


Please cite the Published Version

Lisewski, B  (2021) How tutor-practitioners conceptualised and enacted their practice-based knowing in a Higher Education Fashion School: a Teaching and Learning Regime approach. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 45 (6). pp. 730-743. ISSN 0013-1326

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2020.1812550>

Publisher: Taylor & Francis (Routledge)

Version: Accepted Version

Downloaded from: <https://e-space.mmu.ac.uk/626572/>

Usage rights:  In Copyright

Additional Information: This is an Author Accepted Manuscript of an article published in Journal of Further and Higher Education by Taylor & Francis.

Enquiries:

If you have questions about this document, contact openresearch@mmu.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in e-space. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our Take Down policy (available from <https://www.mmu.ac.uk/library/using-the-library/policies-and-guidelines>)

How tutor-practitioners conceptualised and enacted their practice-based knowing in a Higher Education Fashion School: a Teaching and Learning Regime approach

Dr Bernard Lisewski

b.lisewski@mmu.ac.uk

University Teaching Academy, Manchester Metropolitan University, 1st Floor All Saints Building, Oxford Road, Manchester, M15 6BG, UK.

Abstract

This paper examines how tutor-practitioners conceptualised and enacted their practice-based knowing (PBK) in a Higher Education Fashion School (HEFS). It adopts a qualitative insider-researcher methodology composed of oral biographies, dialogic interviews and participant observations. Social practice theory (SPT) is utilised as the analytical framework; composed of Trowler's Teaching and Learning Regime (TLR) theoretical construct and Schatzki's conceptual relationship between viewing practice as a connected entity and practice as performance. Tutor-practitioner vignettes are employed to integrate the presentation, analysis and discussion of the qualitative data. They illustrate that the tutor-practitioners' PBK was conceptualised as a combination of: learning rules and techniques, bringing contextualised working methods into the HEFS, acknowledging tacit knowing including sensible knowledge, having contemporary and historical perspectives alongside accrued experiences and applying theory in relevant contexts to make connections with Fashion Industry practices. Its enactment was composed of dialogical, collaborative, modelling and mentoring processes in conjunction with demonstrating and simulating such practices. Tutor-practitioners also exhibited hybridised and fluid identity formation in the enactment of these practices. The paper concludes by explaining the implications of the research outcomes for the possible enhancement of the TLR heuristic when applied in Higher Education (HE) research contexts where tutor-practitioners teach.

KEYWORDS: Tutor-practitioners; Social Practice Theory; Teaching and Learning Regime; Practice-Based Knowing

Introduction: research context and the nature of knowledge in Art and Design disciplines

The research was conducted in a small privately owned for-profit UK based HEFS. It originated in Milan in 1935 to endow amateur seamstresses with professional expertise based on Italian craftsmanship. Today, it provides vocational training for mainly international students seeking to work in the Fashion Industry. A key feature of its educational philosophy is the employment of tutor-practitioners based in the Fashion Industry who work alongside their full-time academic colleagues in the delivery of the HEFS's degree programmes in Fashion Design, Styling and Business. In HE Art and Design (HEAD) disciplines, industry practitioners are often employed as part-time tutors to undertake teaching focused on 'practice and making rather than on transmission' (Orr and Shreeve, 2018: 4).

Tutor-practitioner expertise places less emphasis on propositional knowledge (knowing about) and more on experiential procedural knowledge (knowing how). According to Shreeve, Wareing and Drew (2009: 346) such knowledge is often highly specific to certain situations, tacit, difficult to articulate and made accessible through visual and verbal means. Furthermore, Strati (2003: 56) argues that 'personal knowledge based on the faculty of aesthetic judgement and the perceptive-sensorial capacities' is a key constituent of the 'knowing-in-practice' competence of practitioners. Strati (2007: 62) refers to this as 'sensible knowledge' or that which is:

Perceived... judged... produced and reproduced through the senses. It resides in the visual, auditory, the olfactory, the gustatory, the touchable and in the sensitive aesthetic judgement.

In HEAD disciplines, 'sensible knowledge' is a key constituent of tutor-practitioners' tacit expertise and presents them with pedagogic challenges because as Austerlitz *et al* (2008: 19) argue:

Knowledge and knowing in Art and Design is complex and not readily rendered through text. Many practices develop ways of knowing through experience of the tactile, visual and spatial.

Within such educational settings, Austerlitz *et al* (2008: 1) highlight the need for a 'pedagogy of ambiguity' where the open-ness and uncertainty inherent in student project briefs is integral to developing problem-solving learning approaches alongside knowledge which is 'procedural, provisional, socially constructed and ever changing'. Orr and Shreeve (2018: 7) conceptualise the ambiguity of creative HEAD knowledge as a 'sticky curriculum' composed of messiness and uncertainty, opaque values, mutability and embodied enactments which provides troublesome challenges to students and tutors. This 'sticky curriculum' is 'linked to practices beyond the university' (Orr and Shreeve, 2018: 73) and presents ambiguous scenarios which:

Require negotiation for those working in HE... translating creative practice into pedagogic activities.

Research rationale and questions

Given such challenges, the research sought to examine how eighteen tutor-practitioners conceptualised and enacted their Fashion Industry PBK whilst teaching on the HEFS's degree courses. The study's rationale resided in the issues raised by previous educational research by Shreeve (2009) which focused on how HE tutor-practitioners in Art and Design experienced the relationship between their creative professional industry practice and teaching. If the benefits of employing practitioners to teach within HEAD contexts are to be maximized, Shreeve (2009: 158) concluded that there is a need to 'explore how their practice-based knowledge can be made available to students' and enable them to 'understand that there are different ways that their identity as a practitioner can be maintained alongside an identity as an educator in creative arts subjects'. Hence, the research focused on examining the nature and enactment of the tutor-practitioners' PBK and the development of their professional identities as HE teachers. The research questions were:

1. In what different ways do tutor-practitioners conceptualise and enact practice-based knowing?
2. What factors influence the development of tutor-practitioners' professional identities as teachers?

The first research question employs the gerund *knowing* within which knowledge and practice are seen as being 'mutually constitutive' (Schatzki, 2017: 27). This epistemological perspective underpins the study's adopted analytical framework of SPT which has a relational treatment of knowledge in its engagement with the discourses, practices and tools of a given practice context. A practice focused stance views knowledge in an active, collective, distributed, provisional, emergent and contextually contingent way. It is situated in processes composed of verbs such as 'learning, organizing, belonging, understanding, translating and knowing' (Nicolini, Gherardi and Yanow, 2003: 21). Thus, the tutor-practitioners' knowledge was initially conceptualised as their ability to participate competently in the multiple practice relationships and the material and discursive conditions of the HEFS. They were involved in recurrent social processes of negotiating their teaching competence and legitimacy. By learning of, and participating in, the HEFS's educational practices the tutor-practitioners were developing their professional identities as HE teachers. In the face of such changes, the research also sought to identify the factors which influenced the tutor-practitioners' developmental trajectory as HE teachers.

Theoretical framework

Trowler's (2012: 31) SPT was utilised as the study's analytical framework. This meso level focus is 'the point of social interaction by small groups such as those existing in the classroom, in the university department, in the curriculum planning team' (Trowler, 2008: 20). Hence, it was an appropriate theoretical lens to examine the HEFS tutor-practitioners' enactments of their PBK where practices rather than individuals are the significant units of analysis.

In HEAD disciplines, tutor-practitioners regard themselves as ‘co-learners with their students’ where student learning arises through ‘replicating the experience of being a practitioner’ (Shreeve, Sims and Trowler, 2010: 129) within a socially structured process of absorbing, simulating and being absorbed into, a practice (Logan, 2007). Reckwitz (2002: 249) defines a social practice as a:

Routinized type of behaviour consisting of several elements, interconnected to one other: forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, *things* and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge.

Within this definition, the practitioner is a ‘carrier of a practice... of many different practices which need to be co-ordinated with one another’ (Reckwitz, 2002: 250).

Trowler’s SPT emphasises the material influences on practices by examining the ‘relationships between humans and artefacts and how they co-exist and *use* each other in the enactment of practices’ (Trowler, 2012: 31). His application of SPT to HE contexts views individuals as ‘carriers’ of routinized practices amongst and between workgroups using artefacts and tools within the ‘multiple cultural configurations’ (Alvesson, 2002: 190) of different disciplinary territories. He regards discourse as one form of practice whilst emphasising the historical development of identity or subjectivity in shaping practice trajectories and highlighting the significance of accessing different knowledge resources in the production of both routine and emergent practices (Trowler, 2016: 50). This highly contextualised blend of ‘features, concepts and characteristics of social groups’ examines ‘how they interact in various social settings under different relations of power between actors, discourses, tools and rules’ (Trowler and Knight, 2002: 149). The long term social interactions of university disciplinary workgroups are defined as TLRs and conceptualised as ‘depictions of unique constellations of sets of practices and frameworks of meaning oriented to teaching and learning projects’ (Trowler, 2008: 60) at an organization’s meso level.

The TLR concept is an ‘analytical construct rather than a description of *reality*’ (Trowler, 2008: 56) employed for heuristic purposes within which its associated practices are influenced by structure and agency. Analytically, it sits as a ‘figure in its ground’ (Trowler, 2008: 58) such as the educational practices of a Fashion Design workgroup; the ‘ground’ being composed of the macro level forces of a rapidly changing Fashion Industry and the micro level agency of tutor-practitioners’ conceptions of teaching and learning. A TLR can display simultaneously a varying mix of contestation and consensus between its participants where shared assumptions and practices occur alongside diverse shades of opinion (Trowler (2009: 187). These differentiations exist because TLR boundaries are difficult to identify given their porous nature where practices are dynamically constructed and enacted. Each TLR is composed of a constellation of eight ‘moments’ (Trowler, 2008: 55):

- Recurrent practices: the way things are undertaken habitually in a practice context;

- Tacit assumptions: taken for granted practices and meanings;
- Implicit theories of teaching and learning: how teaching and learning interactions are conceptualised and practiced;
- Conventions of appropriateness: what constitutes normality or deviant behaviour in relation to it;
- Codes of signification: socially constructed layers of meaning involving emotional responses to institutional 'signifiers';
- Subjectivities in interaction: how practitioner identities may be adjusted to accommodate different practice contexts;
- Discursive repertoires: how language is employed to either enable or facilitate practice participation;
- Power relations: patterns of power, regulation and accountability procedures.

Trowler (2008: 62) advises that each 'moment' should be considered individually to 'lend some analytical purchase' to the TLR construct and thereby conceptualise the 'territories in which practices are realised' (Trowler, 2009: 194). They should be employed to 'unpick' (Trowler, 2016: 57) HE workgroup cultures into researchable 'moments' particularly the nature of their agentic and structural constituents and how they impact on academic practices and identities. However, there are 'interconnections and overlapping characteristics across all of these 'moments' (Trowler, 2008: 113) and hence, they should be examined both holistically and separately.

The TLR heuristic tool and its associated 'moments' were employed to analyse the data in conjunction with Schatzki's (1996: 89) conceptual distinction between practice as a connected entity; a 'temporally unfolding and spatially dispersed nexus of doings and sayings' and practice as performance, the 'do-ing, the actual activity or energization, at the heart of action' which manifests itself in 'continuous happening... ceaseless performing and carrying out' (Schatzki, 1996: 90) or practice as a process of ongoing enactment. Shove, Pantzar and Watson (2012: 7) describe the interactive relationship between this distinction as:

It is through performance, through the immediacy of doing, that the 'pattern' provided by the practice-as-an-entity is filled out and reproduced. It is only through successive moments of performance that the interdependencies between elements which constitute the practice as entity are sustained over time.

Research methodology and methods

The research methodology comprised of a qualitative, insider-research and idiographically based study which focused on two different yet related perspectives; 'zooming in' on the situated enactments of PBK by the tutor-practitioners in the HEFS alongside a contemporaneous 'zooming out' on the connectivity of such activities to their Fashion Industry practices (Nicolini, 2012: 213). Trowler (2013: 2) within the methodological spirit of 'zooming in' and 'zooming out' articulates the need for a *practice-focused* ethnography consisting of:

Fine-grained, usually immersive, multi-method research into particular social activities aimed at developing 'thick description' (Geertz, 1987) of the structured behavioural dispositions, social relations, sets of discourses, ways of thinking, procedures, emotional responses and motivations in play. Beyond that descriptive agenda the approach seeks to uncover broader reservoirs of ways of thinking and practising which are being differently instantiated locally.

Eighteen tutor-practitioners with varying degrees of Fashion Industry practitioner and tutor experience were invited to voluntarily participate in the research as a criterion based purposive sample. All participants granted informed consent prior to data collection.

Each tutor-practitioner provided an oral practice history in which they described the context and history of their Fashion Industry experience, how and why they became a tutor and how their practical industry experience influenced their tutor identity and practice. They also participated in a dialogic interview where the 'interviewer and the informant... collaborate to construct explicit accounts on the basis of the informant's experience and tacit knowledge' (Knight and Saunders, 1999: 144). As part of the dialogic interview process, the tutor-practitioners were asked to brief an imagined double by offering them the following scenario:

Imagine that you have a double who will replace you for a 'typical' class that you have to deliver tomorrow. Describe how you would best prepare your double to ensure that s/he is not unmasked. Please focus on how s/he should teach to ensure that your PBK is best articulated to your students to ensure that they don't discover the switch.

Nicolini (2009: 196) refers to this as the 'interview to the double' (ITTD) technique for 'articulating and re-presenting practice' particularly tacit practice-based knowledge. He warns though that the ITTD method is useful in accessing tacit knowledge only when combined with other approaches such as participant observation. Hence, thirteen of the tutor-practitioners were observed for an hour in their teaching context based on the transcribed accounts. Student and tutor-practitioner permissions were granted for the observations to be undertaken. Each of the aforementioned interactions were digitally recorded, transcribed orthographically and sent to each tutor-practitioner for verification and or amendment.

Data presentation, analysis and discussion

A Thematic Analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006) of the data was undertaken in three iterative stages. Firstly, through a deductive process of using the eight TLR 'moments' as theoretical lenses to interpret the data and secondly, through an inductive process focusing on what was seen to be missing from them. In analysing the relationship between theory and data, Ashwin (2009: 9) warns of the dangers of just exemplifying theory rather than challenging or developing it. To avoid this 'circularity' problem, he argues that one should adopt an approach to data analysis that is 'not simply the identification of the theory within the data, thus the data needs to have space to knock against the theory'. The inductive approach focused on the tutor-practitioners different PBK conceptualisations and enactments and examining the possible relationships between their practices as connected entities in the Fashion Industry and their practices as performances in the HEFS. Thirdly, anonymised tutor-practitioner vignettes were constructed to provide a 'thick description' (Geertz, 1973: 3) of the dominant thematic data patterns arising from the data.

Conceptualising and enacting PBK

The following vignettes illustrate the key thematic findings from typical tutor-practitioner responses with regard to their PBK conceptualisations and enactments and the factors influencing their developing HE teacher identities. The presented thematic extracts are composite formations from the oral histories, dialogic interviews, ITTD perspectives and researcher notes from the participant observations.

Gianni, a Pattern Cutter regarded PBK as students learning rules or techniques to make experimenting with practice possible:

They have to practice and learn the rules... practice is like experimenting. You do things, knowledge is about learning techniques or rules that will make the experimenting possible.

He distinguished between knowledge and practice but regarded them as being interdependent whereby the former existed as a composition of relatively stable working methods upon which the students' creative experimenting took place. This comparison resonates with Schatzki's (1996: 89) analytical distinction between practice as a 'nexus of doings and sayings' (learning techniques or rules) and practice as performance (experimenting). As Watson (2016: 80) states this is a recursive, interactive and dynamic relationship:

A practice (as entity) shapes human action (as performance). While the practice as entity is only the effect of performances, any one performance is substantially shaped by the practice as entity.

Each student's creative experimenting involved a 'unique configuration of know-how, resources, affordances and purposes' (Trowler, 2013: 5) resulting from learning the entity based rules. Gianni acknowledged the tacit component within his PBK:

Unconsciously, you develop technical skills but important is the awareness you gain from having to explain to somebody why and how you do something, before teaching I was never aware of that.

As a practitioner, he unconsciously acquired tacit expertise of Fashion Industry practice rules but as a tutor he realised his explicit understanding of such capability and the challenges of articulating it to his students. Gianni undertook a dialogical (Danvers, 2003; Shreeve, Sims and Trowler, 2010) enactment of his teaching practices:

Open questions were used to guide each student: how do you think the trousers should be developed? What do you think about your jacket's design? Can you describe what you have here - aesthetic and technical? You're the creative designer, I'm the Pattern Maker, do you want it to go to the tailor? The collar? How would you improve it?

His teaching practice made use of his body in conjunction with mannequins to demonstrate what improvements could be made to each student's work but the final decisions were always left to the students; 'it's not for me to decide these things'. Gianni acted as a co-constructer which required the 'suspension of preconceived ideas and outcomes for a project and supporting a process of discovery to take place for each individual student' (Shreeve, Sims and Trowler, 2010: 130).

Marion, a Fashion Designer viewed PBK as contextualised working methods and techniques which she brought into the HEFS:

Bringing practices into the university. I make them do tech packs and spec sheets. These are the techniques this company would use, linking it to why they would do it. I'd say look at that brand, it's very sportswear which is why they would use this method.

Marion echoed Reckwitz's (2002: 250) description of a practitioner as a 'bodily and mental agent' not only acting as a highly contextualised 'carrier of a practice' but also of 'certain routinized ways of understanding, knowing how and desiring'. She conceptualised her embodied PBK by:

Showing students, you will be sculptors making a sculpture around the body explaining to them that we're made of circles.

Marion enacted her PBK through modelling her practice:

I do a modelling process, how a sleeve fits, the shape of a neck or an arm hole showing them a vision of what we're going to do. Then get them doing the practice.

Budge (2016: 255) confirms that modelling professional practice is a key feature of tutor-practitioner teaching approaches when there is a crossover between creative

practice contexts and educational ones. This process plays an important role in students 'learning to be' designers. Marion described what she wanted from her students:

Once you know everything, you become a better designer because you know the rules that you can break. When you graduate, you need to think that you're unique.

Students breaking the rules is 'actively encouraged' in HEAD contexts (Orr and Shreeve, 2018: 119) as a transgressive process around which a dialogue takes place between tutors and students. Like Gianni, Marion adopted a consultative dialogical teaching approach through open questioning of her students' work; 'what do you see when you think about gowns, what can you learn from that?' complemented by illustrative body language, such as 'if you're going to wear it, what would you want in the design'?

Oliver, a 3D Designer regarded PBK as experience composed of owning and communicating creative, technical and aesthetic perspectives which he brought into the HEFS:

Experience, that's where it comes from, having a perspective. It's hugely important, viewing a painting and seeing something different. That's what you *bring* into your lessons - industry knowledge.

He conceptualised PBK as something carried with him composed of tacit and contemporary constituents:

It's hidden knowledge. I'm not going to use the word cult because that's a different connotation. But the main priority of my PBK teaching is being current. It's a very here and now scenario.

Oliver described his PBK enactment:

You simulate industry techniques; the processes you need to have something that would be perceived as a professional body of work. By demonstrating techniques, getting them to think in a way that will be beneficial to them and how to best present themselves.

This *bringing* from industry involved mediation through tools, artefacts and language:

It's a design language, tools and devices that are tried and tested in advertising, the formulas; colour, photography, illustration, typography. It's storytelling and having a narrative.

In doing so, he sought:

Interaction and openness with students. You listen to them as much as they listen to you, a platform to voice themselves and develop their identities. It's a dialogue.

Oliver pursued a more equal tutor-student relationship, his role being to 'facilitate, listen and draw out so he could be perceived as the midwife for the student work' (Orr, Yorke and Blair 2014: 39) to guide each students developing Fashion Stylist identity. Using a dialogical approach, as adopted by Gianni and Marion, Oliver sought to engender an interactive relationship between the 'tried and tested' devices and techniques (practice as a connected entity) that the students acquired and used and how they actioned them creatively (practice as performance).

Quentin, a Fashion Photographer, regarded PBK as contemporary production experience and developing a working method:

It's my production expertise. People are thirsty of practice... students need practical knowledge plus energetic exchange. To produce the photo shoot there are people to call, things to organise. I give them my method... a framework you can adapt to your own needs.

He enacted his PBK through his routinised and contemporary working methods in conjunction with one to one dialogues or 'energetic exchange' to unblock student thinking:

Communication is my job in a one to one way, guiding them step by step insisting that I'm teaching my method, then they take it, re-adapt it.

Quentin used a metaphor to describe his teaching approach:

I give them *very precise string* to put on their things, very straight guidelines. If they want another way, that's fine, giving them a controlled range of interpretations where they can feel free to experiment.

His perspectives on 'my method' and 'precise string' portray practice as an embodied connected entity whilst the students' actions, in feeling 'free to experiment' with them, illustrate practice as performance.

Neil, a Marketing consultant conceptualised PBK as an embodied process of creating connections between his Fashion Industry experience and his teaching:

I create connections between teaching Marketing and my professional activity. It comes naturally to me; mutual support between the two sides of my professional activity.

Neil acknowledged a strong tacit component in his creation of 'connections' and the application of theory to industry practice. He cited be-bop jazz improviser Charlie Parker of learning everything and then forgetting it whilst playing:

Whatever you've learned as a practitioner, you won't necessarily remember the theory but you will know what you are doing and why. You need to learn the rules, then forget them and play but the rules haven't disappeared, they're at the back of your mind.

Neil regarded rules and theory as components of connected entity within his PBK. The rules resided in theoretical frameworks he brought to the classroom but he acknowledged that they may change through the reality of enacted practices:

I present a business model using Powerpoint as a mediating tool explaining it with an example from my experience. That's the process of connection. All reality is challenging theories. We need to consider whether this is an exception or whether reality will move faster than theories making them obsolete.

Elizabeth, a Fashion Buyer regarded her PBK as accrued knowledge which is fossilised yet temporally mutable:

It's sediments built up into rock layers over time, then that structure gets eroded by wind and rain, then new shapes and forms emerge.

Describing her PBK enactment, Elizabeth explained:

I'm a mentor sharing knowledge giving tools to students, like dial radios where you tuned in and watched the needle go up and down. My role is helping students go up and down the scale, twiddling the dial until they come into tune and find their niche.

Elizabeth sought to simulate a Buying environment:

You can't create a professional world in teaching spaces. A buyer needs to be a really good negotiator. It's a key skill so I teach them negotiation theory and then have filmed practical live negotiations. Then we all examine body language, what was said and how.

Helen, a Fashion Stylist, conceptualised PBK as having strong visual and aesthetic senses:

It's your taste levels, visual clues, taking students down to their primitive levels, like historical memories and senses.

She viewed PBK enactment as:

Exploration, playing with fabrics to deconstruct things. Cutting and pasting images into radical new ways to get ideas flowing. Hands on studio practice to create things. Structurally rebuild, reinterpret, reimagine. Taking apart clothes to create something new, to experiment with ideas, to think and play like an artist.

Helen's exhortation to students to 'rebuild, reinterpret, reimagine' resonates with Shreeve, Sims and Trowler's (2010: 12) characterisation of HEAD curriculum fluidity:

The curriculum is fluid... process-based... reliant on the students own development of ideas and stances in relation to the creative practice as it is evidenced both within and beyond the confines of the university.

To summarise, Gianni wanted his students to participate dialogically in 'learning the rules and techniques' to creatively 'experiment' in 'their working processes'. Marion brought her 'contextualised working methods and techniques' into the HEFS and through 'dialogical' and 'modelling' processes demonstrated how her students could 'learn how to be' and acquire 'the rules that you can break' by 'doing the practice'. Oliver demonstrated his contemporary 'tried and tested' techniques to his students so that they could activate them creatively. Quentin gave his students 'very precise string to put on their things' whereby, through a dialogical process of 'energetic exchange', they were enabled to 'feel free to experiment' and 'take it, re-adapt it'. Neil encouraged his students to 'learn the rules, then forget them and play' whilst Elizabeth saw her PBK as 'sediment' which was temporally mutable. By sharing her knowledge through mentoring and simulating Fashion Industry practices, Elizabeth guided her students to 'come into tune and find their niche' and develop 'new shapes and forms'. Helen, emphasised the visual and aesthetic constituents of PBK by collaborating with her students to enable them to 'think and play like an artist' to 'rebuild, reinterpret, reimagine... experiment with ideas'. Orr and Shreeve (2018: 151) regard such discursive and collaborative social interactions in HEAD contexts as:

Not seeking to train students to precisely replicate practice... it is seeking to produce critical thinkers within the practice who can also stretch the practice.

These educational interactions were underpinned by an implicit theory of teaching and learning, one of Trowler's (2008: 72) eight TLR 'moments', which was social constructivist in approach. Given this 'kind of exchange' (Shreeve, Sims and Trowler, 2010), Orr and Shreeve (2018: 121) maintain that 'both staff and students animate' the HEAD curriculum'. It provided an emergent, co-constructed and connected nexus to Fashion Industry practices. Hence, within the HEFS's social practices, PBK was:

An emergent and process-oriented concept involving the ongoing negotiation, interpretation and formation of meaning, action and identity between the tutor-practitioners and their students through dialogue, collaboration and co-construction which invoked a dynamic inter-active relationship between practice as a connected entity and practice as performance. Through such mechanisms and actions, the tutor-practitioners established their competence, legitimacy and identity as HE teachers.

The tutor-practitioners conducted their 'doings and sayings' by not merely replicating Fashion Industry practices. Their 'bringing and carrying' of such practices into the HEFS was not composed solely of the habitual and reified 'transfer' of practice as a

connected entity. Instead, it involved interpretive, negotiatory and performative processes through the re-imagining, re-accommodating and re-appropriating of their Fashion Industry PBK for a different yet relational HEFS practice context. They had to renovate and re-frame aspects of their own practice entities to operate collaboratively with their students in preparing them for Fashion Industry employment. Spaargaren, Lamers and Weenink (2016: 11) argue that examining such contextual and relational agency involves accounting for it 'in relation to social practices and in relation to how embodied human actors participate in these practices'. Not only do human actors exert agency but they also 'possess *transformative capacities*' which are 'open-ended and dynamic in nature'. The tutor-practitioners abilities in shaping their students' identities into effective Fashion Industry practitioners were integral constituents of 'bringing and carrying' their practices into the HEFS.

Factors influencing the development of the tutor-practitioners' professional identities as HE teachers

The TLR 'moment' subjectivities in interaction, which Trowler (2008: 101) describes as a 'situated approach to identity involving an intimate connection between social locale and the individual', was a prominent thematic category. This analytical prism was useful in seeking to understand tutor-practitioner identity formations. Agnes, a Fashion Designer, emphasised the influence that her biographical trajectory played in maintaining her credibility with her students and helping her to prepare them for Fashion Industry employment:

I can't imagine learning from somebody with no industry experience. It's a must to guarantee a good education and illustrate a way of being for them. It's the most important thing I feel being a teacher.

Her biographical trajectory helped Agnes to nurture her students' 'way of being' as Fashion Designers. Moreover, she revealed that her identity was constantly being re-negotiated:

I started a designer, but as I got more into the teaching role, I understood more what it was about. A year ago I'd say I teach but I've been saying I'm a designer and I also teach as many times as I've said I teach and I'm also a designer. I've said things in a mixed way depending what I was most engaged with in the moment.

Rachel, a Fashion Photographer had an academic background in Art History but was still discovering how she identified herself with her students and how this could influence teaching relationships:

My approach changes on how the students perceive me and how I behave with them. I struggle because of my past influences as to how a teacher should be. If I get too close I lose my authority. But on the creativity side, it's not helpful being authoritative as they need a more relaxing relationship. I don't know

what my role is, I'm trying to find the right balance between being their teacher and a creative person.

Rachel was conflicted as to how she should be as a teacher in the HEFS environment. Her subjectivity in a different educational culture was a site of tension structurally conditioned by her more formalised dispositions arising from her former university teaching role and her cultural history. However, she did acknowledge her teaching agency:

To teach how to be as the Fashion Industry changes, I have to stay fluid as a tutor-practitioner in who I am and what I do. They have to stay fluid as students.

Rachel's positioning and subjectivity were influenced by her ongoing student relationships, socio-cultural history and perceptions of future Fashion Industry changes. As Trowler (2008: 103) asserts:

Cultures and subjectivities are intimately linked. Socialisation involves not just a passive process of enculturation of the individual but an accommodative process which involves elements of change at both the individual and the cultural level.

Elizabeth, also placed emphasis on her biographical trajectory and student relationships in her identity development:

I started as a Fashion Designer, knowing nothing about business, so I got jobs negotiating with factories about design collections. I've done the garment trajectory from design, buying, retail and marketing going from the back room to the front through the whole fashion jigsaw.

Her biographical trajectory through participation in the 'whole fashion jigsaw' led to the ontological transformation of her identity but one that was not easily definable. Elizabeth explained that:

It's finding your place, identity and voice, the way you express who you are. It's helping students find that moment of fit. My practice is about finding my and their identity and place. I've always been a mish-mash, I've never wanted to be pigeon holed.

She acknowledged her agency in never allowing herself to be 'pigeon holed'. Her subjectivity in interaction with her students was continually being re-assessed, re-negotiated and re-constructed within a 'mish-mash' of relationships through space and time.

Agnes, Rachel and Elizabeths' PBK enactments were undertaken within ongoing states of mutual dependence and fluid identity formation between themselves and their students. Shreeve and Bachelor (2012: 20) describe such tutor-student relationships as

being 'mutable, often ambiguous and uncertain in character'. Mutually defining and dependent relationships existed between the tutor-practitioners and their students as they sought to develop their respective identities as HE teachers and Fashion graduates. Such processes and outcomes were a consequence of the interconnecting and overlapping 'moments' existing between the tutor-practitioners' biographical trajectories, their social constructivist implicit theory of teaching and learning and their subjectivities in interaction within the HEFS and its associated Fashion Industry practices.

Roxå and Martensson's (2009: 212) examination of a TLR asserts that the formation of tutor identity can be 'constructed both as a positive interpretation of a TLR but also in opposition to it'. Instances of opposition and contestation can be reflected in the 'moment' conventions of appropriateness or 'what feels normal and what feels deviant in relation to teaching, learning and assessment' (Trowler, 2008: 92). Some tutor-practitioners exhibited a more balanced perspective on how they identified themselves compared with Agnes, Rachel and Elizabeth. This group were also prepared to transgress against received conventions of academic practice which had emerged from recently imposed course validation requirements. Pietro, a Graphic Design practitioner, explained that:

The key is to find the right balance between the two things. It's fundamental that I stay in the industry. Visual design continuously changes, working on real projects puts me in a beneficial situation.

He contested the validity of 'academic driven' courses regarding them as not being appropriate to preparing his students for Fashion Industry employment:

It isn't structured around practice. Tutors who wrote courses were very academic driven. I want students to be industry level but the big issue is students being unemployable, its unfair. As a tutor you have problems with not following academic structures.

Pietro challenged, and negotiated with, the normalised HEFS curriculum structures and processes in order to benefit his students from his experienced industry perspective. He regarded his practitioner and tutor experiences as being highly interdependent and adjusted his identities accordingly conditional upon the contexts that he found himself in:

I'm a Graphic Designer and a teacher, I never say that I'm just a Graphic Designer or a teacher. I cannot detach the two things.

Oliver also felt at ease with his creative practice and tutor role identity pairing. He regarded this as a healthy and mutually interactive process enhanced by collaborating with his students:

I'm comfortable in my own skin. I've got something valuable based on my experience as a practitioner, sharing ideas and collaborating with my students

and colleagues. It's a very even balance. I don't see myself as one or the other as they inform each other.

Oliver's identity was formed in conjunction with his internal and external professional peers and his students which highlighted the importance of these different practice contexts in developing his respective competencies. But, he regarded his contemporary industrial expertise more favourably than that of his more academic colleagues and the educational discourses that they were beholden to:

Academics are less connected with practice. My teaching priority is being current, practice revolves around what's here and now. I don't come across learning outcomes in practice. The institution overcomplicates things; terminology and criteria, what they mean, it constrains you. I don't write them, it's too prescriptive. They're thrown in your face by management. They ask did you tell the students about the learning outcomes? Just to show that you're on their team.

Pietro and Oliver's strong sense of balanced identity gave them the confidence to contest what they regarded as academically driven practices and discourses which they felt would not best prepare their students for Fashion Industry employment and develop their ability to tolerate 'ambiguity and uncertainty' (Orr and Shreeve, 2018: 63). Such discourses can form all or part of the TLR moment, discursive repertoires which Trowler (2008: 76) argues can both enable and constrain the 'way projects and tasks are conceived, discussed and pursued'. Oliver saw the learning outcomes discourse as a form of management control which accords with Trowler's (2008: 77) view of discursive repertoires as being 'manufactured, deliberately manipulated ... as one of the levers of culture' within HE institutions.

Farnsworth and Higham (2012: 500) describe such curriculum tensions as 'disidentification' with academic trajectories whereby industry experiences become privileged over academic ones. Practice tutors modulate their identities, mediated by their individual biographies and the contexts in which they teach. Farnsworth and Higham (2012: 499) though acknowledge that identity modulation may involve conflicts which are never resolved. Teachers who straddle different practice contexts may develop fluid and 'hybridised identities' through processes of productive ongoing tension thereby 'conceptualising their identity in myriad ways' (Budge, 2014: 32).

Conclusions

Belluigi (2016: 26) views HEAD tutor-practitioners as mediating between students and industry practice by drawing 'connections, comparisons and distinctions between student work, current artefacts in professional practice and historical references'. The vignettes illustrate that tutor-practitioners conceptualised and enacted their PBK in various ways. It was conceptualised as a combination of: learning rules and techniques, bringing contextualised working methods into the HEFS, acknowledging tacit knowing, having contemporary visual, aesthetic and historical perspectives and sensibilities alongside accrued experiences and applying theory in relevant contexts to

make connections with Fashion Industry practices. Its enactment was composed of dialogical, collaborative, modelling and mentoring based teaching practices in conjunction with demonstrating and simulating Fashion Industry practices. These conceptualisations and enactments were interdependent and mutually-productive processes given the collaborative and co-constructive educational practices undertaken between the tutor-practitioners and their students.

Fanghanel (2009: 205) accuses TLR theory of underplaying the role of power relations for 'marginalised voices' such as part-time teaching staff. Previous TLR HE research has been situated within publicly funded universities focused on mature disciplinary cultures consisting of full-time staff workgroups with strong senses of academic identity (Boag, 2010; Fanghanel, 2009; Trowler, 2005; Trowler, 2008; Trowler and Cooper, 2002). In contrast, this research focused on a privately owned for-profit institution employing part-time, hourly paid staff teaching different aspects of their Fashion Industry practices within the less academically mature areas of Design, Styling and Business. Fanghanel (2009: 206) asks, as academic identities become more hybrid, might TLRs become hazier' and might 'some moments play a more crucial role than others?' The TLR 'moment' subjectivities in interaction was very prominent in the HEFS data in comparison to more traditional full-time and mature HE academic cultures. The tutor-practitioners had 'hybridised identities' which displayed fluidity and agency in their ongoing formations. These were constituted through the overlapping interactions between their diverse Fashion Industry biographical trajectories, social constructivist implicit theories of teaching and learning and mutually reinforcing subjectivities in interaction between the themselves and their students. Instances of transgression in the form of the TLR 'moment' conventions of appropriateness alongside processes of 'disidentification' against academically driven educational practices and discursive repertoires were also in evidence.

The remaining TLR 'moments' of recurrent practices, tacit assumptions, codes of signification and power relations were not absent in the data but they were much less prominent. For example, the recurrent practice 'moment' was reflected in a lack of flexibility in the use of studio spaces and timetabling practices which qualified tutor-practitioners' intentions to organise their teaching practices to better reflect the Fashion Industry seasonal cycle. Tacit assumption 'moments' revolved around tutor-practitioners' perspectives on the nature of their students such as 'they don't know what they are letting themselves in for' given the highly competitive nature of the Fashion Industry or that 'it's difficult to teach Fashion if you have no experience of working in it'. Codes of signification manifested themselves in the tutor-practitioners' emotional responses to externally imposed validation quality procedures which brought practice tensions and anxieties to the fore. These were expressed in statements like 'we know what really happens in the industry' and 'we know what good work is, why do we need assessment criteria?'. Power relations were experienced by the tutor-practitioners as emanating from the rules and procedures of the 'quality' discourse which they regarded as prioritising academic rather than Fashion Industry practices.

The implications of the research outcomes are that the analytical robustness of Trowler's (2008) original TLR theory can be augmented by two additional 'moments'.

Theses are tutor-practitioner practice biographies and the application of Schatzki's (1996: 89) conceptual relationship between practice as a connected entity and practice as performance particularly when studying HE contexts involving the employment of part-time tutors from professional backgrounds who teach their practice such as in other HEAD disciplines, Nursing and Social Work. These enhancements offer further analytical heft to TLR theory application within an increasingly differentiated and rapidly changing HE system particularly given the need as Tight (2019: 175) argues for 'more detailed studies of the academic staff experience including... the burgeoning number of part-time and sessional academic staff'. As Trowler (2020: 42) himself has recently reflectively acknowledged 'there are limits to the heuristic power of the TLR concept as originally developed'. As such, he himself offers three additional analytical 'moments': the need to account for the 'socio-material' within any TLR, the 'historical and emergent properties which form the basis for contemporary practices' and the interactions which exist between different TLRs within a given HE institutional context.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author

ORCID

Bernard Lisewski <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1205-4394>

References

Alvesson, M. (2002) *Understanding Organizational Culture*. London: Sage Publications.

Ashwin, P. (2009) Relations between theory and data in research in higher education, Educational Research Seminar 7th October 2009

Online:

https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/doc_library/edres/09seminars/ashwin_07.10.09.pdf

Accessed: 23rd May 2018.

Austerlitz *et al* (2008) *Mind the Gap: Expectations, Ambiguity and Pedagogy within Art and Design Higher Education*. In Drew, L. (ed) *The Student Experience in Art and Design Higher Education: Drivers for Change*. Jill Rogers Associates Limited, Cambridge, 125-148.

Belluigi, D.Z. (2016) Constructions of Roles in Studio Teaching and Learning, *The International Journal of Art and Design Education*. 35 (1) 21-35.

Boag, B. (2010) *The Role of the Programme Team in the Implementation of Policy at Institutional Level - A Case Study in the UHI Millennium Institute*, Degree of Ed.D. University of Stirling.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3: 77-101.

Budge, K. (2014) Context and Performativity in Identity Choices: Artists, Designers and the Academy, *Educate*, 14(2) 32-43.

Budge, K. (2016) Learning to Be: the Modelling of Art and Design Practice in University Art and Design Teaching, *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 35 (2) 243-258.

Danvers, J. (2003) Towards a Radical Pedagogy: Provisional Notes on Learning and Teaching in Art and Design. *Journal of Art and Design Education*. 22 (1) 47-57.

Fanghanel, J. (2008) Exploring Teaching and Learning Regimes in Higher Education Settings. In C. Kreber (ed.) *The University and its Disciplines: Teaching and Learning Within and Beyond Disciplinary Boundaries*. London: Routledge. 196-208.

Farnsworth, V. L. and Higham, J. J. S. (2012) Teachers Who Teach their Practice: the Modulation of Hybridised Professional Teacher Identities in Work-related Educational Programmes in Canada, *Journal of Education and Work*. 25 (4) 473-505.

Geertz, C. (1987) *Local Knowledge*. New York: Basic Books.

Knight, P. and Saunders, M. (1999) Understanding Teachers' Professional Cultures Through Interview: A Constructivist Approach', *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 13 (3) 144-156.

Logan, C. (2007) Metaphor and Pedagogy in the Design Practicum, *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 18 (1) 1-17.

Nicolini, D. (2009) Articulating Practice Through Interview with the Double, *Management Learning*, 40 (2) 195-212.

Nicolini, P. (2012) *Practice Theory, Work, and Organization: An Introduction*, United States: Oxford University Press, USA.

Nicolini, D., Gherardi, S. and Yanow, D. (2003) *Knowing in Organizations: A Practice Based Approach*, New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Orr, S., Yorke, M. and Blair, B. (2014) The Answer is Brought About from Within You: A Student-Centred Perspective on Pedagogy in Art and Design. *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 33 (1) 32-45.

Orr, S. and Shreeve, A. (2018) *Art and Design Pedagogy: Knowledge, Values and Ambiguity in the Curriculum*. London: Routledge.

Reckwitz, A. (2002) Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 5 (2) 243-263.

Roxå, T. and K. Mårtensson (2009) Teaching and Learning Regimes From Within: Significant Networks as a Locus for the Social Construction of Teaching and Learning. In C. Kreber (ed) *The University and its Disciplines: Teaching and Learning Within and Beyond Disciplinary Boundaries*, London: Routledge. 209-218.

Schatzki, T. R. (1996) *Social Practices: A Wittgensteinian Approach to Human Activity and the Social*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shove, E, Pantzar, M., and Watson, M. (2012) *The Dynamics of Social Practice*, London: Sage.

Shreeve, A. (2009) "I'd Rather Be Seen As A Practitioner, Come In To Teach My Subject": Identity Work in Part-Time Art and Design Tutors, *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 28 (2) 151-159.

Shreeve, A., Wareing, S. and Drew, L. (2009) Key Aspects of Teaching in the Visual Arts, In Fry, H., Ketteridge, S., and Marshall, S. (eds) *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 345-362.

Shreeve, A., Sims, E. and Trowler, P. (2010) 'A Kind of Exchange': Learning from Art and Design Teaching, *Higher Education Research and Development*, 29 (2) 125-138.

Shreeve, A. and Batchelor, R. (2013) Designing Relations in the Studio: Dealing With Ambiguity and Uncertainty in One to One Exchanges. *Design and Technology Education: An International Journal*, 17 (3) 20-26.

Spaargaren, G., Lamers, M. and Weenink, D., (2016) Introduction: Using Practice Theory to Research Social Life. In Spaargaren, G., Weenink, D., and Lamers, M. (eds) *Practice Theory and Research: Exploring the Dynamics of Social Life*. London: Routledge. 2-27.

Strati, A. (2003) Knowing in Practice: Aesthetic Understanding and Tacit Knowledge, In D. Nicolini, S. Gherardi and D. Yanow (eds) *Knowing in Organizations: A Practice-Based Approach*, Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe. 53-75..

Strati, A. (2007) Sensible Knowledge and Practice-Based Learning, *Management Learning*, 38 (1) 61-77.

Tight, M. (2019) *Higher Education Research: the developing field*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Trowler, P. (2005) A Sociology of Teaching, Learning and Enhancement: Improving Practices in Higher Education. *Revista de Sociologia*, 76. 13-32.

Trowler, P. (2008) *Cultures and Change in Higher Education: Theories and Practices*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Trowler, P. (2009) *Beyond Epistemological Essentialism: Academic Tribes in the 21st Century*. In Kreber, C. (ed.) *The University and its Disciplines: Teaching and Learning Within and Beyond Disciplinary Boundaries*. London: Routledge. 181-195.
- Trowler, P. (2012) Disciplines and Academic Practices. In Trowler, P., Saunders, M. and Bamber, V., (eds) *Tribes and Territories in the 21st Century: Re-thinking the Significance of Disciplines in Higher Education*. New York: Taylor and Francis. 30-38.
- Trowler, P. R. (2013) Practice-Focused Ethnographies of Higher Education: Methodological Corollaries of a Social Practice Perspective, *European Journal of Higher Education*, 4 (1) 1-12.
- Trowler, P. (2016) *Doing Insider Research in Universities*, Kindle Edition.
- Trowler, P. (2020) *Accomplishing Change in Teaching and Learning Regimes: Higher Education and the Practice Sensibility*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trowler, P.R. and Cooper, A. (2002) Teaching and Learning Regimes: Implicit Theories and Recurrent Practices in the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning Through Educational Development Programmes, *Higher Education Research and Development*, 21 (3) 222-240.
- Trowler, P. R. and Knight, P.T. (2002) Exploring the Implementation Gap: Theory and Practices in Change Interventions', In P. R. Trowler (ed) *Higher Education Policy and Institutional Change*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press. 142-163.
- Watson, M. (2016) Placing Power in Practice Theory, In A. Hui, T. R. Schatzki and E. Shove (eds) *The Nexus of Practices: Connections, Constellations, Practitioners*. Routledge, London. 169-182.