

# *Work as the curriculum: Pedagogical and identity implications*

*David Boud and Nicky Solomon*

*UTS Research Centre Vocational Education & Training  
Working Knowledge: Productive learning at work  
Conference proceedings 10-13 December 2000  
University of Technology Sydney  
New South Wales, Australia*

*Working Paper 07*

## **COPYRIGHT STATEMENT**

This publication is copyright. Apart from fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research, criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission of the University of Technology, Sydney.

ISBN 1 920754 06 7



**The Australian Centre for Organisational, Vocational and Adult Learning  
UTS RESEARCH CENTRE FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING**  
*A key national centre supported by the Australian National Training Authority*

## Contents

What is work-based learning? .....	3
Learning and working: Tensions and synergies .....	4
Learning challenges.....	6
Work-based learning: beyond the present and the particular .....	8
Beyond the particular .....	11
Identity challenges.....	13
Conclusions .....	14
Acknowledgment.....	16
References .....	16

The end of the twentieth century has seen rapid changes in the economy of higher education (Boud and Symes 2000). These changes have been accompanied by a dramatic increase in innovative curriculum developments. They are manifest in courses for new and emerging professional areas, a broadening of student interest away from single-subject degrees and new forms of engagement by educational institutions with the world of work. Alongside these there have been the beginnings of a shift of interest from the relatively well-ordered traditional disciplines towards the unruly domain of professional practice and transdisciplinary knowledge, where increasingly work and workplaces are becoming key sites of and sources for the academic curriculum.

This paper points to some of the features involved in this shift of focus. It examines challenges posed by a new form of practice in higher education institutions. This practice—work-based learning—has been brought about by changed relationships between those institutions and other enterprises. It involves new kinds of students who do not fit the pattern of either the non-traditional mature-age student returning to study, nor the access student, but which share some characteristics with both of these.

The paper draws on our experiences and efforts in theorising as well as in designing and delivering work-based learning programs within a higher education setting. Through these experiences we have confronted head-on the multiple conceptual and practical challenges to our identity, our disciplinary and institutional structures and our work practices. All of these challenges have contributed to disturbing our understanding of the role and function of higher education, our understanding of what is legitimate academic knowledge, what are academic standards and our belief in the resilience of our disciplinary and teaching and learning practices.

We focus on work-based learning, not because it alone signifies an end to higher education as we know it, but because it epitomizes many of the challenges in contemporary academic work. These challenges are a consequence of the changing relationship between knowledge and the university in these 'new times'. Of significance is the way these changes have meant that the university is becoming more open within its internal structures as evident in the increased number of cross-faculty courses and cross-disciplinary institutes and centres. But it is also more open in its relationship with the outside world as seen in the increasing number of entrepreneurial and research relationships with industry and government bodies (Turpin et al 1996). These openings are both cause and effect of the reduction in status of universities as primary producers of a particular kind of knowledge as

well as the loss of their monopoly position as certifiers of competence in knowledge production (Solomon & Usher 1999). These losses not only have a symbolic significance, but also have a considerable number of practical consequences.

While work-based learning challenges many aspects of existing practice, the paper focuses on two of them. Firstly, it is concerned with the question of what constitutes learning in the context of work and how this relates to familiar views about learning within conventional courses. In discussing this question it offers some thoughts about the problematic issue of the transfer of learning and how to ensure that learning in a single context does not trap understanding to that context alone. Secondly, the paper considers the implications of this kind of learning for the role and identity of academics.

### **What is work-based learning?**

While there are many uses of work placements in higher education courses, and there are many aspects of learning in workplaces, the view of work-based learning adopted here is that found in the increasing number of work-based learning partnerships. These are arrangements between educational institutions and external organisations specifically established to foster learning.

Work-based learning programs typically share the following characteristics:

1. Learners involved are employees of, or are in some contractual relationship with, the external organization. Learners negotiate learning plans approved both by representatives of the educational institution and the organization. Different learners follow different unique pathways.
2. The program followed derives from the needs of the workplace and of the learner rather than being controlled or framed by the disciplinary or professional curriculum.
3. The starting point and educational level of the program is established after learners have engaged in a process of recognition of current competencies and identification of the learning they wish to engage in rather than on the basis of their existing educational qualifications.
4. Learning projects are typically undertaken in the workplace. These are oriented to the challenges of work and the future needs of the learner and the organization. Learners are encouraged to locate

resources to contribute to their learning wherever they might be found. Modules from educational providers or training courses offered elsewhere may be used as part of an overall learning plan.

5. The educational institution assesses the learning outcomes of the negotiated programs with respect to a framework of standards and levels. Such a framework is necessarily transdisciplinary.

The particular characteristics of work-based learning require a new focus on the notion of a course of study and ideas about learning which underpin it. This focus arises from the different relationship between learning and knowledge that exists in work-based courses relative to traditional university courses. This relationship prompts a reappraisal of the ways in which learning is viewed in a work-based learning context and necessarily on the ways in which a program of study is supported.

The following section aims to provide a basis for framing the work-based curriculum in terms of ideas about knowledge and about learning. After discussion of the challenges of learning while working and the different kinds of knowledge which might be explored in the curriculum, the question of how do we learn for situations not yet encountered is examined.

### **Learning and working: Tensions and synergies**

The defining characteristic of work-based learning is that working and learning are coincident. Learning tasks are influenced by the nature of work and, in turn, work is influenced by the nature of the learning that occurs. The two are complementary. Learners are workers; workers are learners. They need to be able to manage both roles. The academy and the workplace need to operate together to ensure that they are not sending contradictory messages. The challenge for the work-based learning curriculum and those who support it is to ensure that the potentially mutually reinforcing nature of work-based learning is effectively utilized and that conflicts between the exigencies of work and learning are minimized. This can only happen if all the parties involved—learner/workers, workplace supervisors and academic advisers—are mindful of the potentials and the traps, and they are appropriately resourced in terms of the materials and expertise needed.

While work and learning may be coincident, they are not the same. In some circumstances they may be reinforcing to each other, but they have different goals and are directed towards different ends. Work is directed towards producing what the organization is in the business of offering, or some related output, whether that is a tangible product or a service, either now or in the future. Learning is directed towards the

acquisition of knowledge or the capacity to gain further knowledge. The knowledge that is the object of learning may or may not be closely related to whatever the organization produces now or in the future. For example, there is always a need to orient new employees to their immediate work tasks and there is often considerable learning for them in this. However, most work-related learning involves development of knowledge of use in improving present practices or processes or in developing practices or processes for the future. It may even involve knowledge to be used to transform the organization and lead it to new kinds of activity. Learning may be directed towards immediate or to long term ends.

Learning and working often take place at the same location, and to the external observer the activities associated with each may not be easily separated. Many work assignments require employees to engage in learning before the work can be effectively completed. Such learning is an intrinsic aspect of work and may not be differentiated from it in the minds of worker or supervisor. However, this aspect of learning is not the focus here. Work-based learning typically emphasizes learning beyond the immediate and necessary requirements of work completion while drawing on the opportunities work provides. The employee takes on the additional and explicit role of a learner in the workplace and engages in activities that add to the normal work requirements of the position they hold. In many instances, activities of learning and working can be shared. The workplace provides a kind of textbook from which the worker/learner draws their problems, complete exercises and assignments, some prescribed, some not. For example, in completing a work assignment, the reading for and writing of a report may well be of benefit to work outcomes as well as other learning outcomes that can be formally recognized. There are therefore potential savings of time and effort on the part of the learner in work-based learning compared to similar tasks in an entirely educational environment. Not all of these savings can be realized, as learning has additional demands of its own which may not be apparent to those new to work-based learning.

While they might share many interests in common, the roles of worker and learner do not necessarily sit easily together. When a worker is also a part-time student, there is a separation of activities in time and place that distinguishes learning from working. Classes may occur in the evening or at the weekend and course assignments are completed at home. In work-based learning, the activities of working and learning often take place in the same location at the same time. The learning involved is often multi-modal. There may be no sign that a shift from one mode to another has taken place. This can create additional tensions and an extra process for the work-based learner to manage.

Work-based learners are students, but they may not feel like students. That they do not attend an educational institution on a regular basis, if at all, compounds the feeling of identity ambiguity. They may not meet students other than those in their own workplace, who anyway are fellow workers. They do not follow an existing curriculum, and they do not sit examinations or complete set assignments. Many of the conventional attributes of being a student are absent. Learners have to manage their work and learning without the conventional boundaries that exist between them. They may even occupy the same physical space. Learners also have to manage the shift of identity from worker to learner and back again. They may not have the opportunity of being able to devote themselves single-mindedly to one or the other role, especially the learning role. They may have to explain to co-workers and supervisors what they are doing and why, and deal with the feelings which attending to learning in the workplace and the comments of others may provoke. All this can be managed, but the challenges are not necessarily obvious to the new learner. They also raise the aforementioned question of identity: is the work-based learner really a bona fide student or some type of hybrid student cum worker?

### **Learning challenges**

*What knowledge constitutes the work-based learning curriculum?*

Even though subject matter knowledge may not be the defining characteristic, the work-based curriculum must take into account a view of knowledge. Learning always has an object of attention. It is learning about something. It cannot be separated from knowledge either in the general or local sense. What perspectives on knowledge need to be considered in developing the work-based curriculum then?

A basic assumption of work-based learning is that knowledge is generated through work. All workplaces are potentially sites of knowledge production in similar ways that universities and research institutions have traditionally been thought of as sites of knowledge production. Different workplaces will be differentially generative of knowledge production depending on the nature of the work undertaken and the particular expectations of productivity, which are placed on those who work there. These include the nature of the enterprise as well as the extent to which

- work follows standard patterns and routines,
- the organization understands and represents its own knowledge,
- employees are given scope to exercise initiative to transform the nature of their work and that of others,

- there is freedom to pursue goals beyond those required for current work output.

The kinds of knowledge generated in workplaces may differ greatly from that generated and sustained by academic institutions. Knowledge production is driven by different imperatives. Different knowledge may well be valued in different sites. One way of contrasting the distinction between the kinds of knowledge valued in universities and that of other settings has been elaborated by a number of recent commentators. Gibbons et al (1994) are among the most prominent of these and they describe two modes of knowledge production:

in Mode 1 problems are set and solved in a context governed by the, largely academic, interests of a specific community. By contrast, Mode 2 knowledge is carried out in a context of application. Mode 1 is disciplinary while Mode 2 is transdisciplinary. Mode 1 is characterized by homogeneity, Mode 2 by heterogeneity. Organizationally, Mode 1 is hierarchical and tends to preserve its form, while Mode 2 is more heterarchical and transient. Each employs a different type of quality control. In comparison with Mode 1, Mode 2 is more socially accountable and reflexive. It includes a wider, more temporary and heterogeneous set of practitioners, collaborating on a problem defined in a specific and localized context. (1994: 3)

When they developed these distinctions Gibbons and his colleagues were focusing on research and did not appear to have in mind the kinds of work-based learning discussed here. However, such an analysis is helpful in identifying ways in which knowledge may need to be treated differently in work-based courses relative to disciplinary-based elements of which many university courses are constructed.

The focus of work-based learning is on the knowledge of practice, on what is needed to understand and develop the activities of particular work sites. The knowledge requirements and the knowledge outcomes of work-based courses will not necessarily coincide with those of disciplinary courses. This does not imply that Mode 1 knowledge is irrelevant to work-based learning, but that it may be subordinated to other more pressing agendas. A work-based learning curriculum will not necessarily incorporate elements of existing university courses, although in many circumstances where these courses do provide for the kind of knowledge development needed for particular desired outcomes, they are included.

One of the major challenges of the work-based learning curriculum is how to reconcile the Mode 1 knowledge of the university and the Mode 2 knowledge of the workplace in ways that do not place an unrealistic burden on the individual learner. Academic advisers will typically be drawing on their background of Mode 1 knowledge while workplace supervisors or advisers will be drawing on their

understanding of Mode 2 knowledge. What Mode 1 knowledge they possess will be overtaken by the exigencies of work. While much of the vocabulary may appear to be the same, they will not necessarily be speaking the same language. This means that there is a particular need for all parties to be explicit about what they are bringing to the encounter and what this offers to the person availing themselves of the learning opportunity provided jointly by their organization and by the university.

Of course, knowledge derived from the university part of the work-based learning partnership is neither all Mode 1, nor is it only available wrapped up in standard course units. The university provides knowledge of learning and how it might be promoted. It provides access to an enormously wide range of expertise in many areas. It also has knowledge of knowledge acquisition over a wide range of fields of inquiry. Conventionally it has been assumed that access to such knowledge can only be gained by enrolling in standard units available in undergraduate and postgraduate degrees. However, this assumption will be increasingly tested. Universities will have to find ways of 'disaggregating' their courses and making them available in different ways and in different combinations as they move towards accepting the need for flexibility. The unit of study takes on a different complexion when it is not a part of a wider disciplinary framework. Additional items may need to be included and others removed when it is used in different ways and for different purposes. It is extremely unlikely that it will end up as being of the same magnitude of existing units that owe more to the amount that can be covered in weekly classes in a standard semester period than to any intrinsic features of the knowledge domain. Smaller size, self-contained elements, well documented, will be needed.

### **Work-based learning: beyond the present and the particular**

Not only do new forms of learning and work require us to focus on what constitutes knowledge; they also require a new look at the notion of learning. When students are engaged in work-based learning, what are they actually learning? They are not learning existing knowledge from a standard curriculum. They are not engaged in research in the sense that someone undertaking a PhD is engaged in original research (unless perhaps they are engaged in doctoral level work-based learning). They are not learning how to do their existing job, though they may well be extending their present work. For the most part what they are doing is equipping themselves to be continuing learners and productive workers through engagement with tasks that extend and challenge them, taking them beyond their existing knowledge and expertise. Such continuing learning requires a fresher view of learning than that hitherto promoted in higher education.

Over the past twenty-five years or so there has been a transformation in understanding of student learning in higher education. A research base has been established where none existed previously and there is now a body of work that speaks directly to the concerns of academics. The most influential of this research has been that on qualitative conceptions of knowledge. This has been associated with the tradition of phenomenographic research associated with Marton among others (Marton, Entwistle and Hounsell 1996).

In recent years Marton and his collaborators have moved on from their earlier view of phenomenography to a concern with a topic which lies at the heart of all education, that of what does it take to learn? (Marton and Booth 1997; Bowden and Marton 1998). In particular they confront the fundamental problem of how can we learn in a way that enables us to deal with unknown situations. While they use this problem to explore curriculum and teaching issues for all university courses, their thinking is especially applicable to work-based learning. The reason for this is that in work-based learning most situations are unknown. Not only are they unknown to the learner, but unlike in conventional courses, they can also be unknown (at least in part) to their supervisors and advisers. The two features of Bowden and Marton's solution to the problem of learning for unknown situations are; first, to focus on discerning aspects of situations that vary from others and, second, to integrate disciplinary and professional frameworks of knowledge. The first of these is less apparent, but it is probably of greater significance for work-based learning.

What do they mean by discerning aspects that vary and why is that important? They argue that one of the problems with existing curricula and approaches to teaching is that students are expected to focus on a particular issue or problem and practice solving it until they become expert. They then move on to another issue or problem type and repeat the process. When they are faced with a new issue or problem they try to decide which of the approaches in which they are expert is appropriate. When they find that it belongs to none of the sets they know, they don't know how to approach the problem. They have no experience in deciding what the problem is. In order for them to gain such experience, they must be exposed to novel situations with different kinds of problems. The important element that Bowden and Marton (1998) have added to this analysis is that students should go on to work out just what the problem really is. It is the understanding of what the problem really is which is the key to learning for the unknown.

Understanding what the problem is involves students in noticing the variation between one situation and another. They are required to draw on various aspects of their knowledge to make sense of and

account for the particular features of the problem or issue with which they are confronted. Students learn variation by noticing differences in different problem situations. By comparing and contrasting these, they come to focus on salient features that will enable them to address the new problem. In this way of looking at learning, it is not just the solving of the problem which indicates learning, but the development of an appreciation of what was actually learned. Students need to stand back and reflect on their learning in order to understand what it is that they have learned which goes beyond the specifics of the situation in which they find themselves. It is this aspect of learning that enables them to face new situations with equanimity.

The second of Bowden and Marton's (1998) solutions to learning for unknown situations is the integration of disciplinary and professional frameworks of knowledge—Mode 1 and Mode 2 forms of knowledge. This is important for work-based learning, but potentially more problematic as work-related frameworks of knowledge are generally underdeveloped, not well documented and certainly little analysed. Also, existing disciplinary knowledge frameworks are rarely constructed in ways that link directly with working knowledge. In particular, the ways in which disciplinary knowledge are represented in the conventional curriculum may not be accessible to those who have not progressed through a conventional disciplinary education. There are substantial challenges in making existing course units available within a work-based learning framework as Mode 1 and Mode 2 knowledge may be qualitatively different and unable to be translated from one to another. It is easier to imagine a dialogue between disciplinary and professional frameworks within a conventional course, than in a work setting. There are a number of reasons for this. First, there is a degree of control and standardization of the curriculum possible within an academic framework. This means that work-based knowledge becomes subordinated to disciplinary knowledge. Second, there has been substantial dialogue between disciplinary and professional knowledge within universities, in some cases over very long periods of time. Traditional professions, such as law and medicine, have been represented in universities over many centuries and, while there have been tensions between academic and professional knowledge, both now are subject to research as the development of professional expertise is explored systematically. There is no equivalent investigation for most domains of work-related knowledge outside defined professional areas—though this is changing particularly in areas such as nursing and teaching.

This does not imply that there should not be closer integration between disciplinary and work-related knowledge, but that this remains to be undertaken. There is a need for new conceptual frameworks useful in interrogating Mode 2 knowledge. This is a prerequisite for the kinds of integration envisaged by Bowden and

Marton (1998). There are for example many aspects of post-structuralist theory that can be deployed to this end, including Foucaultian analysis that can illuminate the power/knowledge dynamics of work settings (See Gore 1997; Rose 1990). However, by and large, there has been little systematic analysis of the kinds of conceptual and theoretical work of value for work-based learning. This is likely to be a fruitful area of research necessary for the further development of work-based learning.

### **Beyond the particular**

A particular challenge for the work-based curriculum is the danger of trapping learners' understanding within their own work setting. That is, learners may well learn how to improve their immediate practice, but, constrained to that environment, they will be unable to move beyond it. Their understandings and working knowledge becomes over-localized and cannot transcend the present and the particular. While this is an issue of much broader significance, in work-based learning strategies for addressing it must be found if recognition of learning beyond the organization is sought.

Bowden and Marton's (1998) suggestions can also be used to address the problematic issue of the transfer of learning. That is, how can we ensure that students can apply their learning in situations other than the ones in which they developed it? The conventional way of phrasing this is how can transferability of learning beyond the workplace be enabled? However, Bowden and Marton argue, following Smedslund (1953), that transfer is not needed as a concept. As they put it:

Anything you learn, you must make use of in other situations. You can never re-enter the very situation, which gave birth to learning. Transfer is involved in every instance of learning; questions of transfer are simply questions of learning. And, if so, you do not need the concept of transfer of course. It is redundant. (1998: 25)

They also challenge the framing of the problem in terms of transfer:

Sorting situations into two categories—learning situations on the one hand and situations of application on the other—seems hard to defend. Every 'learning situation' includes the potential for application (of something learned previously) and every 'situation of application' implies the potential for learning (something new). (1998: 25)

The difficulty that the notion of transfer seeks to address is still an important one. They suggest that the idea of variation is sufficient to deal with the problems that 'transfer' was invented to deal with. They focus on the importance of the differences between situations of various kinds:

There are differences between situations within educational institutions (this is one form of variation), there are differences between situations outside educational institutions (another form of variation) and there are differences between the two classes of situation (a third form of variation). Interesting issues are the extent and nature of these different sorts of variation, and the possible relationships between them. (1998: 26)

Bowden and Marton thus shift the attention away from the notion of 'application' towards that of exploring the variations that exist in the objects of study and the relationships between them. It is only through experiencing variation in learning, discerning different sorts of variation and being able to draw upon this variation in new settings, that learners can successfully approach new problems or issues. This implies a greater emphasis on students appreciating what they are learning and what they have learned at the time of their learning. They need to disembed their knowledge from the particularities of context in which it was learned so that it is available for use elsewhere (Donaldson 1978). In the work setting this will often involve an additional step beyond that needed for the immediate use of that knowledge. Developing an awareness of their learning is a necessary step that must be incorporated explicitly into the work-based curriculum. Such an emphasis helps address the criticism of work-based learning that it lacks the feature of providing a 'critical distance' in the development of professionals, that is, that it does not enable learners to perceive what they are learning separate from their immediate context.

In terms of the language of approaches to learning, students must necessarily have engaged in a deep approach to learning if they are likely to be able to use their knowledge in a new situation. While there may be more potential for them to do so in the relevant and meaningful context of the workplace, many pressures to cut corners and not fully process their learning are present also. Work-based learning in itself does not of course guarantee that a deep approach will be adopted.

While Bowden and Marton (1998) focus on what they term disciplinary and professional knowledge, they do not address the challenges of Mode 2 knowledge directly. They also draw most of their detailed examples from relatively simple science contexts. Professional knowledge has already undergone some degree of codification compared to the wider range of Mode 2 knowledge, and discerning variation is more demanding the more complex the situation considered. Nevertheless, their work provides the most useful starting point so far in dealing with the learning challenges of work-based learning.

## **Identity challenges**

One of the other major challenges of work-based learning is that to the identities of academics. When work is the curriculum, the reshaping of concepts of knowledge and learning is accompanied by a parallel reshaping of their identity. This section briefly focuses on academics' engagement in work-based learning and the different 'subject' positions they take on. The use of the word 'subject' is deliberately ambiguous. It refers to what it is being learnt/taught as well as to the new role and expertise (and tensions around these) of academics as they are 'subjected' to the various disciplinary practices of both the university and workplaces (Usher and Solomon 1999).

It is important first to say that we believe that the current challenge to traditional notions of academic identities is not confined to this kind of curriculum. The closing of the conceptual and physical space between contemporary universities and other organisations together with changes in government funding arrangements have had an enormous impact on academics. This relates to the way universities are redefining themselves, in terms of their identity as educational institutions, their relationships with other universities and industries, their understanding of the composition of target markets and much more. While these redefinitions are constantly unfolding, one sustaining feature is a set of discourses that construct higher education as an industry, that is, as a business involved in the commodification and marketisation of education. The university, as only one player in this industry, located at the heart of the blurring of educational and non-educational discourses, is being constructed as a workplace. Such a construction is reflected through the entry of discourses of management into the management practices of the university. The 'mission statement', 'strategic planning' and 'quality assurance' have a remarkable resemblance to those of other corporations. Previously workplaces were of interest to academics mainly as sites of research or as the destination of their students. Workplaces were 'other'. However in the contemporary university, while there are likely to be many sites of resistance and struggle to the corporatisation of the university, management practices in the university and the everyday work practices of almost all academics, mean that it is difficult not to experience the university as a workplace. While, of course, academics literally have always 'gone to work' in a 'workplace', conventionally, the subject position of academics has been constructed by disciplinary practices associated with expertise in knowledge and curriculum structures rather than organisational imperatives.

Furthermore to complicate the effects of managerialism on academics, in work-based learning awards, where work is the curriculum, even their expertise in a disciplinary knowledge area is troubled. Their work practices require a different expertise signalling a shift from an

identity shaped by a particular disciplinary area and the academic community more generally. In this context, the identity of academics is influenced by a new role in the learning process—one of facilitator or expert in *learning* rather than an expert in a disciplinary body of knowledge. This is disturbing to those who construct their identity through their academic or professional discipline. Moreover, as discussed above, the knowledge produced in work-based learning is often very specific to its context of application. This is contrast to a perceived ‘universality of knowledge’ produced within a university. This contrast encourages a more explicit scrutiny by disciplinary communities. Indeed work-based learning often comes under the microscope by academics suspicious of the consequences of work-based learning programs.

Simultaneously the academic is subjected to a considerable amount of regulation by the participating organisation. From the organisation's perspective, during the program the academic is ‘one of them’. They find themselves also working within the rules and regulations of the company—many of which are inconsistent with those of the university.

The academic is therefore working at the intersection of two sites of regulation (the university and the organisation). This can result in a considerable amount of tension for the academic, whose identity is no longer clearly defined by the boundaries of any one institution. It is not surprising that academics are confused about their role and identity. On the one hand they can be asked, for example, to ensure that the individualised work-based projects of the learners in a work-based learning program add value to the company’s productivity goals. On the other, at the same time in university forums, they are frequently challenged about the academic merit of these individualised programs.

## **Conclusions**

This paper has suggested that a focus on work-based learning requires rethinking about how learning is conceptualised and programs of study organised as well what constitutes academic expertise. Work-based learning does not arise from the disciplinary frameworks in which knowledge has been traditionally ordered within the university; in many instances it exemplifies more local knowledge, flowing from the particular spatial and temporal circumstances of work contexts and situations. In the traditional university this knowledge was spurned, and the catchcry was to go beyond the present and the particular (Bailey 1984).

Work-based learning celebrates the pedagogic significance of the particular and the present. As has been argued earlier, this could limit its transferability and trap the work-based learner in degrees that have a very limited shelf life. However new theories of variation, most notably those espoused by Bowden and Marton (1998), could redress this, and offer the prospect of work-based learning being codified at source in such a way as ensure that such learning transcends the present and the particular. Whether this occurs or not depends on developing a pedagogy for work-based learning, a topic beyond the scope of this paper.

This focus on what constitutes learning is reflected in the construction of the identities of academics who become involved in work-based learning. Not only do they face threats to their traditional identity as 'subject experts', but they face the discomfort of having to develop new expertise as 'learning experts'. The implications of work-based learning are far more profound than a description of the practice might lead one to expect.

## Acknowledgment

Aspects of this paper are drawn from contributions by the authors to Boud, D. and Solomon, N. (Eds.) *Work-Based Learning: A New Higher Education?* Buckingham: SRHE and the Open University Press, to be published in 2001.

## References

- Bailey, C. H. (1984) *Beyond the Present and the Particular: A Theory of Liberal Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bowden, J. and Marton, F. (1998) *The University of Learning: Beyond Quality and Competence in Higher Education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Boud, D. and Symes, C. (2000). Learning for real: work-based education in universities. In Symes, C. & McIntyre, J. (Eds.) *Working Knowledge: The New Vocationalism and Higher Education*. Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.
- Donaldson, M. (1978) *Children's Minds*. London: Fontana.
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. and Trow, M. (1994) *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
- Gore, J. M. (1997) Power relations in pedagogy: an empirical study based on Foucauldian thought, in C. O'Farrell (ed) *Foucault. The Legacy*. Brisbane: Queensland University of Technology.
- Marton, F. and Booth, S. (1997) *Learning and Awareness*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Marton, F., Hounsell, D. and Entwistle, N. (1996) *The Experience of Learning: Implications for Teaching and Studying in Higher Education*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- Rose, N. (1990) *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self*. London: Routledge.
- Smedslund, J. (1953) The problem of 'what is learned?' *Psychological Review*, 60: 157-8.
- Solomon, N. & Usher, R. (1999) 'Open Plan? Re-organising the space of knowledge' conference paper at the 'Re-Organizing Knowledge: Transforming Institutions – Knowing, Knowledge and the University in the XXI Century' September 1999, University of Massachusetts, Amherst US
- Turpin, T., Aylward, D., Garrett-Jones, S. and Johnston, R. (1996) *Knowledge-based Cooperation: University-Industry linkages in Australia*. Canberra, DEETYA
- Usher & Solomon (1999) 'Experiential Learning and the Shaping of Subjectivity in the Workplace' in *Studies in the Education of Adults*, Vol. 31, No 2, pp 155-63.