

## Legitimising Foundation Degrees: principles, practice and pedagogy

Claire Taylor

Bishop Grosseteste University College Lincoln

Corresponding author: [claire.taylor@bishopg.ac.uk](mailto:claire.taylor@bishopg.ac.uk)

### Abstract

*Foundation Degrees are work-based programmes of higher education situated at intermediate level within the UK higher education qualifications framework and introduced in England and Wales in 2001. This paper investigates the emerging principles, practice and pedagogy of Foundation Degrees. It briefly reviews the historical and political development of the Foundation Degree and views the qualification through the lens of 'the new vocationalism' (Symes and McIntyre, 2000). The paper continues by scrutinising key features of the Foundation Degree format. Finally, pedagogical models aligned with work-based learning are considered and applied to the Foundation Degree model. In conclusion, the paper suggests that Foundation Degrees are emerging as a re-engineered form of work-based learning, with specific features that give the degree its uniqueness and with the potential for the development of a pedagogical framework unique to the Foundation Degree, thus underlining the qualification's growing legitimisation within the UK higher education sector.*

### Introduction

Foundation Degrees are work-based programmes of higher education, delivered within Further and Higher Education institutions in England and Wales, which give exit qualifications at intermediate level. Within this article I shall briefly chart the historical and political development of the Foundation Degree, against a backdrop of a consideration of recent developments in vocational education and training in the UK. Within the discussion, Foundation Degrees will be viewed through the lens of 'the new vocationalism' (Symes and McIntyre, 2000). In addition, the key features of Foundation Degrees will be considered in the context of policy documents and promotional materials. It is these features that make the Foundation Degree unique amongst a plethora of vocationally-related courses available at different levels to UK students.

In addition, I shall consider how work-based learning is gaining legitimacy within higher education. Within this, I shall conduct a survey of pedagogical models aligned with work-based learning and will consider their application to Foundation Degrees. In particular, the discussion will explore the suitability of such pedagogical models in the context of key Foundation Degree features and how the development of a new pedagogical framework particular to the Foundation Degree qualification would further legitimise its place within the higher education qualifications framework.

### **Foundation Degrees and ‘the new vocationalism’**

Foundation Degrees were first announced in February 2000 by the then Secretary of State for Education, David Blunkett, in his ‘Modernising Higher Education – facing the global challenge’ speech. Aspects of this speech subsequently appeared in the Foundation Degrees consultation document (DfEE, 2000a). Since then, Foundation Degrees have been heralded by policy makers as a significant vehicle for expansion in higher education (DfES, 2003) with an ambitious target of 100,000 students anticipated by 2010 (Foundation Degree Task Force, 2004). Professor Leslie Wagners’ introduction to the Task Force report is positive but realistic, signifying the perceived potential that is attached to Foundation Degrees for moving vocational education on in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, yet also acknowledging the difficulties faced in fully integrating Foundation Degrees within the qualifications framework and in supporting effective and appropriate partnerships for work-based learning:

Foundation Degrees represent both an opportunity and a challenge. The opportunity is to create a new type of provision meeting the need for a high quality, intermediate, vocational higher education qualification. The challenge is to produce it through partnership, developing effective work-based learning and integration with the existing qualification system’ (Foundation Degree Task Force, 2004:3).

The discourse is indicative of ‘the new vocationalism’ (Symes and McIntyre, 2000), a term also used by Hager and Hyland (2003) and by Edmond (2004). ‘The new vocationalism’ is a concept that Higher Education has increasingly grappled with over recent years. Hager and Hyland (2003: 279) describe the ‘new vocationalism’ as ‘a term that commentators use to characterise the vocationalization of all aspects of education since the 1970s.’ However, this is a rather broad interpretation. More helpful is the work done by Symes and McIntyre (2000) which aligns work-based learning with ‘the new vocationalism’. They argue that old distinctions between education and training will become increasingly irrelevant, as work-based learning gains legitimacy within ‘the academy’. This is reinforced by Boud and Symes who suggest that ‘work-based learning is...an idea whose time has come’ (2000:15). Similarly, Barnett (2000) observes that it is clear that the place of vocational training within the global education system has never been in doubt, rather ‘the new vocationalism’ emphasises a need to reinterpret and reconstruct traditional understandings of higher education within the context of today’s working world.

The introduction of Foundation Degrees was preceded by a series of influential reports in the 1990s, which served to significantly underpin the key principles of the new Foundation Degree. For example, the ‘Choosing to Change’ report (Higher Education Quality Council, 1994), recommended qualifications at Higher Education Intermediate level, which combined vocational relevance and the potential for further progression within the higher education framework, as well as enhanced employment opportunities. In 1997, the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education chaired by Sir Ron Dearing highlighted the importance of developing Higher Education level qualifications as part of a strategy for increasing participation in Higher Education. This was followed by two reports of the National Skills Task Force (DfEE, 1998, 1999) the second of which ‘Delivering Skills for All’ (DfEE, 1999) recommended exploring a new system of two year associate degrees in vocational subjects to support progression from level 3 qualifications such as National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs).

The suggested ‘Associate Degrees’ closely mirror the qualifications framework offered by the Community College Model in the USA (DfEE, 2000a). This model provides two year courses

focused on specialist technical and professional skills, closely aligned to employer needs and with core skills seen as central for success. A major theme has been a drive to increase participation in post-secondary education in order to create a more inclusive society. The same targets are now associated with Foundation Degrees in England and Wales. In particular, the Foundation Degree qualification benchmark states explicitly that Foundation Degrees are designed 'to address shortages in particular skills...(and) to contribute to widening participation and lifelong learning' (QAA, 2004:1).

At the same time as models for Associate and Foundation Degrees were being explored, Boud and Symes (2000) linked the emergence of work-based learning within higher education to a shift from discipline centred to student centred university practices. They argued that work-based education was 'demand-driven' (2000:19), citing a number of key stakeholders:

- *students* who want recognition for what they have already learnt...require flexible modes of study, including the opportunity to make work the major focus of their study;
- *employers* who want to harness more effectively what they see to be the considerable under-utilized potential of universities and to emphasise learning as part of new forms of productivity;
- *governments* which want to increase the measure of satisfaction among students and employers regarding the outcomes of higher education, and to shift costs away from the public purse;
- *universities* which want to be less dependent on the purse strings of government, to provide more relevant courses of learning for their students and to engage in partnerships with new sites of knowledge production.

The context here is the higher education sector in Australia, but parallels can be drawn for the development of Foundation Degrees in England and Wales. For example a shift towards learning and the needs of learners is seen in the development of flexible modes of study, the needs of employers are being addressed and given validity through the development of higher education programmes more closely linked with work, and universities are recognising the need to situate learning in sites other than 'the academy' through the development of partnerships in business, industry and the community and the acceptance of different modes of learning and knowledge.

Central to this shift towards 'the new vocationalism' was a growing recognition of the need to move away from the narrowness of pure vocational qualifications in order to have transferable skill and knowledge. Developments in Vocational Education and Training during the 1970s and 1980s had underlined the divisions and distinctions between vocational and academic studies by narrowly defining skills and competencies (Hager and Hyland, 2003). Boreham (2002) notes that during the 1980s and 1990s the UK government sought to reduce the theoretical elements within vocational courses such as traditional apprenticeships. A narrow, competence-based system was developed, resulting in National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs). The introduction of Foundation Degrees represented one response to a policy u-turn which signified a recognition that knowledge and understanding had to be an expectation of vocational education and training, alongside competence on the job. Therefore, this was a politically driven initiative, but with support from employers and recognition by the academic community of the urgent need to reappraise vocational qualifications (Boreham, 2002). Thus, 'the new vocationalism' began to see knowledge equally weighted alongside skills.

## Foundation Degrees in practice

*Foundation Degrees integrate academic and work-based learning and are situated within the intermediate level of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications for England, Wales and Northern Ireland. The integration of academic study and work is fundamental to the Foundation Degree model, as emphasised by the DfES (2004a:3): 'a Foundation Degree is a vocational higher education qualification which combines academic study with work-based learning and experience.' The Foundation Degree award is recognised at higher education level 2, equivalent to the National Qualification Framework, level 5. Those studying for Foundation Degrees may be seeking to enter a profession, or may have worked within a profession for a while and the qualification is designed to provide opportunities for individuals to engage in 'lifelong learning'. Opportunities for progression from Foundation Degrees should be clear within individual institutions, with courses normally linked to a programme leading to an honours degree (QAA, 2004).*

The Foundation Degree Task Force Report to Ministers (2004) noted that by September 2004 there were 800 Foundation Degrees on offer nationwide. These courses cover a wide range of subject areas, with the most up to date listings appearing on the website of Foundation Degree Forward, the organisation charged with leading Foundation Degree development nationwide. QAA (2004) make it clear that the distinctiveness of Foundation Degrees is dependent upon the integration of certain characteristics. These are:

- employer involvement;
- accessibility;
- articulation and progression;
- flexibility;
- partnership.

Many of these characteristics are recognisable in other programmes, for example in the Higher National Diploma (HND) and vocational degree courses, but it is 'their clear and planned integration within a single award, underpinned by work-based learning, that makes the award very distinctive' (QAA, 2004: 5).

### *Employer involvement*

A driving force behind the introduction of Foundation Degrees was a demand from employers for a higher level of skills amongst the workforce (HEQC, 1994; DfEE, 1998; DfEE, 1999). Foundation Degrees are therefore intended to give students the specific knowledge, understanding and skills that employers need. This implies employer involvement in the design of programmes and in monitoring the 'currency' of knowledge, skills and understanding that the programmes produce.

However, the exact nature of employer involvement is more problematic. Edmond (2004) suggests that within the practice of delivering Foundation Degrees, and within documentation related to their delivery, there is a perceived conflict between the prioritisation of the needs of employers versus more ambiguous discourse regarding the role of employers. Employer involvement could mean as little as the provision of a 'community of practice' (Lave and Wenger, 1991), or as much as financial support and involvement in

course design and assessment. In terms of the latter interpretation, some historical precedents have been set, for example employer involvement in apprenticeships. However, work by Foskett (2003) emphasised the difficulties and barriers to curriculum change within the context of partnership working. The examples that Foskett gives are around cultural disparities between academic institution and workplace, and the difficulties of meeting a variety of expectations from stakeholders.

The Foundation Degree Task Force report describes employer involvement as ‘... at the heart of what makes the Foundation Degree distinctive’ (Foundation Degree Task Force, 2004:28). Within this, the Task Force suggests three strands to employer involvement:

- involvement in development and design;
- delivery and assessment;
- supporting students and employing Foundation Degree graduates, with a view to giving credibility to the Foundation Degree qualification.

Government discourse makes its expectations for employer involvement explicit, but still does not clarify the extent to which involvement by a single employer may be required. For example, point three above, seems ‘low effort’ whilst points one and two would demand more of the employer and therefore may impact significantly more upon the workplace.

#### *Accessibility, articulation and progression*

The political impetus behind the introduction of Foundation Degrees also had at its centre the agendas of inclusion and access. The Foundation Degree benchmark states explicitly that ‘Foundation Degrees are intended to increase access and widen participation into higher education ...’ (QAA, 2004: 5). This could be interpreted as access related to both geographical location and to ease of access to the course by students with ‘non-traditional qualifications’ (for example, qualifications other than ‘A’ levels). Therefore, Foundation Degrees are expected to be delivered locally and may take account of experience as well as qualifications when assessing entry qualifications for the course. Additionally, many learners should be able to earn as well as learn, thus increasing accessibility in terms of financial support.

In addition, the benchmark states that ‘Foundation Degrees are intended to make a valuable contribution to lifelong learning ...’ (QAA, 2004: 5). A further ‘defining characteristic’ of the FdA is the prospect of progression within work and/or to a suitable honours degree. This was emphasised at consultation stage (DfEE, 2000a). By situating the Foundation Degree as an intermediate level qualification in Higher Education, achievement at this level can provide progression opportunities to other higher education and/or professional qualifications. Therefore, here are built in aspirational possibilities for Foundation Degree students in term of progressing to honours degree study, which may open up further possibilities for future progression within the postgraduate qualifications framework.

#### *Flexibility and partnership*

Flexible delivery is underlined by the Task Force report (2004) as an important factor in accessibility. It is applied broadly to Foundation Degrees, to include the institution, the learner and the employer. Institutions are expected to recognise and respond to the needs of learners from a variety of backgrounds and with a range of qualifications and experience. In practice, this may mean flexible study patterns (for example, full and part time, distance

learning, evening and weekend learning, web-based learning etc) (QAA, 2004). It may mean that keener attention is given to flexibility of teaching strategies too, buoyed on in academic circles in recent years by a greater understanding of how people learn and an appreciation of the range of learning style that students bring to higher education. However, Challis (2005: 18) acknowledges that 'flexibility in this context is a difficult issue to pin down.' Challis contends that flexible delivery is not just a matter of curriculum change, but that 'truly flexible provision is built around specific and identified needs of prospective learners on the programme' (2005:18).

Partnerships within Foundation Degrees may happen across a wide spectrum. For example, higher education/further education partnerships, employer/institution partnerships, partnership with other organisations such as sector skills councils, to name but a few. Foskett (2003) tried to highlight the benefits of working in partnership, citing as a primary example sectoral representatives bringing different perspectives when problem solving, leading to creative approaches to questions of course content, organisation and delivery.

Therefore, Foundation Degrees possess certain characteristics, which, when fully integrated, become unique to the Foundation Degree programme which in itself is indicative of 'the new vocationalism'. Indeed Edmond (2004) suggests that the policy discourse merges vocational and educational need and juxtaposes academic knowledge with vocational skills, thus legitimising Foundation Degrees within the forum of 'traditional' higher education. This may be the case, but Edmond's judgement is based almost exclusively upon politically generated documentation. In order to establish a deeper and more academically credible legitimacy, I shall turn to a consideration of pedagogical frameworks in particular.

### **The Legitimation of Work-Based Learning: Pedagogical Theory**

#### *Defining work-based learning*

There are potential difficulties in achieving consistency when referring to work-based learning and what the term may mean. The Task Force report (2004) notes that 'a variety of similar sounding terms are used to describe the work element of HE programmes. This includes 'work-oriented', 'work-related', 'work-focused', 'work-placed', and 'work-based' (2004:20). In the context of Foundation Degrees the consistently used term at policy level is work-based learning, although in academic texts 'workplace learning' often seems to be used interchangeably with work-based learning. Therefore, although it is upon work-based learning that this discussion will focus, references to workplace learning will be considered, as appropriate.

Boud, Solomon and Symes offer the following useful definition of work-based learning: 'Work-based learning is the term being used to describe a class of university programmes that bring together universities and work organisations to create new learning opportunities in the workplace' (2001: 4). The emphasis here is upon the workplace as providing a forum for learning, within a university (higher education) level programme, developed as a partnership between university and work.

Gray (2001:4) says: 'Work-based learning...is the *means* through which a discipline is delivered...it is a *mechanism* for learning' and discusses three types of work-based learning. Firstly, learning for work, which may include professional development (for example teacher education) or work placements on 'sandwich' degrees. Secondly, learning at work, which may usually include such activities as company 'in house' training, which would not usually

be assessed or accredited. Thirdly, learning through work linked to an accredited programme of study.

Guile and Young (2001) take the concept of 'learning at work' a stage further by considering key sociological aspects:

- the link between training and economic success, with learning opportunities planned by and within the workplace;
- unintentional, informal leaning through workplace socialization.

Informal workplace learning has also been researched by Lohman (2000). Lohman defines informal learning as '... activities initiated by people in work settings that result in the development of their professional skills and knowledge' (Lohman, 2000: 84). The author makes it clear that informal learning may be 'planned or unplanned and structured or unstructured.' (Lohman, 2000: 84). In this way, informal learning allows individuals to construct meaning from their experiences. Such a concept was also raised by Billett (2002a, 2002b), and explored by Schön (1983, 1987) and Brockbank et al (1998) further within the context of the 'reflective practitioner'. In addition, Raelin (2000) makes it clear that fundamental to work-based learning is the process of reflection. Engaging in work-based learning is not just about collecting knowledge and a set of skills, rather, Raelin argues that learning arises from shared action and problem solving, thus further underlining the social mode of learning in the workplace. This has particular relevance for research around Foundation Degrees where the links between theory and practice (and student ability to reflect on such links) are fundamental programme components.

Dirkx, Swanson, Watkins and Cseh (2002) give four meanings of workplace learning:

- formal learning in the workplace through structured training programmes, delivered by teachers;
- informal workplace learning;
- action learning – a hybrid of informal/formal learning – structured activities used to study and learn from specific aspects of work.

The idea of structured training programmes parallel Gray's 'learning at work', whilst Dirkx et al also identify informal learning as a valid form of workplace learning (also, Lohman, 2000). The third element, 'action learning' is most closely aligned to Gray's third element of work-based learning; learning *through* work (Gray, 2001), usually linked to an accredited programme of study. Furthermore it is 'learning through work' which is most relevant for Foundation Degree study, where situational, work-based learning is a significant mechanism for learning and demands not only workplace support, but cross-sector partnerships between employers and institutions (see also, Foskett, 2003).

The common thread through all discussions around the nature of work-based and workplace learning, is the sociological perspective. Learning situated within the workplace will almost always happen through workplace socialisation, although the degree to which this may happen could be variable, and is more usefully considered within the pedagogical frameworks, discussed below. Guile and Young (2001) develop this further by giving sociological perspectives on work and learning, concentrating on the formal provision of learning opportunities for workers in the workplace and also the potential for unintentional, or informal learning opportunities through workplace socialisation. Thus the impact for students

engaged in this form of learning within Foundation Degrees may not be inconsiderable, both within the structured elements of work-based learning and the informal opportunities that may exist, each partly determined by sociological factors.

*Pedagogical models of work-based learning*

Beaney (2005) brings many of the above points together regarding a definition of work-based learning in addressing specifically the 'conceptual confusions around the role of work-based learning' (2005: 4). He acknowledges that work-based learning has potential power as a legitimate pedagogy, but warns against a narrow focus, emphasising that work-based learning is situational and socially shaped. In addition, he makes it clear that 'at the heart of work-based learning is the assumption ... that experiential learning is a powerful and effective pedagogy' (2005:6).

Over recent years there has been a growing interest in developing pedagogical models for workplace learning. Central to the debate is work around theories of situated learning and to this effect the influential work of Lave and Wenger (1991) around legitimate peripheral participation will be considered firstly. Billett's (2002a, 2002b) work on co-participation in the context of work-based learning will be examined next, followed by a further consideration of Lave and Wenger's work within the context of work by Fuller et al. (2005) in reassessing the key concepts of learning as peripheral participation in communities of practice.

Lave and Wenger (1991) develop the idea of situated learning specifically within the theory of participation in communities of practice. They take an anthropological view of learning as part of social activity. This is a move away from 'traditional' views of learning and learners (for example, learners as receivers of knowledge), rather, learning is not something undertaken individually and in isolation, nor is it simply following directed practices in the workplace, but learning is seen as participation in the social world.

Lave and Wenger see situated learning as a gradual and growing engagement, beginning with peripheral engagement and developing along a continuum to becoming a full participant in a community of practice. The focus here is on the community rather than on the individual. Although the key thread of socialisation has already been identified as a key component of work-based learning (Dirkx et al., 2002; Guile and Young, 2001; Billett, 2002a, 2002b), Fuller et al (2005) have critiqued this as a rather narrow view. In addition, Tennant notes that Lave and Wenger 'reject the idea of learning from reflection on practice or action...' (2000: 132) and that they do not recognise the existence of a 'plurality of situated knowledges' (2000: 133). Furthermore, Dirkx et al (2002) challenge the assumption that workplace learning progresses in a linear way 'a one way path from ignorance to knowledge, in which knowledge is viewed as a substance' (2002: 7). Instead, knowledge is seen as a 'structural dynamic', characterised by vibrant interactions between and among people. Thus the theory appears rather formulaic and inflexible and certainly does not appear to foster the view that it is possible to progress beyond a given situation. This is contrary to key principles of Foundation Degree practice which sees progression as crucial for success and flexibility as fundamental for accessibility.

Billett's theory of 'Workplace learning as Co-participation' (2002a) is founded upon the principle of reciprocity – between how individuals access workplace learning activities and how they decide to engage with them. The theory of co-participation is comprised of 'the intersection of the trajectories of the evolving social practice that constitutes the particular workplace, and individuals' socially shaped personal histories or ontogenies.' (2002a:1)

Billet (2002b) has drawn upon studies examining learning through everyday work activities and guided workplace learning in order to understand workplace pedagogic practices. The research considers how workplaces enable participation in learning and also how individuals choose to engage with work practice. Central to Billett's work is a deep concern to understand individual social and cognitive construction around workplace learning and to justify the use of guided learning (with mentor support) alongside an 'invitational' working environment which promotes practice and improvement of established routines. Similarly to Hardy (2003), ontology is important and is central to the theory of co-participation:

*These participatory practices are a product of the evolving social practice of the workplace, which is historically, culturally and situationally constructed, and the socially constructed personal history of the individual. (Billett, 2002b:466)*

The study considers models of workplace learning of three kinds – everyday workplace tasks, guided learning for work and transferable guided learning. Billett's approach uses as a starting point a clear theoretical and philosophical rationale and asserts that 'Workplace experiences are not informal' (Billet, 2002b:457). He is keen to underpin his work with a thorough and detailed consideration of how 'learning is conceptualised as an inter-psychological process of participation in social practices such as workplaces' (Billet, 2002b:457). This approach provides a useful framework, linking the pedagogic aspects of Foundation Degrees and work-based learning, with a consideration of the nature of learning and student engagement.

Returning to the original theory of situated learning, Fuller et al. (2005) observe of Lave and Wenger's work:

*For them, the action of participating in social practice can be read as a way of belonging to a community. It is the fact of becoming a member that allows participation, and therefore learning, to take place. The process, relationships and experiences which constitute the participant's sense of belonging underpin the nature and extent of subsequent learning. (Fuller et al., 2005:51).*

In updating Lave and Wenger's research, Fuller et al. develop case study research around three models of apprenticeship (2005). They suggest that part of the package for legitimate peripheral participation is for the novice to help other workers. Crucially, they observe that 'this insight is of significance as it helps to undermine the view of communities of practice as unchanging' (2005: 64). However, the researchers also recognise the limitations of their research and emphasise that a range of working contexts may unearth yet more patterns of work-based learning, including possibly restrictive practice. For example, they consider the significance that organisational structures and power relations have in determining the existence of 'communities of practice, their nature and their boundaries' (2005: 63). This is a key point for application to Foundation Degrees, as the suggestion is that there is inevitably impact within and upon the community of practice, or the workplace when a student is engaged in work-based learning.

When applied to Foundation Degrees, another restriction with Lave and Wenger's research is their assumption of 'novice practitioner' moving to experienced, or knowledgeable, practitioner. Within Foundation Degree study students are not always coming to the workplace as new members. Some with positions of responsibility, or with many years of experience within the workplace are perceived as already established and integrated

members of the community of practice. However an aspect that is not considered in any of the research is the possibility of Foundation Degree students 're-entering' their community of practice with an alternative 'student' identity.

Beaney (2005) highlights the importance of viewing work-based learning as a subset of experiential learning: 'It is the experience of work and how it is worked upon by appropriate abstract learning and reflection that makes work-based learning such a potentially powerful pedagogy' (Beaney, 2005:6). Historically, John Dewey's work on experience and its relation to education reinforced the educational value of integrating experience, learning and reflection upon it (Dewey, 1938, 1966). He believed that education must not only engage with experience, but also enlarge it; a model which fits well with the work-based elements of Foundation Degree programmes. This theme has been taken up by contemporary researchers. For example, work by Dirkx, Swanson, Watkins and Cseh is grounded in the progressive education movement to which Dewey subscribed. Of importance is what the learner brings to the context of learning. 'What learners come to know and understand through the process of learning reflects who they are as persons and how they are making sense of their experiences in the workplace' (Dirkx et al., 2002:6).

## Conclusion

This paper has charted the historical and political development of the Foundation Degree and viewed the developments through the lens of 'the new vocationalism' (Symes and McIntyre, 2000). Key features of Foundation Degrees have been identified in order to establish the uniqueness of a Foundation Degree within the further and higher education sector. A central aim of the paper has been to establish an evidence base for the legitimisation of work-based learning within higher education and, by implication, Foundation Degrees. This has been done through a survey of pedagogical models aligned with work-based learning and their application to Foundation Degrees.

The development of a new pedagogical framework specific to the Foundation Degree model would further establish Foundation Degrees as legitimate players within higher education and as part of 'the new vocationalism'. Further work could be done to develop the theories of situated learning and legitimate peripheral participation (Lave and Wenger, 1991) with particular application to the Foundation Degree model. This may also necessitate a reconsideration of what constitutes the 'community of practice'. In addition, Billet's work would undoubtedly contribute to the development of a new model in that the theory of co-participation and the emphasis upon developing opportunities for 'rich learning' within the workplace are vital. However, the possibilities for students in the workplace of more independent working and learning could also be considered within the social nature of work, in order to ensure that the intra personal, meta-cognitive elements of learning as well as inter-personal elements are fully considered within a pedagogical framework specific to Foundation Degrees.

## References

- Barnett, R. (2000) Foreword. In: C. Symes & J. McIntyre (eds.) *Working Knowledge: The New Vocationalism and Higher Education*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Beaney, P. (2005) All in a day's work? Unravelling the conceptual tangles around work-based learning and Foundation Degrees. *Forward: the Foundation Degree Forward Journal*, 4, 4-8.

- Billett, S. (2002a) *Workplace learning as Co-participation*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002.
- Billett, S. (2002b) Workplace pedagogic practices: co-participation and learning. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 50(4), 457-481.
- Boreham, N. (2002) Work process knowledge, curriculum control and the work-based route to curriculum qualifications. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 50(2), 225-237.
- Boud, D. (2001) Knowledge at Work: Issues of Learning, in: D. Boud & N. Solomon (Eds.) *Work-based Learning: A New Higher Education?* Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Boud, D. & Solomon, N. (eds.) (2001) *Work-based Learning: A New Higher Education?* Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Boud, D. Solomon, N. & Symes, C. (2001) New Practices for New Times. In: D. Boud & N. Solomon (eds.) *Work-based Learning: A New Higher Education?* Buckingham, Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Boud, D. & Symes, C. (2000) Learning for Real: Work-based Education in Universities. In C. Symes & J. McIntyre (eds.) *Working Knowledge: The New Vocationalism and Higher Education*. Buckingham, Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Brockbank, A. & McGill, I. (1998) *Facilitating Reflective Learning in Higher Education*. Buckingham, Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Challis, M. (2005) Challenging issues for Foundation degree providers...flexible delivery. *Forward: the Foundation Degree Forward Journal*, 4, 18-21.
- Dearing, R. (1997) *Higher Education in a Learning Society: The National Committee into Higher Education*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Dewey, J. (1938) *Experience and Education*. New York: McMillan.
- Dewey, J. (1966) *Selected Educational Writings*. London: Heinemann.
- Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1998) *First Report of the National Skills Task Force: Towards a National Skills Agenda*. London: DfEE.
- Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (1999) *Second Report of the National Skills Task Force: Delivering Skills for All*. London: DfEE.
- Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (2000a) *Foundation Degrees: a consultation document*. London: DfEE.
- Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) (2000b) *Working with Teaching Assistants: A Good Practice Guide*. London: DfEE.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2003) *The Future of Higher Education*. Nottingham: DfES Publications.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2004a) *The Employer Guide to Foundation Degrees*. Nottingham: DfES Publications.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2004b) *The Student Guide to Foundation Degrees*. Nottingham: DfES Publications.

Dirkx, J.M., Swanson, R.A., Watkins, K.E. & Cseh, M. (2002) Design, Demand, Development and Desire: A Symposium on the Discourses of Workplace Learning. Innovative session. *Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) Conference Proceedings*, Honolulu, Hawaii, February 27 – March 3, 2002.

Edmond, N. (2004) The Foundation Degree as evidence of a new higher education: a study of HE provision for teaching assistants. *Higher Education Review*, 36(3), 33-53.

Foskett, R. (2003) Employer and needs-led curriculum planning in higher education: a cross-sector case study of foundation degree development. Available online at: <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00003182.htm>.

Foundation Degree Forward (2005) Foundation Degree Programmes. Available online at: <http://www.fdf.ac.uk/courses/index.php>.

Foundation Degree Task Force (2004) *Report to Ministers*. London: DfES.

Fuller, A., Hodkinson, H., Hodkinson, P. & Unwin, L. (2005) Learning as peripheral participation in communities of practice: a reassessment of key concepts in workplace learning. *British Educational Research Journal*, 31(1), 49-68.

Gray, D. (2001) *A Briefing on Work-Based Learning*, LTSN Generic Centre Assessment Series No.11.

Guile, D. & Young, M. (2001) Apprenticeship as a Conceptual Basis for a Social Theory of Learning. In: C. Paechter, M. Preedy, D. Scott, & J. Soler (eds.) *Knowledge, Power and Learning*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing and Open University Press.

Hager, P. & Hyland, T. (2003) Vocational Education and Training. In: N. Blake, P. Smeyers, R. Smith & P. Standish (eds.) *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Education*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hardy, M. (2003) *Analyzing the work-based learning experiences of students from vocational and technical education programs*, Paper presented at the Vocational Education and Training Network (VETNET), European Conference on Educational Research, University of Hamburg, Germany, 17-20 September 2003  
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00003160.htm>.

Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC) (1994) *Choosing to change: extending access, choice and mobility in higher education*. London: HEQC.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lohman, M. C. (2000) Environmental inhibitors to informal learning in the workplace: a case study of public school teachers. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 50(2), 83-101.

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) (2002) *Foundation Degree: Draft Qualification Benchmark*. Gloucester: QAA.

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) (2003) *Overview report on Foundation Degree reviews*. Gloucester: QAA.

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) (2004) *Foundation degree: qualification benchmark*. Gloucester: QAA.

Raelin, J. A. (2000) *Work-Based Learning: The New Frontier of Management Development*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Schön, D. A. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner*. London: Temple Smith.

Schön, D. A. (1987) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. London: Temple Smith.

Symes, C. & McIntyre, J. (eds.)(2000) *Working Knowledge: The New Vocationalism and Higher Education*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Tennant, M. (2000) Learning to Work, Working to Learn: Theories of Situational Education. In: Symes, C. & McIntyre, J. (eds.) *Working Knowledge: The New Vocationalism and Higher Education*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.