long as current one-size-fits-all funding policies persist, the current decline in practical skills will continue.

**Implications for managers**

One of the main implications for the study is aimed at managers. The belief that generalised, academic-styled learning will serve as a suitable introduction for foundation students is based upon the assumption that specialisation is a question of level. L2 students were led to believe that specialised tools and technologies were more appropriate to a higher Level 3 course. Students' choices were, experientially, uninformed about fundamental material differences of terminology and practice. Some experience of a range of materials, such as resistant and non-resistant materials, allows abstracted, differentiated learning about measurement, accuracy, utility, function and problem-solving. Managers of diagnostic foundation provision need not
automatically accept that a required reduction of resources will necessitate limitations on students' experience.

The physical and cultural remoteness to students of some artists and their work, and the sensory experience of artists' materials, was accepted in course design. Teachers used a great deal of imagination to demonstrate techniques and encourage students to extend their understanding via internet searches. Museum and gallery visits were useful, but inevitably did not allow tactile or propriocentric interaction for students. Understandably, books and conventional library references can be bypassed for computer access to the library. Managers could consider the creation of on-site materials libraries and artefactual topologies maintained as an experiential adjunct to practical lessons, which could serve inter-subject study purposes, for instance for art, engineering and business (marketing) students.

**Implications for BTEC and Sector Skills Councils (SSCs)**

An implication of the study for BTEC relates to their specification. BTEC is a 'brand' of Pearson, who needs to maintain commercial viability, which means ensuring registrations for as many schools and colleges as possible. Two modifications to their specifications would improve opportunities for specialised teaching and learning, without reducing their potential market scope. Firstly, they could offer more tightly specified resource requirements for some courses, for instance through a general or specialised provision at Level 2. Secondly, they could require external contacts, such as periods of work experience with nominated employers, or specified liaison with galleries and collections. This latter facility could be devolved to the two SSCs, Creative and Cultural Skills and Skillset.

**Implications for teachers and course designers**

The study also has implications for teachers and course designers. In linking 2D and 3D, teachers could consider their specialist articulation before generalising assignments. This would involve recognising the sensory capabilities of their differentiated qualities and providing the balance of vertical and horizontal knowledge structures (for example introducing the related technical discourses, and providing time to absorb intuitively the material qualities of 3D work). In reflection and course planning, teachers should allow some consideration of the principles underpinning sensory perception, such as examples of spatial, temporal and material awareness; this would contribute to the development of tacit knowledge and the confident material disposition of students. This would also provide a useful experiential basis for assessment. The question could be asked: 'How has the student
used her time / space / materials?’ And in relation to quality assurance, a key question to inform practice could be: ‘How have we (teachers) used our space/ time / materials?’

**Contribution to Knowledge**

**Substantive contribution**

The study focussed upon the curriculum content generated by teachers as knowledge constructors, which operated as both liberal, progressive, student-orientated frameworks and as rigorous, task agendas. Secondly, the research emphasised the importance of the relevance of a curriculum to the external world. The absence of a clear occupational purpose, in the case of this course risked diminishing valuable educational benefits for students. The study explored the considerable effects that the criterion referenced / normative grading assessment system had upon curriculum construction and students' engagement, which previous studies have found difficult to establish (EPPI, 2005). Importantly, the study confirms the value for foundational students of articulating both visual and haptic learning.

**Methodological contribution**

In the under researched FE sector the research employed an ethnographic approach to a case study, and developed a critical role for reflection on course design. The approach of participant observation can minimise disruption to course operation and supplement diminishing teaching resources within a continuing culture of performativity.

**Theoretical contribution**

This study is based upon, but not necessarily restricted by, its conception as a societal entity (Bernstein, 1990; 2000; Moore, 2004; Young and Muller, 2013)). The study itself questioned the role of knowledge within an art and design curriculum, and explored ways of examining its transmission and formative contribution to practice. In considering the knowledge structure within an art and design context, Bernstein's (1990; 2000) theories of horizontal knowledge structures and Maton's (2009) conceptualising of cumulative knowledge were extended to include sensory articulation.

Secondly, in taking account of the importance of foundational learning, the study revisited the principles of the classification of knowledge, and developed the importance of 'powerful knowledge' (Bernstein, 1990: 2000; Wheelahan, 2010), which articulates the discrete nature of curriculum categories and allows the positive transgression of boundaries by learners and
teachers. This was explored by revisiting the heuristic separation of 2D and 3D as visual and haptic learning (Lowenfeld, 1952). This makes a contribution to knowledge in the field, as it enables an understanding to be developed of the way in which the BTEC Art and Design curriculum privileges 2D learning.

Thirdly, for knowledge in art and design, in our capitalist, consumer society, the study underlines the importance of developing an 'external language' (Bernstein, 2000) of the internal studio language. In examining the nature of art and design practice as reproduced in the local curriculum, the study explored the purpose of the curriculum to explore art, and to explore the world, and has identified how the neglect of the latter risks diminishing the sensory interaction and our understanding of the material environment.

Conclusion

The research journey I undertook was one that was long and complicated, due to factors both external and internal to the study. Throughout the journey, I have continued to be impressed by the dedication that FE staff have to their roles, despite the policy churn and constant changes to regulations and practice in this field. In reflecting on the key outcomes of the study, it is clear that there is much to do to ensure that the foundational BTEC Art and Design curriculum offers students the best possible provision and prepares them sufficiently well for future study and employment.

This study contributes to the field in that it offers insights into how the elements of course design can be revisited to accommodate future, inevitable changes to regulations. These changes need not result in the narrowing of the underpinning experience for art and design students, if teachers and managers are allowed to fashion local elements of the teaching and learning environment, and explicit bridges are made to current technologies. In other words, the facility that FE currently affords to provide hands-on experience for students and teachers needs to be maintained, should vocationality for art and design be firmly re-established.

Course design can be a reflective and creative vehicle for practice development. However due to the circumstances of FE described above, and the expectations and experience of new students, course design cannot be assumed to be a linear process. The intensified concentration upon courses' 'success' contributes to the inwardness of the teachers'
experience. This risks the relevance of experiential learning in art and design being nullified by the automatic acceptance of instrumentalising, short-term, changes.

This study offers a way of recontextualising the curriculum, and a vision of how it could be framed, and I look forward to the future work involved in attempting to implement some of these changes in the sector.
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# Appendices

## Appendix 1: Grading Criteria

### Unit 1 Contextual Referencing in Art & Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>MERIT</th>
<th>DISTINCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To achieve a pass you must:</td>
<td>To achieve a merit you must also:</td>
<td>To achieve a distinction you must also:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 list influences of historical and contemporary art and design developments</td>
<td>M1 explain the influences of relevant historical and contemporary art and design developments</td>
<td>D1 analyse the influences of historical and contemporary art and design developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 use contextual research to support the development of own response</td>
<td>M2 make connections between sources of contextual research to support the development of own response</td>
<td>D2 creatively connect contextual research to support the development of own response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 present relevant information about the work studied.</td>
<td>M3 present coherently, information about the work studied.</td>
<td>D3 present imaginatively, individual insights about the work studied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit 2 2D Visual Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>MERIT</th>
<th>DISTINCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To achieve a pass you must:</td>
<td>To achieve a merit you must also:</td>
<td>To achieve a distinction you must also:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 demonstrate use of 2D mark-making techniques safely when working from primary and secondary sources</td>
<td>M1 demonstrate consistent and effective use of 2D mark-making techniques when working from primary and secondary sources</td>
<td>D1 demonstrate imaginative and independent use of 2D mark-making techniques, when working from primary and secondary sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 communicate design ideas using 2D visual communication techniques</td>
<td>M2 communicate ideas effectively and consistently using 2D mark-making techniques</td>
<td>D2 communicate ideas imaginatively and independently using 2D mark-making techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 use formal elements in 2D visual communication.</td>
<td>M3 explain the use of formal elements in 2D visual communication.</td>
<td>D3 evaluate the use of formal elements in 2D visual communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unit 13 Working with Visual Arts Briefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>MERIT</th>
<th>DISTINCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To achieve a pass you must:</td>
<td>To achieve a merit you must also:</td>
<td>To achieve a distinction you must also:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 research and record from primary and secondary sources in response to visual arts briefs</td>
<td>M1 conduct competent research and record appropriate visual and other information from primary and secondary sources in response to visual arts briefs</td>
<td>D1 independently research and record diverse visual and other information from primary and secondary sources in response to visual arts briefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 use materials, techniques and processes safely</td>
<td>M2 explore materials, techniques and processes effectively</td>
<td>D2 explore diverse materials, techniques and processes imaginatively and independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 develop appropriate ideas and outcomes to meet visual arts briefs</td>
<td>M3 develop coherent ideas and outcomes to meet visual arts briefs</td>
<td>D3 develop imaginative ideas and outcomes to meet visual arts briefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 discuss successful visual arts work.</td>
<td>M4 compare and contrast development and final creative works.</td>
<td>D4 evaluate development and final creative works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.V. Signature: Date:
Appendix 2: Participant Information Form

Participants Information

1. Research Project Title: Visual and Haptic skills

   How far do the perceptions of craft skill perceived by learners correlate with the visual arts curriculum they are offered and what are the implications of this relationship?

2. Invitation paragraph

   You are being invited to take part in a research project. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask me or if you prefer - as a student ask your teachers if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.

3. What is the project’s purpose?

   Visual and practical skills remain important in the teaching of art and design and they way these skills are presented and perceived by students will change as curriculum requirements and students’ needs change. The aim of the project is to improve the way visual and manual skills are taught in art and design programmes by influencing policy and curriculum design. The objective of the project is to look at how students’ and teachers’ perceptions relate, and to construct a story in observations, images of work and records of conversation about students’ work and teachers’ planning. This is expected to last over one academic year.

4. Why have I been chosen?

   Students and staff at [Redacted] have been chosen for a number of reasons. Firstly a broad range of activities provided for Level 2 can be observed, which includes for instance ceramics, printmaking, photography, painting and drawing. Secondly, the high success rates of the programme and the confidence of the teaching team provides more opportunity for such research to be seen positively and accept the presence and participation of an observer. Lastly, the Art Design and Media Department is not untypical of a creative facility existing within a vocational setting. [Redacted]. Hopefully results from the research will thus have some value within the 250 or so similar colleges in England.

5. Do I have to take part?

   It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep (and be asked to sign consent forms to do with specific involvement e.g. if interviews are recorded or work photographed) and you can still withdraw at any time without it affecting any benefits that you are entitled to in any way. You do not have to give a reason.

6. What will happen to me if I take part?

   The research project is intended to last until July 2012; that is observations in studios and classes will take place regularly, one or two days per week during this time.

Vishapstudyparticipants24/10/2011
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Students will be asked to take part in focus groups about various aspects of art and design. These will be semi formal or quite open discussions and may be recorded, with the permission of participants. Students will also be invited to take part in small group discussions about their work, hopefully including photography of their work, and again recorded with permission. Two or three focus groups and four or five small group discussions and are planned to take place per term. These meetings will last 45-50 minutes. For focus groups there will be little preparation for participants and for small groups participants will be asked to bring examples of their work.

Teachers will be asked to take part in interviews two or three times per term and to share their ideas on curriculum planning.

Students and teachers will be asked to complete questionnaires related to issues and ideas around discussions and interviews. Where possible participants will be reimbursed in kind for participation.

In all cases good notice will be given when requesting interviews and discussions and participants will be given access to all recorded information or data. It is intended to post participants' accounts and images of work on a Wiki with individual electronic access to add or suggest amendments of detail of emphasis. The audio recordings of your activities made during this research will be used only for analysis and for illustration in conference presentations and lectures. No other use will be made of them without your written permission, and no one outside the project will be allowed access to the original recordings.

7. **What do I have to do?**

Participants will be asked to be as honest and specific about their work and their expectations; to let the researcher know in advance about alterations to plans or arrangements for interview. It is likely that the reached will have a college email account by which he can be reached.

8. **What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?**

Participation is entirely voluntary and will hopefully be of interest to participants as they look back over their accounts and perceptions. Apart from the displacement or work time that participation in interviews and focus groups will cause there is little risk envisaged in talking part.

9. **What are the possible benefits of taking part?**

Whilst there are no immediate benefits for those people participating in the project, it is hoped that this work will help the reflective learning process for students and teachers. The main benefit will be in the contribution to policy at national level and the training preparation for art and design teaching.

10. **What happens if the research study stops earlier than expected?**

The particular approach of the research is dependent on many factors including the continued trust among participants and available resources. Should the research come to an end or be suspended all participants will be informed and information gathered – data- will be confidentially stored.
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11. **What if something goes wrong?**

**Treatment by researcher**
The research will be mainly organised out by one individual, although all student and teacher participants hopefully will have collaborative roles and be able to openly share outcomes. If students have complaints about the process of interview or observation they should in first instance consult with their teachers or the Head of Department. Similarly teachers may seek redress with the Head of Department with whom will be lodged details of Sheffield University’s Registrar

**Reportable events**
Should a serious event come to light in the process of interviews or observation the researcher will be under an obligation to report this to the relevant college authority despite any expectation of confidentiality

12. **Will my taking part in this project be kept confidential?**

All the information that will collected about you during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential. You will not be able to be identified in any reports or publications. It is the intention keep and maintain a transparent rolling record of interviews and work and access to audio records and photographs of work will be provided to specific participants, i.e. not shared across groups without permission.

13. **What will happen to the results of the research project?**

The results of the research will be part of a doctoral thesis submitted to The University of Sheffield in 2013 or 2014. This may result in broader publication as indeed aspects of the research may be submitted to journals or conferences. In all cases participants will informed and they will not be identified in any publication.

14. **Who is organising and funding the research?**

The research will be privately sponsored although some sponsorship may be obtained from educational or arts organisations.

15. **Who has ethically reviewed the project?**

This project has been ethically approved by the University of Sheffield School of Education ethics review procedure. The University’s Research Ethics Committee monitors the application and delivery of the University’s Ethics Review Procedure across the University.

16. **Contact for further information**

Ken Newlan, 53 St Stephens Road, Hounslow, Middlesex TW3 2BJ.
Mobile: 07900 394 275
Email: ken.newlan@blueyonder.co.uk

You will be given copies of the information sheet and signed copies of consent forms.

**Many thanks for agreeing to take part**

**Date:** March 2012

**Name of Applicant:** [redacted]
Appendix 3: Participant consent Form

Participant Consent Form

Title of Project: Visual and Haptic skills
How far do the perceptions of craft skill perceived by learners correlate with the visual arts curriculum they are offered and what are the implications of this relationship?

Name of Researcher: Ken Newlan

Participant Identification Number for this project:

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet dated 25 January 2012 for the above project and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason. Insert contact number here of lead researcher/member of research team (as appropriate).

3. I understand that my responses will be anonymised before analysis.
   I give permission for members of the research team to have access to my anonymised responses.

4. I understand that images of my work will photographed and recorded, that authorship will be anonymised before analysis and I give permission for members of the research team to have access to these images.

5. I understand that my responses may be audio-recorded and will be anonymised before analysis. I give permission for members of the research team to have access to my anonymised responses.

6. I agree to take part in the above research project.

Amarjit

Name of Participant (or legal representative)

Name of person taking consent (if different from lead researcher)

To be signed and dated in presence of the participant

Lead Researcher

To be signed and dated in presence of the participant

Copies:
Appendix: 4 Student literacy diagnoses: Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Diagnostic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Independent living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>ESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>ESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>ESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>ESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>ESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>ESOL Punctuality issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>ESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>ADHD &amp; asthma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Dyslexia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Excluded from school. Taught within smaller group - limited subjects. Originallly offered L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Dyslexia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \frac{1}{14} = 0.07, \frac{1}{30} = 0.03 \]
Appendix 5: Estimation of Reading Age Levels

### Reading Ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>Reading age level (approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>14-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>11-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry level 3</td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry level 2</td>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Level 1</td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre Entry</td>
<td>Pre-school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Course Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading age 12-14</td>
<td>Reading age 14-16</td>
<td>Reading age 16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE D/E</td>
<td>GCSE A*-C</td>
<td>AS/A/Extended Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ 1 /GNVQ Foundation</td>
<td>NVQ 2 /GNVQ Intermediate</td>
<td>NVQ 3 /GNVQ Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Diploma</td>
<td>First Diploma</td>
<td>Extended Diploma Subsidiary Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Award in Childcare</td>
<td>CACHE Level 2 Certificate in CCE</td>
<td>CACHE Level 3 Diploma in Childcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Access to HE courses</td>
<td>Access to HE courses</td>
<td>AS and A Levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 6: Students’ and Teachers’ Interview Dates

### Interviews name alphabetical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Int 1</th>
<th>Int 2</th>
<th>Check</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Int 1</th>
<th>Int 2</th>
<th>Int 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 Agathe</td>
<td>1/25/2012</td>
<td>4/25/2012</td>
<td>12/12/2012</td>
<td>T1 Marjorie</td>
<td>2/27/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 Amarjit</td>
<td>1/25/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T3 Imogen</td>
<td>7/2/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4 Bill</td>
<td>1/18/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T4 Sophie</td>
<td>3/12/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5 Anna</td>
<td>25/1/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T5 Dave</td>
<td>5/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7 Rana</td>
<td>2/1/2012</td>
<td>5/2/2012</td>
<td>12/12/2012</td>
<td>T7 Chris</td>
<td>1/30/2012</td>
<td>3/12/2012</td>
<td>4/26/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8 Elaine</td>
<td>2/1/2012</td>
<td>3/21/2012</td>
<td>12/13/2012</td>
<td>Asst Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9 Sylvia</td>
<td>1/18/2012</td>
<td>4/25/2012</td>
<td>12/10/2012</td>
<td>A1 Daphne</td>
<td>5/29/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10 Timo</td>
<td>1/18/2012</td>
<td>5/21/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>A2 Jill</td>
<td>5/23/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L = Learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T = Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = Assistant Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### lst interviews date sorted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Int 1</th>
<th>Int 2</th>
<th>Check</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Int 1</th>
<th>Int 2</th>
<th>Int 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5 Anna</td>
<td>25/1/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T7 Chris</td>
<td>1/30/2012</td>
<td>3/12/2012</td>
<td>4/26/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7 Rana</td>
<td>2/1/2012</td>
<td>5/2/2012</td>
<td>12/12/2012</td>
<td>T1 Marjorie</td>
<td>2/27/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8 Elaine</td>
<td>2/1/2012</td>
<td>3/21/2012</td>
<td>12/13/2012</td>
<td>T6 Harry</td>
<td>2/27/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 Agathe</td>
<td>1/25/2012</td>
<td>4/25/2012</td>
<td>12/12/2012</td>
<td>T4 Sophie</td>
<td>3/12/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3 Amarjit</td>
<td>1/25/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T5 Dave</td>
<td>5/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4 Bill</td>
<td>1/18/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 Daphne</td>
<td>5/29/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L9 Sylvia</td>
<td>1/18/2012</td>
<td>4/25/2012</td>
<td>12/10/2012</td>
<td>T3 Imogen</td>
<td>7/2/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10 Timo</td>
<td>1/18/2012</td>
<td>5/21/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L = Learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T = Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = Assistant Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: 1st Interview: Agathe

F14. 00.03 Right we are going to start talking now...tell me about it...yeah that’s like..er Cubism painting and its inspired by George Braque...I am going to close the door
now...George Braque..it’s in my own style because em I think George Braque was...had one image in his mind...and he was drawing like one image but  I took ... we did we one image but did things differently but the point is that I wanted to do the viewpoints... to have many viewpoints that’s why... yeah and em I dunno what else ontic

and so (01.09) what were you being asked to do? were you being asked to do many viewpoints like George Braque? No, yeah I was asked to produce er Cubism painting ...and in the beginning we did the line drawings of yeah yeah what we were watching and seeing and then I stuck them all together and I cut them and ...like that

OK, was the way you were cutting and bringing together like the way you imagined George Braque did it? or was it your own way?... no I don’t think it was... George Braque...there is a very specific thing going on here isn’t there like it’s like strips isn’t it... em George Braque had a different style I think I think its a lot more fun that George Braque .. hm yeah he was using like green or yellow and orange, yellow and greens (..) many different colours so were you being asked to use your own style. Em (agrees) OK.
so this is good its successful so why ...? (02.32) em I like the colours, I like the way that I placed each object... I like some of the patterns that I added... and .some ... the geometrical stripes...em I like it because em...em I don’t know because I like it because ....it’s like it placed in an order and I don’t know I feel its in an order as though its in an order like an order ? yeah so it’s not a rubbish heap is it? No it’s not rubbish OK what kind of order? (3.27) I want it like that face here it’s here its one viewpoint and that other face one here another viewpoint so I put the same colours to see they are like they are like ... here it’s like leaves and here, are the leaves and I put that leaves and that leaves the same colour so you can understand what it is. I don’t colour like messy

so this is related to that and you are making relationships across the piece; in a way its quite tricky isn’t it? In a way you could put that over there and it might be less interesting but you’ve divided the two yeah and the colours so you can understand what it is the each ...thing...

so you made it interesting by chopping it up and re-arranging it in different a kind of way – have you ever seen anything like this before? What does it remind you of? Like that one this arrangement is quite unique to me? Don’t know because Picasso and Braque they were drawing like Cubism drawing they were drawing in geometrical shapes but you couldn’t understand what it is – I couldn’t understand what it is

so this is bright, its more colourful, its more entertaining its more em different decorative perhaps whereas George Braque and Picasso they were using dull colours and trying to be serious and sort of natural, and these are unnatural colours aren’t they in a way.

OK (5.28) so what else where you looking at, at the time? what were your sources for the whole thing, was it observational drawing yeah anything else? Em the Cubism movement how they were placing all the geometrical shapes the they had in Cubism; em the fruit that Cezanne was drawing, still life everywhere.

I used many sources to create the composition, the kind of geometrical shapes the Cubists employed and the fruit shapes used by Cezanne as well as observational drawings from still lives in room 301.

There is all kinds of things aren’t these? There is your drawing; can you show me something that you drew from observation here? Is there something in the room you w
know 301? did you draw anything from 301? Yeah what anything there? that face here
what is it? a vase yeah that bottle, that one, that face the apple the fruit so there is a real
mixture yeah

the things you drew from observation we call primary don’t’ we they? and things you
drew from a book are secondary yeah primary sources, yeah and secondary sources
primary sources I don’t’ have them – yes you do this is a primary source, you drew that
from observation, you said you drew that from the studio yeah that’s primary secondary
primary no I saw something and I drew it so its still primary oh oh yeah it is yeah it is true
them in a balanced way yeah

so did you used photographs at all? No OK do you think Braque so even though they
look the same you’ve used a mixture of sources; a mixture of primary and secondary
sources but you’ve treated and Picasso would have taken photographs? No they did not
have photo.. oh ... photography was invented 60 years before Braque and Picasso really...
I do not think they were taking photographs, I don’t think so I think they were I don’t’ think
so, they were doing things like primary painting OK I think you should look into that.

When we went to the Tate yeah last week quite a lot of people were taking photographs
on their cameras did you do that as well? Yeah what did you do with those
photographs? Em still on the camera? No they are in my portfolio are they? Yeah did
dou you print them out yeah all of them, there are like 24 pages good girl, are you sure? Can
you show me now Yeah and I choose some of them (having trouble Marcus? have you got
the questionnaire?) and that one I was using too that’s fantastic, there’s one of them in
Liverpool Street station 60 feet high. Phew... you’ve done some hard work (looking at
photos) well done.

so going back to this, what materials were you asked to use? Em paint yeah and anything
else, line anything else em no do you remember the list of formal elements? Yeah
texture, shape oh yeah...anything of those from the formal elements you were being asked
to get across? Pattern? pattern its very strong isn’t it; its a lovely piece of work actually;
so you were being asked to use paint and line and then to you something like pattern
and other things from formal elements came into play colours em I don’t know

What kind of tools instruments were you asked you use? For that one brushes, scissors
pencils, rubber, ruler anything else? em No how did you use a ruler? to make straight lines
Not to measure anything? No
What do you think you learned? em it is the first time I drew something from the Cubist movement and I’ve never done that kind of painting before, like mixing images and em drawing different parts because it’s quite difficult, it is if you take it seriously because... on the colours maybe they have a meaning or something because or something that one and that one yeah... its quite interesting have a meaning what do you mean by that?(12.15) the mood yeah and I mean and like I’ve put here you can understand that this is here the leaves coming up all the composition of that so you’ve given them a relationship yeah it has a perspective... composition... yeah so they relate yeah it’s the beginning of a meaning, in that as a composition.

So what have we learned... its the first time you’ve attempted a composition like this, which is based on looking into Cubism something else and from your own observation. So would you say you were feeling what it was like to be a Cubist? (13.10) sort of? no alright – so you were using it to say something of your own, is that a better way of putting it? yeah

OK em so while you were doing it what were you feeling? I was thinking how they would drew so wonderful pieces because it was like so difficult to do it when you see an Image of Picasso or Braque you say, “oh that is easy” but when you go and go for it, is so difficult and I understand that when I did that piece because they like had so many viewpoints and they were trying because it all the geometrical shapes and do it in a messy way but were so amazing, and yeah...took time now you’ve done it it has taken long time and its nicely done did you spend a lot of time at home doing this as well? No since you’ve done this have you seen any other artists or any artists work who are a bit like this? No Braque and Picasso and Juan Gris but he did do that kind of stuff you’ve heard of the Impressionists yeah well the Post Impressionists painters used colour in a similar kind of way and they were working around about the same as the Cubists so you might want to look at them.

So what do you think you found out? did you discover anything, about yourself, or, life XXX College – me? was there a feeling of discovery? or did you just do it or for that piece? yes I don’t know you’ve already said you were finding out more about the Cubists and finding out in a way I think what you were saying how difficult it was for them as well to see and to say what they were trying to say; did you find out what you liked? Is there something new that you did? - yeah I liked it what did you like? that was
new like I said before you cut out pieces and you put it in a different direction it’s like a puzzle its nice so when you were working on it did you work at a steady pace? – no it was like I was (tuned?) when I did that it went OK? yeah did you have an image of a final piece the kind of thing you wanted - eh eh before I starting that project I knew Picasso but I did not know Braque and I knew about the Cubist movement and all this stuff and I knew that we would do Andy Warhol so I wanted to do something like Andy Warhol and still life together something like the classic period with the modern period is that what this is? No for my final piece that did not inspire me for the final piece so much – maybe the colours so OK did you know that was the kind of thing that you were going to get no or you found out and you had to work it out.

So what were the stages of that..did you do...if it was not going to look like that...in the beginning I thought we had to do had three of those... so I was running out of time and doing it really quickly and when Sylvia (17.39) told us you need to do only one I gave emphasis to that one so you had a choice from two others? yeah and I haven’t time to do three of those, so I have so many things to do so why did you choose this one? what was so different about this arrangement than the other two? I just pick it I don’t know, it is not my favourite one but as I say in the beginning that felt we were doing the three so yeah what was different about this arrangement than the other two it wasn’t your favourite? the other one like were in circles like in the middle that one is in everywhere its more balanced? Yeah that’s the kind of thing..... em yeah so you sorted out the kind of thing you were going to do by having alternatives in front of you? Which is well know part of the design process ...you produce lots and you choose one. OK thank you very much.
Appendix 8: Agathe First Interview Synthesised

Although this painting was partly based on the work of George Braque I approached it differently from him. I think that he had an idea of presenting one viewpoint, although he was using many viewpoints but here, amongst other things, I wanted use many viewpoints in one presentation.

The process involved making line drawings and then we were encouraged to cut the drawings into various elements, something like a Cubist arrangement. I deliberately used brighter colours than Braque’s Cubist paintings and presented the composition in vertical sections.

I particularly like the way I used the colours in the painting and the patterns I added from observational drawing to sections drawn from Braque’s work. I divided images across the composition to create a different kind of order. In Braque’s work his images and shapes to me look a little rough or crude; I wanted to create a more distinct feeling to the composition. I think this makes it more comprehensible, easier to understand.

I used many sources to create the composition, the kind of geometrical shapes the Cubists employed and the fruit shapes used by Cezanne as well as observational drawings from still lives in room 301. I realise now that I was using a combination of primary and secondary sources in my own way, but I suppose that is what the Cubists might have been doing as well, by including typography and text next to their drawn imagery.

Although the Cubists might have been aware of photography I do not think they used photography for instance like David Hockney has done more recently; they were more interested in primary observation and painting directly from observation. Perhaps the difference between primary and secondary information is not always clear. For instance I used photography last week to record my primary experience in visiting the Tate Modern Gallery, although the 24 pages of information I have included in my research for my current project is really secondary information.

This is the first time I have attempted a painting anything like this; mixing elements from Cubist paintings with observational drawing. I had to take this very seriously as combining the different parts meaningfully is really very difficult and it made me realise how difficult it must have been for the Cubists to create meaning in their composition- and I still felt I did it in my own way. At first it might seem as though Braque and Picasso’s paintings are easy but when I got down to really studying their work it was very difficult to get to tackle. I was able to use some key formal elements such as line, pattern, colour, shape, texture and a small range of tools – brushes, scissors, and a ruler just to make straight lines.

I did not have a final plan when I started and at first I did not understand that we were only asked to complete one piece like this one- I originally thought we had to make three. I did know that I wanted to somehow incorporate the work of Andy Warhol, combining different periods and making this composition a kind of puzzle. I was able use the three arrangements to help me select the final piece to paint, which is not really my favourite but is a composition
### Appendix 9: Elaine’s Second Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was this the first thing you did?</strong></td>
<td>Yes this was <em>Me Myself and I</em> this project was when I first came to Kingston, learning about pencils, how hard pencils are and things. The next significant thing I did – To me this was because I did not think I could do a portrait of myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>So this was a breakthrough – what is this?</strong></td>
<td>This was exploring typography just mainly different compositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>This, using ICT, I had to research Any Warhol looking at different portraits and we went to do it on computer, on Adobe, Photoshop and using the colours and getting to know...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Next...something that meant something to you – | | ![Image 307x577 to 568x773]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>So looking at visual things...</th>
<th>and brainstorming… Yes to get ideas together and everything else as well and developing final ideas as well. The next project- 3D this is the project I found the most complicated. It was really frustrating it was mainly observational drawings which was my strongest point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Brainstorming, is that Important for you? | ![Image 431x445 to 590x565]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you find that difficult?</th>
<th>No not really I found it easy to observe different objects that Jim Dine uses, then ink and bleach experiments, and then moving on....</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

![Image 307x215 to 504x363]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I thought that was a breakthrough for you?</td>
<td>Yes it was and then this was going out to museums, working with card. Then this was...I cannot (do) the card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So this was the first 3D thing you did?</td>
<td>Yes and then this was developing working with clay and working them into pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You work quite hard on working with references, doing research, have you always been like that?</td>
<td>I have always been like that. Yes. The main thing about this project was health and safety and working with equipment in the classroom and developing ideas I had to do at least five maquettes as well. This is what I had to do if I was to do a pot, and here again artists’ research, Louise Nevelson. This was my final design but hasn’t been kilned as yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It hasn’t been fired?</strong></td>
<td>No and evaluation but this was the most difficult project for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What was difficult?</strong></td>
<td>Getting the artists together and developing ideas I guess. I like to draw and plan out, if I had more time I would like to go back into it and improve it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next project</strong></td>
<td>The still life project my work was stronger I enjoyed this project a lot. This was my favourite task out of the whole project using bright colours...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do you think of Michael Craig Martin? What kind person do you think he is?</strong></td>
<td>I think he is more of loud person because of the colours he uses in these photos and he just puts anything together and mix them up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you think he is a chaotic mix person?</strong></td>
<td>Yes Because I can just tell from the photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>He is entirely the opposite he works it all out very carefully...</strong></td>
<td>this was more Morandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that was an example of good visual skill?</td>
<td>Oil pastel techniques I could do that anyway. This was a still life I did at home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Do you think that was an example of good visual skill?                  | Oil pastel techniques I could do that anyway. This was a still life I did at home  
This was a plant done at home.... this was more going into artists, cubism                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
<p>| What we are looking for are things that hit you as visually significant; this is like a Matisse why is this important for you?                                                                                                                                         | It looks lively but at the same time it is toned down compared to Michael Craig Martin                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Next                                                                   | again developing ideas I was not sure here should I do Andy Warhol then I asked everyone in the class the triptych....                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| This is the finished piece- why is this important?                      | Because I am not usually an acrylic painter using acrylic paint this took me at least two days to make sure it painted and this took me another two days as well                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <strong>So one of the things that might be useful to earn is to work faster –</strong> | I have learned that I need to work faster because in the real world....this is the one I working on now this is the final major project so it is really important ...this is the first three days, looking t line drawings...looking at live objects things you see outdoors and this is how I developed the print and I used in ICT...and then this was some more drawings |
| <strong>So these pages...</strong> | So this is how you develop design for lino print, this is how you mark out the areas that are going to be cut out...and then you have the lino there ...I just did one...this was the reverse of a painting then using colours |
| <strong>What’s that?</strong> | This is a knit so this is something we are doing in fashion; where we want to go next in September, this was really complicated for me I did not know how to knit but I picked up really well, this using plastic bags because we have to use recycled materials, and researched designers who use recycled materials and use |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>So in terms of making skills, using your hands, what are the other making skills you have learnt?</strong></th>
<th>Clay yes but I they have broken in pieces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is this plaster piece, so you have made things in plaster, card, clay...</strong></td>
<td>I have some things in my drawer... I have some card here; I have found the clay....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Let’s put some making things together...</strong></td>
<td>these two are relief’s and that is something I am working on now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How did you make that? What tools did you use?</strong></td>
<td>Superglue, that thing you use in graphics, a scalpel, and cut it, a ruler, not tracing paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modelling tools? And this here?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This was knit, this was one of the knitting tools I used big wooden ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>And who showed you how to do that?</strong></td>
<td>It was Jenny (ALS) I picked up after her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>So how are the visual skills taught to you?</strong></td>
<td>You draw from observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mainly or sometimes?</strong></td>
<td>Sometimes yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>And sometimes you draw from handouts?</strong></td>
<td>Sometimes, I understand your point; I mainly like to draw from primary, because to look at what is in front of you that is how you get the most out of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>But you are taught in both ways, but you are told</strong></td>
<td>Yes but at the moment we are told it is best to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which artists to choose?</td>
<td>research our own artists, like we are going to the V&amp;A on Monday so we can see what we can get from there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So they will set you up with primary information and routes to secondary information and then they divide up the lessons up into tasks,</td>
<td>yes yes tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the teachers help you whenever they can or whenever you need it?</td>
<td>I would say whenever they can because there are so many students in the room and everyone needs help every now and then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do some students need more help than others?</td>
<td>Yes some and I am one of them at the moment I need more help written work I am really struggling with the written work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But you have some successes?</td>
<td>Yes some but when it comes to comparing the work I am not really good at that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So in terms of making skills, is there more of an emphasis on the making side? What do you think?</td>
<td>Making, because making is really important to me because you are expanding ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And at some point you are asked to evaluate that?</td>
<td>Yes at the end of the whole project and to annotate our own work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But you have not done much three dimensional work have you? Most of it is quite flat? Yes</td>
<td>but you can also develop it in 3D whenever you feel like it, it’s not required but you can do it in your own time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything else you would like to say?</td>
<td>No but this interview has really helped me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10: Jackie's First Interview

Jackie Int 1 February 6 2012

Visual sensibility how does it fit?

Visual sensibility?

Or whatever visual skill, is it a skill? Is there a visual skill?

The art of seeing? I think it can be taught the art of seeing definitely, can it? can you say bit more about that?

I don’t really know what you want me to say about it,

Is it important? Is it important? I think it is in everyday life yes... but within art and design.... the fundamentals within art and design are that you are putting an image to paper or to something like a video but you need to be able to see to interpret surely

so the seeing bit can be taught?

Yes how do we teach it? through practice and demonstration ...the basics of observational skills but a lot of things are assumed ...a student will draw something but won’t actually see everything that they are drawing. There is a lovely exercise on my teacher training which is where I get a student ...my peers the other teachers, I ask them to draw a teapot so they drew a circle with a handle a lid and a spout from memory?

from memory, so pretty much all of them were similar, they all had a handle, a lid and a spout, so I was saying to them that we draw from our memory not from what we are actually seeing ..everything has a recognisable thing about it I can’t describe it very well like so... Andy Warhol drawing the iconic objects, there is a main thing I can’t describe it.... something which is very visual recognisable in a Coca Cola can. If I say to my students right we teaching about shopping and I tell them colours, they can tell me what shops the colours relate to and I tell them about you know like blue and white stripes is Tescos; there is all these things which are visually recognisable and sometimes when we are simplifying drawings we need to recognise those things which aim to be recognisable

we need to recognise the recognisable?

Yes, but also with the observational drawings with the bottles for instance they are not taught to recognise the negative spaces and how to... that’s what we try to teach them if we ask them to draw, they look at the bottles and then they look down at the paper they are drawing what they think they see

right OK and talking about from memory they are drawing from a bank

yeah

like a filter as well?

does it works like a filter? I think it must do... I mean everybody knows what a bottle looks like, really, the majority of people know what a bottle looks like the problem is they are
looking at it and then they are looking down at the paper and the minute they are looking at the paper whilst they are drawing they are not drawing the object, they are drawing the memory of the object, so I get them to look at the object and we do the automatic line drawings where we get them to not look at the paper at all its way of freeing up the brain

because... of preconceived notions?

Yeah yeah I kind of get them to disconnect from their memory and to draw what actually is

and the memories are usually somebody else’s vision aren’t they?

somebody else’s vision or a memory of a vision that they had, that they have,

so there is two kinds of storages going on there.. is a socially acquired one.. a personally acquired one and they are not separate yeah and one of the devices is looking at things in positive and negative terms and the other devices is the difference between looking at the paper and looking at the object

yeah and we had to do this thing when I was doing my A Level where we would have to stand round the end of the easel like this and draw (sideways blind) so the same thing as the automatic line drawing...it stops you looking at the paper you would have to draw the figure

so you were having to draw..making aesthetically, to draw in a spatial sense?

we used to do things where we would have to pretend we were a fly crawling across the body so we would have to draw the line of the fly

in teacher training?

When I was doing my A Level so

Hayley, is ‘drawing’ from teacher training and A Level you did not mention your art school yet yeah I think I learned more from my... well I did painting A level, drawing

on a Foundation course?

No

so the thing is back here you were referring to exercises I think if you can start the sessions off by doing automatic line drawing it.. it gets the students to refocus and to make clearer observations slower observations not rushing into...strengthens the observation skills I suppose the Level 2s don’t understand the automatic line drawings they don’t get it

slowing?

slowing down how they observing, and making more accurate decisions about marks they are making

so being more accurate in terms of representation? Images?

yeah and also having the ability to make changes because the students we have on the Level 2 course, they draw and that’s it and then they are fighting to make changes and I go back to my A Level again when my art teacher taught me that the more changes you could make within a drawing...adds strength.. adds strength to a painting

why should that be?
Well I believe that yeah I drew a portrait one time and my art teacher said this is something that’s completely wrong, but for me it was a finished portrait but I was quite convinced going back (would be)...ruining it but actually I worked into it, developed it and made it more accurate and then it became a stronger piece of work.

In terms of this course here how long have you been teaching on the course about five years the same time as Sylvia? yep so you are actually pretty experienced in terms of the changes that have gone on in the last five years? BTEC, QCF expanding etc. so are here any other principal exercises, devices ways in which seeing is made to be important as important as it is to you.

well I guess going on the trips is important, looking at other work

so that’s getting outside what’s the advantage of trips?

In terms of them seeing other artists work (their) visual ability? I don’t know I am thinking on a social level its a different environment its good to get out of the classroom and the students seem a little more relaxed its unfortunate that they did not enjoy the Tate that much I don’t think.

it might have been very challenging for them in a number of ways

em... challenging different things you think it wasn’t literal enough for them? you think they should have been faced with a number of still life paintings that they could look at whereas they were expected to see still lives within sculptures and it was a little bit too abstract for them, for the Level 2 possibly maybe they had to make a lot of connections.

its quite independent isn’t it?

and that’s the challenge isn’t it quite a lot of insight general knowledge or tolerance of ambiguity something like that?

(That’s) the visual stuff, the visual stuff comes in, doesn’t it? nothing goes out visually, its a receptor; the rest of it is... comes in emotional ... what about the physical? in the same kind of way do you teach what I call haptic skills? How important are the haptic skills and how do you get those across?

The haptic skills can be applied to painting and drawing? As well as 3D? the act of them doing the haptic skills? Is it?

Can be, I mean in ceramics those are all haptic skills as well

I think its just getting their hands on different materials to experience the materials to start processing what the different outcomes like what I don’t know the difference between working with clay an card there are some things that we have done with them before where its the process of making something in 3D that’s what we were trying to work on with this 3D project where it’s all very well drawing something, designing something 3D on paper but your not experiencing it as a 3 dimensional object because you are working 2 dimensionally trying to get them to switching the brain in... into seeing things again in a three dimensional way... I am not quite sure how we get them to do that...I mean we tried very hard to do that I am hoping that they... and then the act of making it they started to some of them got it in that that we got them to do draw 2D we talked to them about drawing it as a three dimensional object realise if they could do the project again as in do it once and do it again I would like to
think that they would see things differently, as a design project because they would be considering it as a 3D project but a lot of them haven’t done that (3D) before and so...

the three dimensional materials were card and clay

and plaster

plaster? Is that it is there any other...

that’s it. In the past we have used tracing paper, wire, string and things but there is only so much time that you have to... do these things

does 3D take more time?

no no I don’t think so... maybe it does a bit I suppose it does... I don’t know... there is so many other experiments we could get them to do we have so many ideas because we have to limit what we have to do with them because they have to achieve a final piece

and the limitations are quite nicely controlled in a nurturing sort of way there is a kind of spatial and family feeling to (the delivery) and you have to stay within those confines

yeah and its more on a one to one basis that you get students to explore further you know somebody’s got an idea and it’s not quite what we were planning but with them we would work with them individually.. developing ....and if there is quiet student in the group that has a wonderful idea but hasn’t communicated it they’ve gone, the ideas’ gone isn’t it

In terms of good teaching, and I have see some very nice teaching... have you covered it all how you teach 3dimensionally?

are we covering it all?

yes are you covered for yourself?

yes I think so I think that I need to speed up a bit with the ceramics and get the final pieces done but time is the problem having; the time to do it or having a technician, then that would be lovely then we could send the students over in groups and then could glaze their work; I used to teach ceramics 2 hours a week. It was different before.. and then they would switch between ICT, ceramics and photography so every six weeks they would move... revolve there were three groups, so for six weeks they would do ICT and the next six weeks ceramics, it was much more focussed groups and the there as only groups of 15 the as well.

In terms of formats for working, A3 is a common format erm... A4 is that big, A5 is about as big as your hand, AO is bigger than me, and there are things about that A3 format that actually limits? Controls... what is going on three dimensionally, 30 students in a room...

I think it has to be that way for Level2

how about other limits, clay plaster card...the number of tools,

the limits the implements to draw from these are all limits yes that’s down to funding now isn’t it? I think that the Level 2 course has to be prescriptive, the students wouldn’t know what to do with themselves if you left them on their own, I mean you look at Level 3 and there has got to be this boundary for them and in Level 3 they will expand on that
So in terms of this for you in that course do you have a central.. not, mission... do you have a central thing that you are pursuing as an artist teacher, nurturer do you have (..) call upon, you talk about your A Level experience, your ides you call upon is that important to you to be learning? Your colleagues? Is that what you call upon?

yeah I guess so I have learned a lot since I have been here actually.

is that important to you? that learning process?

Oh yeah I have never been frightened of going and teaching something new, doing something new, what are you learning?

Over the last five years I have learned a huge amount about artists and designers, I’ve learned about the design process, I’ve learned how to do lino prints. I never knew how to do that before

who are you learning that from?

Just from teaching it, however someone has to demonstrate it to me. When I first started I had to teach how to make paper and I was sat in the staff room with my colleague at six o clock at night and I said I am fine, I can do it I just need you to tell me how to do it and I need you to tell me twice, and then I will walk in with confidence tomorrow and teach it, and I did. And I remember her laughing and saying I can’t believe your fine about doing it and I said I am fine so long as you tell me how to do it

So that’s an empirical immersion a very kinaesthetic way of learning

I am a visual learner when I say visual I cannot process things unless I can visualise them or connect them to an experience

Going back to your teacher training is there a best way that you teach or people learn?

I think you have to be able to connect with the students they need to be able to relate to you, possibly em but I think there has to be a certain amount of energy in your teaching and passion and showing a commitment to them in their studies a lot of that comes across by the way you take them seriously yeah they get that within this contact

I do not think some of them have seen that before...

So broader that that is there a purpose to it all? what are you sending them all out to do, in terms of your teaching philosophy, is it justified?

Is it justified? What I’m doing, I am just giving them a sound base to spring board off

what is that is it an art base a vocational base? a personal base?

Both, it’s important for them to have confidence in themselves need their abilities but to have that they need to have knowledge but I guess that I want them to have. I think it is important as well as some of the students don’t have anything; some people even in their home life don’t have parents behind them backing them and for me one of my main things is to teach people that there is somebody out there who cares for them and is there to support them

Right at this Level 2, Level 3? you just teach at Level 2?
no I would love to get involved with Foundation because it would then challenge me more but em there is more to... I find that 50% of them to pick up a pencil and the other 50% you are encouraging them to develop their work. But I find that the 50% who you are encouraging to pick up a pencil are quite frustrated because I want to encourage them to develop their work you know but that’s (not?) what we are here for, but for some of them that’s what they need isn’t it?

**and writing and language is another thing altogether**

I mean it is worrying what where they are going to be

**Some of this work... doe any of this..is any of this good?**

any of it good yeah! I love this

**because**

why do I think it is good?! – yeah its Rosa’s she has drawn exactly what she saw, I love the fact that she drawn the handle not attached because it was broken; I mean it looks real there is a quality to that drawing the shadows its very strong

I am not sure about this- this is Jacks and I understand why he chose it because we talked about it afterwards because of the rubbings and the marks we’ve got here they are very realistic aren’t they, I mean they would be because they are rubbings I think it is very simple and effective.

**That is almost (exactly) what he said and that he rated teachers’ opinion higher –**

do you mean he doesn’t have an opinion? he’s very loyal and he tries very hard and he is always asking questions as to how he can develop.

I love these, I do like these is that Alexia’s? It is you must have a look of Valeria’s if you have time, I know that is Harrison’s... I can’t think who’s that is

**Shanice’**

oh is it? so she chose this because she worked really hard on it and she was surprised by how effective it was

**but for her 20 minutes was working really hard**

yeah I think she is all over the place she thought 20 minutes was hard work well it was, but that was the art of seeing

**trying to get the materials to do simple things?**

this is another example of how we can get them to look, to observe,

**which is how?**

which is by switching the effect; they are so used to making marks with pencil or charcoal, by switching it round makes them stop and when they were doing we were quite strict with them and they worked really hard and it was effective

**any others?**
No I recognise the fish but I cannot recognise whose it is

Husna’s

oh Husna I am not so sure about that one but I think it might just be my personal taste

these two could not remember to bring their previous work

this one relates more to the Cubist but that one doesn’t Husna has got other drawings which are better. Husna had some drawings not very strong at all and Rebecca sat with her for ten minutes teaching her how to observe and see in shapes rather than handles and things and the drawings she produced from that ten minute chat just blew me away and she just changed

she is quite receptive in one way and like a lot of them she is quite down on her own abilities?

I think she is going to do well I think her confidence in herself is developing, definitely and growing

a lot of them talk about confidence, you mentioned confidence –

is that Mahalia? Interesting

Marcus has a very wide vocabulary

yes he throws it all in

whereas Mahalia has a very narrow vocabulary but she repeats it almost like a bar code (at speed) in group discussion she is quite interesting

so I am asking about visual and haptic skills are there any other really important skills? Which you are projecting over there through and with your own experience?

I think the design process is quite important.

Is there only one design process?

I suppose not... but we do, I don’t know what other design processes there might be but here but the process of being given a question, a brief and then doing the research on primary and secondary sources, looking at artists influence or who has used the same concepts and the art for them is to gather it all and to process it and that’s the bit that they don’t get because you look some of their portfolios and they don’t read. They’ve got all these wonderful drawings and observations and artists drawings- they have all this, and then they go to do their design ideas their folders are shut, over here and then they say they don’t know what to do. You say well it’s all there and that’s the trick is to get them to work out yeah and draw little bits in.

What about other things, like the digital world?

it’s all happening isn’t it?

Are you slightly Luddite about this?

I don’t think so it’s the way forward isn’t it.

Is it?
Well in some areas I like painting I don’t like photographic paintings I like to see the paintbrush marks I like to see the artists hand.

**Do you teach photography on the course** No because apart from the photographers eye it shows a limited vision doesn’t it?

So in this teaching situation getting over these skills what are the obstacles in that here and now world; these visual and haptic skills...?

not sure what you want as an answer to that... the fundamental thing is having enough class time, not having enough time, one to ones would be wonderful. Just having the time to sit with each student, I mean team teaching is great but I worry that some of the students get left behind I cannot forget that there is somebody in the room going round as well

**team teaching works doesn’t it?**

yes it seems to and what the students’ expectations I mean I noticed some of the rebellions at the Tate...**do you see that as something you are battling against?** Well you are battling against their social ...their home life as well there is lots going on, attendance punctuality- its all there. Their attitude to their studies as well because we do expect them to do stuff at home........................

and what you might call language skills and writing there is a lot of downloading going on isn’t there?

We need to have a lot more time in tutorials to do artists research which we used to do, but now we’ve got Unit 5 &6 Building a Portfolio, Working in the Art and Design Industry, we are using in the Tutorial to cover that which I think is extremely relevant... it put them into the art and design industry it puts them on the right path, but it is sacrificing time teaching them writing skills teaching them, that has taken the place of the time when we used to teach them how to write artists research how to extract important information from documents, writing it in their own words

**Two things, you know your Formal Elements do you think they fulfil 2D and/ or 3D concepts because these are conceptual frameworks?** Really nice where you give them descriptors

probably not its more 2D I do not know what do you think?

**I think in terms of concepts they look like things that support 2D in that 2D is moving towards the abstraction of experience and moving away from the three dimensional experience So you wouldn’t mind if I commented upon that No because nobody else sees this by the way...**

And one other thing one way of teaching is do this, do this, do this – take things along in stages in a way the background of the visits is to do this, do this etc [algorithmic] –the students are quite happy to be led step by step – is that the way this course runs best or do you think that all people learn like that? Another ways is to present the whole things and say here it is in front of you, here you are, off you go. Very few of these students want to know what the final thing will mean; they all seem happy and confident to be led...
I think the students need that I think so I mean we do start each project by presenting the brief and getting them to think about how to achieve the final piece which is laid out in their brief, including concepts we give the descriptions and then they forget it.

So descriptions of Distinction grades is also what you get as part of this step by step process,

yes.
Appendix 11: Sink, Materials Cupboard, Heater, Lockers
Appendix 12: Studio Layout
Appendix 13: Assignment Briefs

**MM&I Assignment Brief**

**3D Vessels Assignment Brief**
Still Life Brief

BTEC Assignment Brief

Qualification: BTEC Level 3 Diploma in Art and Design
Module 1: Contemporary Referencing in Art & Design
Module 2: 2D Visual Communication
Module 3: 3D Visual Communication
Module 4: Still Life

Assignment Title: Still Life Brief

Due Date: 03.03.12

You are required to research artist(s) who are associated with the Still Life in Art. You will be expected to create a portfolio, which will include a Still Life study. The Still Life study should be based on the artist(s) you have researched. You will be assessed on your Still Life study and your portfolio.

BTEC Assignment Brief

You are required to research artist(s) who are associated with the Still Life in Art. You will be expected to create a portfolio, which will include a Still Life study. The Still Life study should be based on the artist(s) you have researched. You will be assessed on your Still Life study and your portfolio.

Artist(s) to research:
- Paul Cézanne
- Jean-Goujon
- Georges Braque
- Peter Paul Rubens
- Robert Rauschenberg
- Andy Warhol
- Michael Craig Martin
- Magritte
- David Hockney

You will be expected to create a portfolio, which will include a Still Life study. The Still Life study should be based on the artist(s) you have researched. You will be assessed on your Still Life study and your portfolio.
Appendix 14: List of Course Planning Materials

Course File Fact Sheet

Year Plan

Student lists with college diagnostic literacy results (Departmental Reading Ages)

Timetables groups A/B & C/D

Handouts, general: How to do Artists Research, Formal Elements, Art Writing Frame

Assignments

Assignment -Me myself and I: Units 1,2,13
Assignment brief; Grading Criteria; Assignment Submission Sheet; Evaluation frame

Assignment -Vessels & Reliefs: Units 1,3,11
Assignment brief.
Handouts: Jim Dine’s Drawing of Tools; Properties of clay; Generating Ideas for 3D design; Create a relief in clay; Create a relief in card; Compare and Contrast the strengths and weaknesses with observational drawing; Ben Nicholson, Lee Bontecu et al.

Assignment submission sheet; 3D Vessels and Reliefs – Evaluation

Lesson Plans: 3, 18, 25 November 2011

Assignment -Still Life: Units 1,2,13
Tate Museum visit; report
Assignment Brief
Handouts: Post Impressionism; Still Life Morandi, Michael Craig Martin; Task Sheet, MCM; Cubism question sheet; 2D Brief; Homework, produce a photomontage in the style of...;
Still Life w/cs 2 Jan – 6 Feb schedule
Task & progress sheet Weeks 1-5
Assignment submission sheet

Assignment: Natural Forms in XXX Park: Unit 4.
Assignment brief
Trip to V&A
Handouts: A&B Trip to Isabella Plantation; Traditional Chinese Print; multiple images of plant forms.

Final Major Project
Task Sheets, Photography, Fine Art, Fashion, Graphic Design, 3D Design; Evaluation Sheet

Assignment Brief: Unit 5 Building an Art and Design Portfolio
Assignment Brief: Unit 6 Working on the Art and Design Industry
List of jobs frame
Appendix 15: Ethics Review Approval

Dear Ken,

Re: How far do the perceptions of craft skill perceived by learners correlate with the arts curriculum they are offered and what are the implications of the relationship?

Thank you for your application for ethical review for the above project. The reviewers have now considered this and have agreed that your application be approved with the following suggested, optional amendments.

(Please see below reviewers’ comments)

7. Approved with the following suggested, optional amendments (i.e. it is left to the discretion of the applicant whether or not to accept the amendments and, if accepted, the ethics reviewers do not need to see the amendments):

In A6 of the application form and in the info sheet please clarify whether students can opt out of being observed.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs Jacquie Gillott
Programme Secretary
Appendix 16: Aggregated feedback to teachers

1. I saw that the majority of outcomes in portfolios were 2D rather than 3D

2D or 3D: Thinking about the range subjects and media: what were the factors affecting the balance between 2D & 3D outcomes on the course?

Prompts

2D: painting, drawing, print, graphic images, visual downloads, A3 portfolio 3D: clay, card, wire, willows, plaster
Are 3D skills less essential on L2?
Is the development of scale and physical presence aided or inhibited by the focus on A3 scale?
Are there different types of students?
In what way is the studio the same/ different as the workshop?

2. I noted that teachers had differing ideas about art and design education and its main purpose

Teams: thinking about how the team worked together: how did you know what to do in each lesson?
How important are assignment progress forms?
How well attended were the Monday meetings?
Could individual teachers innovate and depart from an agreed approach? To what extent?
What were the more difficult things to handle as a team?
I was quite aware of the different ideas of the purpose of art and design education- do you think that differences could be useful or a nuisance?
How is the sense of autonomy seen in teams?
3. **Students appeared to be very passive and not involved in their own assessments**

**Assessment of skills and outcomes:** Do you think that in ‘progressive’ educational terms students can be responsible for presenting and taking part in their own assessment: do (how did) students take part in their own assessment?
Do marks and grading ever change after the handing in date?
Is this disadvantageous to those that have already handed in?
Rs, Ps and Ms amended – Ds did not appear to be – could you comment on that?
I saw many students very passive during feedback and assessment – did they understand how they were being assessed?
How was student involvement progressed? – ‘takes too long’
‘sIf you get the quantity you get the quality’

4. **No student said they wanted to work after the L2 course but all wanted to progress to L3**

**Vocational and ‘work ready’**: BTEC considers that the L2 should prepare learners for work in art and design, could you say that this was a reasonable goal; could it be better?
Could the course be changed to better accommodate work goals?
How would this affect the course – progression?
How did students consider other routes than University?
Connect with the ‘art world’

5. **I noted that assignments referred mainly to Eurocentric traditions of art and design and to male artists and designers**

**Hidden curriculum.** Thinking about the traditions and recent changes to art and design curricula especially L2: do you think the curriculum reproduces, that is reinforces / resists certain features of society?
Eurocentric views of art and art value?
Male artists to study in assignments?
Traditional distributions of power? e.g. Museums and state collections?
(some students find museum and gallery visits difficult could you comment?)
Consumerism? Including of the art object?

6. **All the students I spoke with expected to progress to L3 courses and progress to universities:**

   **The L2 Course in the department:** How necessary was it for students to progress to L3 or Foundation?
   How would the L3 courses be different if L2 students did not need to progress?

7. **I was aware that the main senses exercised were visual and less so tactile, aural etc**

   **Sensory awareness:** If we live in an ‘ocularcentric’ society what is the role for the other senses in art and design education and the L2 course?
   What are main senses?
   In other domains – theatre, film, performance art?

8. **The list of formal elements formed a central ‘dictionary’ of terms and were possibly 2D focussed**

   **Formal elements:** Thinking about the formal elements as conceptual aids how do these require other than visual senses?

9. **I understand that the College requires LPs to be completed only when observations are expected.**

   **Sows and LPs:** LPs are usually created from SOWs- how are these useful / not useful?
   Do you find them restrictive?
   How do all staff contribute to them? In what way?
   Do they change? How often?
   Full and useful?
10. Almost all students relied upon their mobile phones to take photographs although photography was not taught on the course

Photography - How do you think about the use of photography by L2 students as primary sources of information?
As it was not taught formally did students use photography usefully?
(A recent science paper suggested that taking photographs did not aid memory of museum artefacts)

11. Most staff seemed to subscribe to progressive teaching ideologies and some to more instructive approaches

Pedagogy: thinking about how you teach: progressive ideas are about teamwork, student based discovery, and constructing meaning and value with students – what are the times when a more instructive, didactic approach is necessary?

This is also about standards of work that teachers expect students to achieve

Circumstances in which teachers and students innovate together?

Do you have a main purpose or method for your teaching

Is (was) there experiment in teaching?

How are relationships important? features appreciated?

‘students would not know what to do with themselves if left on their own’

12. I noted from assessment records that grades were often amended retrospectively

Assessment: Thinking about grading, is it best to assess students’ skills within the assignment or at any time?

Is it best to see a student fulfil a skill requirement?

If not do you rely upon your judgement of the formal static qualities of work?
What assessable qualities do you witness in studio? (Independence, motivation)

Can tasks be broken up into micro tasks out of context?

13. I saw that all the tools and materials came from the one cupboard; there was little specialist technology in the studio, the sink was always blocked and the heater

Resources and Technology: One way of looking at technology is through the associated tools: How would you describe the L2 course access to technologies?

Mobile digital technology is available to all students it seemed

Sufficient?

14. L2 portfolios from schools are said to be not as good as College L2 folios- one said this is ‘appalling’

Values in art and design education: Thinking about the value of the L2 qualification: how are these best represented by BTEC, the department, art teachers as practitioners

BTEC represents national standards; the department for progression to L3 – despite these two ‘standards’ do you as a teacher have an independent view?

Is there a moral purpose for art and design education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Merit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>Imagination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>Insight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connectiveness</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. I saw that assignment briefs did not have integrated maths nor specific references to reading or artists writing

**Maths and English language:** In looking at assignment briefs there is lots of writing and little mathematics, how do you think emphasis could be given to Maths and English?

Do you think more could be asked in terms of speaking and listening (art language and study)

Could students use phones as recorders like they use them as cameras?

16. Some teachers referred directly to their own practice, others were not clear that they were still practitioners

**Teacher practitioners:** In a way the curriculum is also constructed via teachers’ own experience and practice. Could you say how you use your own practice in teaching?

Could you give me an example?

Or vice versa- ideas from teaching in practice

17. I saw that many L2 students did not speak English as a first language and some had difficult backgrounds

**Students backgrounds:** Thinking about how to involve students in their own learning - how do key social advantages and disadvantages emerge?

National Curriculum

Confidence? W
Cultural capital?

How is it diagnosed and communicated to staff?

‘battles against homelife’

18. **I noticed that there were very different types of students on the L2 course**

**Equality:** In what way is (was) the curriculum balanced / imbalanced in terms of race, gender, sexuality?

Male / female balance in the groups

Assignment design

Students challenge – which?

19. **Teachers referred to different exercises or ideas for drawing and observation**

(Hayley)

**Drawing and perception:** Thinking about the variety of ways in to get students to think about looking and drawing how is this important for art and design study?

Material culture

Was the course fine art biased?

What would it look like if more design based?

Is making preferred to drawing?

20. **I went on two museum visits and noticed some negative reactions, which staff were surprised and disappointed about**

**Museums and gallery study visits:** In what way are they important?
Some students reacted negatively to Tate visit? How was this significant –or not?

Preparation to collect information

Drawing and or photographs

Discussions coming from visits

21. There were three main projects and one final major project; they were quite long, 5 or 6 weeks, and one person though that were a bit too hard

**Course design:** Thinking about the main characteristics of the course, could it could be different -where is the best place to start?

Philosophy and ideas

Socially i.e. social justice

Materials and artefact focussed

Processed based

Identity and survival
Appendix 17: Data Analysis. Nvivo open coding. TDA1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nodes</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Created On</th>
<th>Created By</th>
<th>Modified By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have been paper colliec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/02/2013 15:13</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st interview</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13/02/2013 17:04</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
<td>03/04/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Affect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:21</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>11/08/2013</td>
<td>02/09/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16/01/2013 22:40</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessia int 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alessia int 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists references</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:15</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Artet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:16</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Breaze</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:16</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cassanne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:16</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dew</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:16</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Warhol</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:16</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Michael Crai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:16</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Picasso</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:16</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists styles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:38</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14/08/2013 09:54</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>14/08/2013</td>
<td>14/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16/01/2013 10:59</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>14/08/2013</td>
<td>14/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:14</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Formative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17/01/2013 10:43</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:14</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Summative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17/01/2013 10:47</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>automatic line drawing...it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/04/2013 12:37</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/2013</td>
<td>05/04/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTEC standards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16/01/2013 10:28</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:23</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- BTEC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18/01/2013 11:19</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18/01/2013 11:19</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Negative</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:38</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Positive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:38</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:44</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructed learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18/01/2013 12:29</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>14/08/2013</td>
<td>14/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:43</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/04/2013 16:32</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/2013</td>
<td>05/04/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:57</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep HOD F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drawing what they think they know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/04/2013 12:25</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/2013</td>
<td>05/04/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy in your teaching a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 15:59</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 16:12</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/04/2013 14:16</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>03/08/2013</td>
<td>03/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:46</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heptic skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17/01/2013 10:49</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>14/08/2013</td>
<td>14/08/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
<td>02/08/2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Nodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Created On</th>
<th>Created By</th>
<th>Modif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Int 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayley Int 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Hayley Bak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 13:19</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Hayley Bak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 13:19</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Hayley Bak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 13:21</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayley Int 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Int 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husna Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a visual learner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/04/2013 14:13</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not quite sure how w</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/04/2013 12:53</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:39</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>14/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Davies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:57</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahalia Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahalia Int 1 (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management directives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16/01/2013 10:35</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16/01/2013 12:21</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Int 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not not really we talk abou</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/04/2013 15:59</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:46</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>14/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17/01/2013 10:50</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artists refs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17/01/2013 10:50</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 12:40</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:24</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:46</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17/01/2013 10:51</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>11/08/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17/01/2013 10:50</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perception</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17/01/2013 10:50</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17/01/2013 10:51</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>14/08/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17/01/2013 10:52</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>14/08/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers aims</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artists refs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assignment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>14/08/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16/01/2013 10:29</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>14/08/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Created On</td>
<td>Created By</td>
<td>Modifies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perception</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>11/08/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annotation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transferable skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:18</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17/01/2013 10:51</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>14/08/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of (art) education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01/04/2013 16:10</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of art education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01/04/2013 16:13</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa 1 Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:48</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17/01/2013 13:49</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanice 1 Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanice 2 Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solen 1 Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solen 2 Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solen 2 Int 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Young</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18/01/2013 13:57</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia 1 Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia 2 Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher experience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:22</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18/01/2013 10:33</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18/01/2013 15:02</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18/01/2013 13:07</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The art of seeing~</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/04/2013 12:14</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the control of the studio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/04/2013 15:33</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The haptic skills can be a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/04/2013 12:48</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there's not many that are</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/04/2013 15:25</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>05/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorial support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Int 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15/01/2013 11:34</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values in art education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:28</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viewpoint</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/01/2013 15:40</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11/08/2013 14:57</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>11/08/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18/01/2013 15:57</td>
<td>KPN</td>
<td>01/04/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 18 CD Portfolios
## Appendix 19. Data Analysis: TDA2-TDA6

### TDA2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 BTEC</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Visual</td>
<td>3.7 Sensory skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Units</td>
<td>1.16 Making skills</td>
<td>3.2 Seeing</td>
<td>3.8 Interpretation - evaluation &amp; analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Student development</td>
<td>1.17 Assignments</td>
<td>3.3 Haptic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Independence</td>
<td>1.18 2D/3D visual art skills</td>
<td>3.4 Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Vocational application</td>
<td>1.19 Evaluation and analysing skills</td>
<td>3.5 Dimensionality</td>
<td>4.1 Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Capital, social/cultural</td>
<td>1.20 IT Skills</td>
<td>3.6 Dimensionality</td>
<td>4.2 Tasks</td>
<td>4.10 Constructed learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 External, museums</td>
<td>1.21 Boundries, rules, deadlines</td>
<td>4. Learning/Identity</td>
<td>4.3 Assignments</td>
<td>4.11 Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8 Work experience, practice</td>
<td>1.22 Language</td>
<td>4.4 Process</td>
<td>4.12 Visual learner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9 Materials - hands on</td>
<td>1.23 Judgement ad tolerance</td>
<td>4.5 Tools</td>
<td>4.13 Power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10 Experience in Education</td>
<td>1.24 Communication and representation</td>
<td>4.6 Writing</td>
<td>4.14 Hard work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Experience as practitioner</td>
<td>1.25 Photography</td>
<td>4.7 Boundaries</td>
<td>4.15 Homework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12 Drawing observation</td>
<td>1.26 Collaborative working</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.8 Affinity, motivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13 Colour, Composition</td>
<td>1.27 Working to scale Compostion</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9 Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14 Portfolio</td>
<td>1.28 Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Processes/Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15 Geometry</td>
<td>1.29 Experiment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>2.14 Teacher training</td>
<td>5.1 Technology, tools</td>
<td>5.10 Hands on with materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Formative</td>
<td>2.15 Support</td>
<td>5.3 Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Summative</td>
<td>2.16 Artists-art practice</td>
<td>5.4 Information technology</td>
<td>3.6 Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Grading</td>
<td>2.17 Independence, growth</td>
<td>5.5 Drawing</td>
<td>2.2 Motivating</td>
<td>6. College/Further Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Level</td>
<td>2.18 Control of group / studio</td>
<td>5.6 Photography</td>
<td>2.23 Motivating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Standards</td>
<td>2.19 Relationships with students</td>
<td>5.7 Design</td>
<td>2.24 Student development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Normative effects of</td>
<td>2.20 BTEC guidance</td>
<td>5.8 Materials, media</td>
<td>6. 1 Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Evaluation, judgement</td>
<td>2.21 BTEC verification</td>
<td>5.9 Resources</td>
<td>6.4 Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Teaching</td>
<td>2.22 Energy and passion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10 Values</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 Efficiency &amp; effectiveness</td>
<td>6.5 Funding limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11 Art education - purpose</td>
<td>2.23 Challenge and interest for teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12 Strategies</td>
<td>2.24 Autonomy and trust</td>
<td>6.3 Progression</td>
<td>6.6 Change, directives, BTEC, funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13 Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers' Framework May 17 2014*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sylvia</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Vis &amp; Haptic</th>
<th>Power &amp; Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Critical comparisons – compare and contrast; they find difficult; it isn’t that clear...</td>
<td>formal language sources and models</td>
<td>formal language sources and models</td>
<td>formal language sources and models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You have to research it all yourself, formal elements – so visual version - so nothing from BTEC...</td>
<td>tentative opportunity to touch on every aspect... you can identify what you like or dislike... and to be tolerant (they can learn from what they do not like Kn).</td>
<td>3D des we touch... only person who is 3D is Paul, students struggle with 3D... making closure...</td>
<td>students unable to go into workplace with L2, voc- skills in a &amp; des F Art, IT – Illus, PH&amp;H animation; only person who is 3D is Paul, we try to keep them on the level; when I first see it; boundaries... they haven’t been taught... understanding discipline &amp; deadlines, agree rules with students; respect for teaching environment / studio; control of the studio, worked in the style; reflect on Picasso;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>working with each other... struggle with that... Denise – false tool died or...</td>
<td>redefine the structures... a nice double line... moves as slightly... work in the style of; what works and what has been successful... you have to understand what it actually means</td>
<td>thinks the key but we have... through drawing can reach a deeper analysis... touch their faces... put cream on; brush down their noses... manual skills...</td>
<td>3D des we touch... only person who is 3D is Paul, students struggle with 3D... making closure...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Impressions:
- Deficit model – second chance
- Suspension of realization – as Foundation; freedom from high stakes and expectations
- Concentration on process, task completion, portfolio material
- Classroom not workshop
- Visits – loose purpose, general information gathering
- Very busy, students task completion; teachers, record keeping, student prodigal relationships, reassured by good work

### Teachers interview codes

#### C. Curriculum
- C1. Assignments
- C2. Visual and Haptic learning
- C3. Power and control

#### P. Pedagogy
- P1. Assessment, evaluation
- P2. Learning and identity
- P3. Tools and technology – material culture

### Inductive sub-codes / themes

- Vocationality: C1, C3, P1
- Planning: C1
- Design, process: C1
- Basic skills: P, C2, C3, P3, S1, S2
- Visit: C1, C3
- Perspective: C, S1
- Hard work: P, S3
- Teamwork: C1, C3
- Control: C3, S4
- Control of studio: C3
- Work skills: C, P3
- Social action: C3, C2
- Support, for deficit: P
- Relationships with student: P, C3
- Reduced resources: P C1, S3
- Compliance, increasing pressure: C1, P
- Surveillance: P
- Student diagnosis: P2, S5
- Emotional response: P2
- Individuality: P2, S5
- Teachers learning: P2, Boundary: P, C3
- Terminology: C, C1, S3
- Instrument: C1, P
- Construction, constructivism: P, S1, S2
- Others: C1
- Writing: P1, C3, S3
- Accommodation: P, P3
- Student motivation: P2
- Gender stereotyping: P, P2
- Genres: C1, S1
- Change, external: C3
- Student disposition: P2, C1, S5
- Language and special terms: P2, S3
- Second chance: C3

### Student interview codes

- S1. Vision and seeing – C2
- S2. Haptic and doing – C2
- S3. Formal language, writing – C1, C3, P1
- S4. Sources and models – P2
- S5. Own ideas, initiatives – P2
### TDA5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocational</th>
<th>reflection</th>
<th>five year planning period</th>
<th>Sequence of learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>CL's dictionary / effectiveness</td>
<td>shared ownership of ideas</td>
<td>technical / creative types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships teacher/student</td>
<td>Individual pedagogies</td>
<td>Control / stability</td>
<td>design cycle / disagreement with management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogic contract</td>
<td>teachers learning / contrasted with own learning</td>
<td>staff availability</td>
<td>staff availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners getting students on side</td>
<td>Bread range of skills</td>
<td>control / shattered backgrounds</td>
<td>management directives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of general skills</td>
<td>What works</td>
<td>Formal language of art and design</td>
<td>student passivity / prejudice in choice of artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All making / composition of 2D and 3D</td>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>Lack of technical support</td>
<td>Practicing artists / taking chances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial purpose of art education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview Questions Sequenced**

**LUCY**

1. What are your main priorities in teaching this curriculum? P2

> I am really not sure what to say about it, I suppose that students do learn something and you hopefully inspire them to go on and want to become practitioners within art and design or go on to seek art and design as a career choice path and see it as a realistic choice as well as an exciting one, specifically for this curriculum.

> I try my best to find out what they like and try to tailor things around the students that is quite important, so my priority is that the students don’t just understand but they enjoy what they are doing.

> Sometimes it is just about getting students on your side and once you do that they pretty much do anything.

**SYDRA 2 12/03 12**

> What are your priorities in teaching the art and design curriculum?

> My priorities in teaching the curriculum are to ensure that students get a diverse range of skills that will help them in the workplace to support them in developing their skills and understanding how they can be cross referenced / cross discipline so how students are able to understand for example how elements of design process can be used right across, in other areas. I think that for me that is something I enjoyed when I was a student, so I always reflect on my own learning and think of elements that will benefit the student, how to build a good art and design portfolio and how to build confidence in talking about their work and presenting their work to others and it is all part of the curriculum so it covers key units in the curriculum.

**SYDRA 3 26/04/13**

> 2.1. Did not see them, the evaluation prompts are the questions are the question and evaluation framework is a box where they write into the box.

> Yes we had evaluation help sheets for each project so it would have guided questions to help the students, we have those if you want a copy of them and (They all answer) Because I am not telling tales but Mark says his ICT is not assessed

> Mark’s ICT is not assessed but Mark assesses at the course work at the end of year and it would be that ICT is not assessed separately because it’s not a separate unit on Level 2.

> There will be extra ones on top of that too that we look at dependent upon individuals work as well up if a student work refines to a specific unit in some way then we will refer the student to look

**MARK 16/05/12**

> 4b. Does in general terms which are the main skills you think art students should have?

> I don’t think any one student should have. I suppose it’s so do with what they want to do. We have some students who go through the course and become very good technical efficient person who makes things or get onto a computer who get on to a computer or produce content of welding that will be a technical aspect that they pick up here then go on to a degree to hone that skill and sometimes they don’t have to have any creative input. They don’t have to be creative. They have to have some visual literacy they don’t have to have that compositional skill, if they want to go on to be a technical operative, attention to
Collated teachers' responses in order x teacher

**Question 1** | What are your main priorities in teaching the curriculum?
---|---
**Sylvia**
- to develop their 2D and 3D visual art skills and artist's research skills, skills in evaluating and analysing their work, to become more sort of independent thinkers for Level 3
- (the students are quite varied so that there are quite few students that would struggle with independent thinking...)
- ...developing their skills ready for the workplace as well...they are developing IT skills and understanding the different subject areas they could specialise in... and when you read the BTEC criteria - the sheet when they first come on to the course - it suggests that they are able after the Level 5 course, that they are able to go into the workplace, perhaps whereas I would struggle to consider that a possibility really. I think they would need to develop a much wider range of...
- My priorities in teaching the curriculum are to ensure that students get a diverse range of skills that will help them in the workplace to support them in developing their skills and understanding how they can be cross referenced, cross discipline so how students are able to understand for example how elements of design process can be used right across... in other areas. I think that for me that is something I missed out on when I was a student, so I always reflect on my own learning and think of elements that will benefit the students... to build a good art and design portfolio... to build confidence in talking about their and work and presenting their work to others... so it covers key units in the curriculum.
- Yes cover the units and to do that in the best way and from the teaching side to be able to adapt that as the years go by, so you are reflecting on what works and what hasn't and how you can adapt and change it and make it better each year, and we tend to do that every year and each year... the processes that we use have been more fine tuned and so forth... but it is a vocational course and it's a course that is very much geared towards students moving towards the workplace at some point or going to university. So it's has more than just a vocational purpose? Yes

**Hayley**
- I think the design process is quite important.
- the process of being given a question, a brief and then doing the research on primary and secondary sources, looking at artists influence or who has used the same concepts and the art for them helping them make the right choices for the next step.
- Well its skills and knowledge isn't it? going back even further it is the ability to draw, to mark make, the positive feedback we get from Level 3 is that the quality of work that comes from our students is of a higher standard than what they see from their GCSE (students)

**Edlyn**
- To produce progression to Level 3 courses at Kington College (this is very important as poor recruitment (to L3) will have direct results on staff retention), a few whom we do not want, apply elsewhere. To restore the confidence of students, both personal confidence and in their learning as many, if not all, have not fulfilled expectations at school or previously have not reached the required standard they were led to believe (e.g. school BTEC L2 graduates in Art and Design).

**Paul**
- my main priorities are... that they actually understand what I have told them and if that needs restating through a visual display or a practical demonstration or a hands -on by mistake process... would like to impart a structure for them so that they can carry on understanding and originating their own ideas even when I am not there...
- to get them to the point to what they have to go to at school, they have got an awful lot of material, and they have been over-guided and I would like to think that I can put something in place to help them originate their own ideas, and to put some building blocks together...

**Mark**
- I am really not sure what to say about it, I suppose that students do learn something and you hopefully inspire them to go on and want to become practitioners within art and design or go on to seek art and design as a career choice path and see that it is a realistic choice as well as an exciting one; specifically for this curriculum.
- I suppose it's to do with what they want to do. We have some students who go through the course and
# Appendix 20: Example Assignment Submission Sheet

## Assignment Submission Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Title</th>
<th>Unit Number(s) and Title(s)</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BTEC Level 2 Diploma in Art and Design</td>
<td>Unit 3 Contextual Referencing in Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Group C&amp;D 09/12/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 1 3D Visual Communication</td>
<td>Group A&amp;B 08/12/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment Title</th>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Resubmission</th>
<th>Y / N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3D Vessels &amp; Reliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence to Submit</th>
<th>Resubmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programme Title:** BTEC Level 2 Diploma in Art and Design 
**Unit Number(s) and Title(s):**
- Unit 1: Contextual Referencing in Art & Design
- Unit 2: 3D Visual Communication
- Unit 3: Working with 3D Design Briefs

**Assignment Title:** 3D Vessels & Reliefs

**Evidence to Submit:**
- Drawings in the style of Jim Dine
- Jim Dine artist research
- Quink ink and bleach techniques
- Quink ink and bleach drawing
- Subtractive charcoal drawing
- Compare and contrast ink drawings and charcoal drawings
- History of reliefs – images presented in date order. To include dates, materials used and annotate images. Describe the differences between each relief
- Card techniques
- Two design ideas for reliefs
- Cardboard relief
- Plaster moulds from mechanical objects and textures
- Photograph of small coil pot and pinch pot with description of how you produced each piece. Remember to use the technical terms.
- At least one ceramic relief tile
- Ceramics and plaster health and safety handout
- 2D Design ideas
- 3D maquettes
- final design
- Final piece
- Evaluation

**General Guidelines:**
- The work you submit **must be in your own words**. If you use a quote or a diagram from somewhere you must give the source.
- Include a bibliography within your submission or on the reverse of this sheet. You must give all your sources of information if applicable.
- Make sure your work is clearly presented and that you use correct grammar.
- Wherever possible use a word processor and its **“spell-checker”**.

---

**Extension task – artist research on any of the following artists.**

Ben Nicholson, Lee Bontecou, Margaret Mellis, Hans Coper, Louise Nevelson, Milla Seyppel
Appendix 21 Formal Elements

**BTEC level 2 Diploma Art & Design**

**Formal Elements**

- **Line**: strong, crisp, expressive, straight, directional, contour, thick, bold, varied. Dramatic, jagged, scratchy, heavy, dark, vertical, horizontal, diagonal, soft, fluid, gestural, light, sensitive, delicate, faint, controlled, meticulous, fine.

- **Tone**: dark, graduated, bold, varied, contrasting, intense, light, pale, trace, indistinct. Hazy, subtle, blended, faint, delicate.

- **Texture**: varied, exciting, coarse, rough, brushstrokes, thick, hard, subtle, delicate. Soft, thin, smooth, shiny, matte.

- **Colour**: visual, many, bright, clashing, complimentary, cold, warm, exciting, contrasting, pale, limited, emotion, dull, pastel, calm, gentle, dark, angry, happy, threatening, tranquil, harmonious.

- **Shape**: geometrical, organic, fragile, simplified, positive, overlapping, solid, negative, transparent, opaque.

- **Pattern**: repetitive, rhythm, colour, line, simplified, movement, decorative, asymmetrical, symmetrical, chaotic, lively, calm.

- **Proportion**: accurate, realistic, distorted, abstract, perspective, abstract, out of proportion, exaggerated, altered.

- **Scale**: size, realistic, enlarged, scaled up, scaled down, zoomed into, varied, miniature.

- **Composition**: viewpoint, perspective, distant, close up, abstract, dynamic, unusual, exciting, asymmetric, weight, rhythm, static, central, still, balance, symmetrical, considered.

- **Mood & Emotion**: happy, disturbed, angry, moody, frightening, peaceful, harmonious, dark, religious, calm, sad, lonely, isolated, joyous, depressing, tranquil, flamboyant, sombre, intense, sensual.
Appendix 22: Tate Handout

BTEC Diploma Art & Design

TRIP

TATE MODERN

Monday 16th  9.45-4pm

GROUP A, B, C &D

Still Lifes in Turbine Hall, Level 3 and Level 5 Galleries (Level 4, special exhibitions closed).

Turbine Hall: Tacita Dean Film

L3 ‘Poetry and Dreams
Room 1: Giorgio de Chirico The Uncertainty of the Poet:
Room 2: Tristram Hiller Composition; *David Smith Home of the Welder (sculpture); *Kurt Schwitters - various sculptures; Joseph Cornell – Planet Set etc; Alberto Giacometti Hour of the Traces; Louis Bourgeois, Lucas Samaras, Marcel Duchamp various objects.
Room 6: *Joseph Beuys Lightning with stag in its Glare (installation); Table with accumulator etc (installations, sculptures).
Room 7: various installations
Room 9 Balthus Still Life with Figure; Meredith Frampton Portrait of a young woman
Room 10: Ai Wei Wei Sunflower Seeds

Level 5: Energy and Process
Room 1: Richard Serra Trip Hammer
Room 5: *Marisa Merz Untitled
Room 6: *Luciano Fabro & Michaelangelo Pistolletto installations
Room 10: Richard Long Small White Pebbles (sculpture)
Room 11: *Abraham Cruzvillegas (installations)
Room 3: Arte Povera (installations)

Level 5 States of Flux
*Room 2: Juan Gris Violin fruit and dish; Bottle of Rum and Newspaper; Jean Metzinger Woman with a coffee pot; (Braque and Picasso landscapes); Picasso Bowl of fruit Violin and Bottle; Fernand Leger Still life with a Beer Mug
Room 7: David Hockney Tea Painting in an illusionist style
Room 10: architectural installations
Room 12: *Pedro Cabritas Reis installations
Appendix 23: Summative Assessment Grades

Assessment note 1

Feedback on sheets does not specify how evidence corresponds to assessment criteria e.g.:  

Unit Distinction

‘You have shown that you can work independently and imaginatively in all sorts of media. I was impressed with the depth of evaluation and extensive study in every area’ – no action plan and very little student response recorded she liked it and was ‘pleased with response’.

Unit 3 Pass

‘You have shown an understanding of working with 3D techniques in a safe way when working with primary sources’

In-year records of summary assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>14 October</th>
<th>9 December</th>
<th>20 February</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarjit</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agathe</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rana</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timo</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Assessments, subscript grades showing previously assessed marks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Final Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarjit</td>
<td>Mₚ</td>
<td>Mₚ</td>
<td>Dₚ</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Mₚ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mₚ</td>
<td>Dₚ</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td>Mₚ</td>
<td>Mₚ</td>
<td>Mₚ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Dₚ</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Mₚ</td>
<td>Dₚ</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agathe</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rana</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timo</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dₚ</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mₚ</td>
<td>Dₚ</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>