

Pedagogies for the 'Dis-engaged': Diverse Experiences of the Young People's Arts Award Programme

Frances Howard 

Abstract

Art education is often praised for its engaging programmes and inclusive pedagogies, with many initiatives created with the intention of widening access for those who are deemed to be lacking. This article investigates one such programme – the young people's Arts Award, which is a nationally recognised qualification for young people aged 11–25. I call upon a range of pedagogies in order to critique the Arts Award within the context of informal and alternative education settings in the United Kingdom. Drawing on a 12-month ethnographic study, the research was conducted across five diverse programmes which included youth work projects and alternative provision. I present two cases – 'learning to be an artist' and 'learning to behave' – which demonstrate a hierarchy of pedagogy in the application of this programme across these particular contexts. Artists' Signature Pedagogies are used as an analytical framework to explore the affordances of working with artists through the programme. Further, I engage with the Pedagogy of Poverty to demonstrate that young people who were classified as 'dis-engaged' were more likely to receive lower quality programmes, low-level work and over-regulated teaching. I argue that despite changes to the ways that young people access art education, there continues to be unequal opportunities. This finding is significant for not only creative practitioners and youth arts workers, but also arts education policy makers and programmers.

Keywords

art education, young people, pedagogy, social justice, arts

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

Introduction

This article calls upon a range of pedagogies in order to critique the Arts Award within the contexts of informal and alternative education projects. The study found examples of creative learning through real-life experiences, popular culture and problem-posing approaches leading to critical thinking and strategies that supported the development of artistic dispositions. However, I argue that for young people taking up the award as part of inclusion programmes or under deficit groupings such as not in employment education or training (NEET), their experience of the programme was of lower quality and lower-level engagement. I demonstrate that these particular kinds of young people were more likely to receive didactic teaching instruction with low-level work, be assigned a passive learning role with little scope for interaction and learn in a more tightly controlled environment where behaviour is monitored. This ran contrary to Arts Award's agenda of widening access to the arts for *all* young people.

The young people's Arts Award – a UK-based vocational qualification for young people aged 11–25 – was praised for its 'exemplary pedagogy' in a recent impact study (Hollingworth et al. 2016). However, my research identified varieties in pedagogical practice throughout the Arts Award programme, which lead to an unequal offer for participants across its programmes. In this article, I explore the diverse pedagogies on offer, arguing that pedagogy was utilised as a strategy by the Arts Award Advisers programming the award with 'dis-engaged' groups in order to make certain advantages and ways of being available to particular individuals. This hierarchy of pedagogy can be considered as a form of 'pedagogical politics' (Atkinson 2017) which manifested in more working-class or 'dis-engaged' young people being offered not only different opportunities for arts participation and learning, but also being 'taught' differently. The results of my research demonstrate that despite changes to the ways that young people access art education, and the mobilisation of programmes such as the Arts Award with a commitment to inclusion, they can unintentionally exacerbate inequalities.

This article explores the award through a variety of pedagogical strategies from art education and beyond in order to argue that despite the affordances of the programme in the development of young people as artists and arts leaders, for some their experience was defined by deficit pedagogies. My lexical choice of the label 'dis-engaged' is explained as a term which reflects the non-traditional arts backgrounds of my participants, the majority of whom considered themselves dis-engaged from mainstream education. Firstly, I explore the Arts Award, its inclusion agenda and its position as a vocationally orientated award within the alternative qualifications framework.

Arts Award's 'inclusion' agenda

Launched in 2005, the Arts Award is a major initiative set up by Arts Council England and is now accredited by Trinity College London. Described as 'a government-initiated programme, ... charged with developing an arts learning framework for all young people, and especially those less likely to engage in the arts or benefit from existing cultural provision' (Fleming 2008), the award's agenda is set out in terms of universal access and inclusion of *all* young people. Within *The Henley Review* (Henley 2012, 45 and 13), the award is heralded as a 'valuable and valued qualification' with a key role to 'support access' to the arts and culture. Now in its

fourteenth year, Arts Award is a vocational qualification that is growing in popularity, with 430,524 awards being achieved by young people (Figure as of 1 January 2019). It occupies an unusual hybrid position as a practice-based qualification that offers both entry to higher education and work experience that holds currency for employment in the arts. Popular within the informal and alternative education sector, the award can also be easily applied to out-of-school informal learning environments such as arts and cultural organisations, youth clubs or anywhere that registers itself as a 'centre'. These centres must employ a trained 'adviser' to run the programme and assess participants' portfolios. Adults with a minimum of three years' experience in working with young people, in any context, can train as an Arts Award Adviser. Their key role is as programmer for the various activities the young people undertake.

Positioned as a vocationally relevant qualification, Arts Award has equivalent points value across the European Qualifications Framework (EQF). It is a growing programme in the context of young people outside mainstream education needing to take up qualifications from the alternative framework. Within secondary schooling and beyond there are three levels of the award: Bronze, Silver and Gold. A Gold-level Arts Award equates to upper secondary education and holds a small number of entry points for higher education; the Silver level is positioned alongside GCSE at level 3. The Bronze level, the most popular level, sits alongside lower-tiered qualifications on the alternative qualification framework such as AQAs or the Duke of Edinburgh award. However, this positioning in relation to other vocational awards situates it low on the educational hierarchy – a long way beneath elite qualifications such as LAMDA (London Academy of Music and Dramatic Arts), which is aligned to art colleges and acting schools and conservatoires, and with less value even than BTEC (Business and Technology Education Council) as part of further education.

Comparable to the Award Scheme Development and Accreditation Network (ASDAN), Arts Award contains many components that were viewed as beneficial to learners. These include portfolio-based work, modular structures and a range of assessment practices in order to accommodate different types of learners (Harrison et al. 2015). Whilst alternative accreditations have more recently been removed from school curriculums, they have flourished within informal and alternative education settings. In addition the focus on 'challenges', experiential and situated learning (Wenger-Trayner & Wenger-Trayner 2015) which draws upon young people's interests, situates the award in a powerful position to engage and appeal to 'dis-engaged' learners. Pedagogues have been shown to be effective in supporting young people through one-to-one support, observational placements, asking 'leading questions' and identifying appropriate evidence to record in portfolios (Torrance et al. 2005). Arts programmes such as these offer quick wins, praise culture and practical learning experiences which are recognised for attracting and retaining young people on the programmes (National Youth Agency 2009). These beneficial elements are further developed by this article which explores the affordances of the Arts Award programme in supporting young people in learning to be artists.

Researching the 'dis-engaged'

This article draws on findings from an ethnographic doctoral study which investigated the Arts Award across five different 'youth' projects spanning informal

education, and alternative provision contexts. In light of the lack of research into Arts Award programmes within non-school based settings and my previous experience in working with the award in youth projects, I took the decision to avoid the formal education sector and schools. Schools often run the award for gifted and talented students, alongside arts organisations, whose programmes are attended by young people with strong arts backgrounds. Instead, my focus was on informal programmes and young people with limited previous arts education, which had previously been identified as a potential area of 'impact' by Arts Award (Hollingworth et al. 2016). Previous research in relation to young people who demonstrate disengagement with conventional schooling has shown that alternative qualifications such as the award have value due to the nature of provision, the networks of professionals involved and the differing modes of assessment (James & Simmons 2007).

Young people who are outside of mainstream education face labels such as 'at-risk', 'NEET' or 'dis-advantaged', which are not self-selected and of which, they are often unaware. The adverse effects of these labels have been well documented on young people's educational attainment and progression (Riele 2006; Simmons & Thompson 2011; Smyth et al. 2013). These terms were frequently referred to by the Advisers running the programmes and unquestioningly applied to the young people as justification for accessing the programmes. Within the list of the five ethnographic case studies that follows, we can see the range of deficit labels used for young people on these programmes:

- a non-compulsory alternative education programme targeting NEETs;
- a compulsory alternative education programme, through school exclusion referrals;
- a youth arts project targeted for young people in 'challenging circumstances';
- an open access youth arts project; and
- a post-16 further education college.

However, my lexical choice to refer to the participants as 'dis-engaged' was designed to contribute to a critique of deficit labelling of groups by acknowledging the complex and often multifaceted reasons young people may not attend mainstream school. These include electing to remove themselves from school and home education, being rejected from the school system because of behaviour or disability and barriers in their lives preventing them from engaging with school.

The length of time that learners spent on the programme varied due to both the funding of the projects and the level of award they were undertaking. Some projects were programmed in alignment with the school year, whereas others were three to six months. Typically the Bronze Arts Award can be completed within three months, with the Gold level taking at least one year. The programmes were delivered through a range of different models including daytime provision through further education or alternative education, having whole days or timetabled sessions, whereas the evening youth projects undertook the award on a more 'drop-in' basis. The level of the award taken up by young people was decided by the Adviser, with those on alternative education programmes being given the lower levels and also those of younger age (participants in the study ranged from 14 to 21) were directed towards Bronze irrespective of ability. This also impacted upon the types of portfolios young people engaged with as more transient groups tended to receive the log book format for Bronze, which involved filling in worksheets and recording evidence

rather than a portfolio approach. The projects covered a wide range of artforms from visual and digital arts, contemporary dance, music production and film making. However, there was not always an opportunity for young people to make choices on what interested them on the shorter-term programmes.

In order to explore young people's experience of an arts education programme, the study drew on ethnographic arts-based methods where creative and visual outputs from participants were considered as data. By capturing and generating a wide range of data, including images, lyrics and films, this enabled an investigation of what young people chose to take up from the different programmes. The artistic methods produced a range of creative data, which were frequently used as a springboard for conversation and as a data set in itself, alongside other arts-based artefacts such as the young people's Arts Award portfolios. The arts as 'artefacts' were utilised in three different ways: observation of 'taking part' in the arts activities; interviews with young people that use artwork, photographs and videos as aides; and analysing portfolios. Particular research processes in the analysis and dissemination stages were designed so that young people's first-hand experience of the programmes could be foregrounded. These included making work and experiencing the arts together, film making as interactional analysis and particular ethnographic techniques at showcase events.

Arts leadership as a pedagogical strategy

Pedagogy is utilised as a strategy through which Arts Award Advisers can make particular advantages and ways of being available to certain individuals or groups. The exploration of the pedagogies within Arts Award focused around the analysis of the arts leadership component of the award, which is an integral part at all levels. In the Adviser toolkit, arts leadership is defined as a workshop series, a one-off day-long event, a performance, an exhibition, development of a product, a publication or an arts-based website (Arts Award 2014). Within this study, young people chose to lead short workshops or demonstrations and plan and host events or exhibitions. Participatory workshops where they passed on their art skills to others included practices such as spray painting, film editing and graphic design. Exploring this element of the award in detail enabled the different pedagogies to be investigated, highlighting the beneficial ways that artists worked, the diverse ways in which Advisers approached young people and the offer of deficit pedagogies. Through the seemingly innocent ways of doing and thinking, pedagogies dictate which young people have access to particular opportunities. Dispositions are socialised ways of behaving that are shaped by the young person's education background and social class (Bourdieu & Passeron 1990). However, dispositions can represent an opportunity to see where young people 'fit' and are formed as young people invest in fields of life and therefore steer actions, experiences and understandings (Thomson & Coles 2018). In doing so, they reveal hierarchies which position young people in both productive and reproductive ways.

Film recordings are often the preferred method in which Advisers chose to document young people's arts leadership activities. In response, a large part of the data which was analysed was recorded on film which enabled a micro-level investigation into the different interactions that resulted from these pedagogies. Particular interactions that were coded included warm-up exercises, demonstration and repetition tasks, introductions and inspiration, sharing back and performing,

explaining and demonstrating, practising and perfecting, prompting and step-by-step instructions, problem-posing, use of artists' terminology, real-life situations and questioning and responding. These interactions were drawn from the theoretical framework of Artists' Signature Pedagogies (Thomson et al. 2012) as examples of how art educators can make their practice more inclusive. A further framework employed was the Pedagogy of Poverty, through which different types of educational experience and curriculum knowledge are made available to young people from different social classes (Anyon 1980; Haberman 2010). This framework helped to identify more basic and low-level instruction directed towards 'dis-engaged' young people. These theoretical frameworks represented different pedagogical approaches that will be addressed in this article. Analysis of these specific interactions highlighted the differing pedagogies, which will now be explored through two cases below.

Jamie: learning how to be an artist

Working with artists was a key practice of the programmes, with the majority of projects offering young people this opportunity and many Arts Award Advisers being artists in their own right. This enabled young people to develop artistic dispositions around critique, artform awareness and how to develop their own practice as part of Artists' Signature Pedagogies (Thomson et al. 2012). Observing artists and arts professionals was inspirational for young people because it enabled them to observe new practice, to collaborate with the artists and to share their own work as a way of getting feedback as part of collaborative creativity (Burnard & Dragovic 2015). Considering their own arts inspirations was an opportunity for young people to learn more about the practitioners they admired. With arts leadership tasks and projects, young people were often placed in situations where they were required to demonstrate and explain, but also to react and problem solve. As I have argued, this varied depending on assumptions made about the academic abilities of the young people and their capacity to work independently.

Jamie attended an evening youth project which was targeted for young people in 'challenging circumstances'. At the time of the research he was attending alternative provision with the view to transferring back into mainstream education. He did not consider himself as someone who was 'good at art' because he had not engaged with the subject at school. However, he did discuss his film and photography work using his father's camera prior to joining the project. In the excerpt accompanied by figure 1 below, Jamie is sharing work that he has made (the film clips), using his own practice to demonstrate, engaging the participant he is working with in learning the techniques of film-editing as well as problem-posing as a form of pedagogy. This is then followed by encouraging this participant to explore for himself, in a process of questioning and responding between young person and adult:

11.45am: From practising with the Adviser, it is obvious that Jamie knows what to do to edit his own films. At first he is struggling to explain these things to another person. But after some practice, I overhear Jamie giving clear direction on how to add titles to the film edit.

12.15pm: Jamie is really getting it now. After an initial reluctance to use the written instructions he has made for himself, he is explaining effectively and referring to them. I am impressed with his direction as it must be hard for people to communicate internal processes, their way of doing their art for others. Jamie is doing quite a bit of prompting but this is done through dialogue and reciprocal

questions. He throws up lots of questions and scenarios for the participant so that they can problem solve. He asks them where they want to go next. (author's field-notes).

Here Jamie can be seen to be reproducing artistic dispositions transmitted through the learned rituals of leadership from the Adviser on the project. This example of reverse pedagogy (Irwin & O'Donoghue 2012; Orr et al. 2014) positions the young person as active co-producer of their arts learning experience. This highlights a shifting dynamic from skill-based pedagogy towards an openness to new individual opportunities and possibilities of working in collaboration. In addition, young people frequently engaged in the practice of reflection as part of evidencing for the award and reported that being encouraged by artists to give feedback and incorporate reflection was different and thought-provoking. The latter approach was indicative of the way in which artists work as part of Artists' Signature Pedagogies (Thomson et al. 2012). Jamie demonstrated the adoption of artists' languages and terminology as part of the development of dispositions, which encompassed ways of being and ways of working in order to be socially recognised as an artist. Other young people were able to emulate artists' practices through access to professional-standard equipment, the building of online platforms for their work and with induction through 'tricks of the trade'.

Jamie reported positively on how he had been able to work with artists and their approach to the programmes. Many other young people commented upon the social nature of learning together with artists, but also reflected on how artists were able to respond to their needs and interests through work on individual projects. These practices, which were captured by the Artists' Signature Pedagogies framework (Thomson et al. 2012), included organising special events and activities, real-world associations, learning through conversation and open-ended processes of enquiry. Jamie, in particular, referred to how the artists he had worked with through his Arts Award had helped him to tap into informal arts networks, benefiting from knowing people and getting help to be 'professional'. In addition, opportunities and processes of collective endeavour, experiential learning and practices



Figure 1
Jamie's Arts Leadership film editing.

of 'induction' further assisted young people in 'learning to be an artist'. These new dispositions offered the opportunity for participants to be 'someone different' and see themselves as part of the artists' world, learning to be an artist. However, this was not the experience of all young people across the programmes.

Billy: learning how to behave

As I have argued in this article, many young people arriving at Arts Award programmes under deficit labels received a less-engaging and lower-quality arts education. This was due to often unconscious assumptions Advisers made about their ability due to their behaviour or social background. This resulted in the offer of more deficit pedagogies which sought to control and monitor young people's behaviour. Classroom behaviour rather than creative expression often became the focus of the session as the programme became instrumentalised within particular contexts of learning. Through an analysis of practices of the Pedagogy of Poverty (Haberman 2010), different educational experiences and curriculum knowledge on offer can be highlighted. Particular classroom dispositions linking to different kinds of occupations are rewarded in particular groups of young people – the working classes for docility and obedience, the managerial classes for initiative and personal assertiveness. Practices of this deficit pedagogy within Arts Award programmes for 'dis-engaged' young people included overtly teacher-controlled instruction, limited interactions and low-level engagement.

Billy was a participant in one of the alternative education programmes. He had been outside of mainstream education for over a year and had no plans to return. In discussing with him why he had been signposted to this programme, he replied that art was the only lesson in school where he wouldn't 'kick off'. For Billy in particular, the Arts Award had been pitched to him as a 'practical' alternative qualification that was 'hands-on' and 'easy' due to the comparative lack of writing. These narratives highlight a key misrecognition of many young people on the programmes as 'good with their hands not their heads' (Thomson & Pennacchia 2015). His experience of the arts leadership activity was characterised by 'spoon-feeding' through simply following instructions and 'dumbed down' activities. Furthermore, analysis of video data highlighted Billy undertaking activities of demonstration and repetition, frequently prompted or made to start again by the Adviser for the purposes of the film. Accompanying this was a frequent reliance on worksheets, demonstrating a general low level of work, which is typical of the Pedagogy of Poverty (Haberman 2010). Less cognitive-demanding tasks, such as worksheets, were often dressed up as a less 'academic' curriculum. The figure below shows Billy being guided through the process of completing a large-scale spray-painted board. The interactions with his Adviser denote an expectation on his behalf to be formally instructed how to make his artwork with little scope for imagination or freedom to explore the materials.

The kinds of pedagogical practices that Billy experienced through the programme meant that he was more likely to be corrected, receive simple explanation and be instructed to repeat activities in order to encourage dispositions of obedience. Particular strategies of controlling behaviour, denoting how to behave, have been aligned to the Pedagogy of Poverty where teaching and learning are designed in a socially reproductive manner in order to produce and reproduce the existing social order (Anyon 1980). Knowledge and skills leading to higher social positions and occupations (medical, legal, managerial) are made available to the advantaged social groups but are withheld from the working classes to whom a more 'practical'

curriculum is offered (manual skills, clerical knowledge). With the Arts Award programmes, those who displayed less-compliant, less school-like behaviours received the most basic instruction, methods of 'safe teaching' and an overemphasis on the performance of schooled routines and the imposition of rules. For those who had accessed the award under deficit groupings, this impacted upon the Advisers' attitudes towards them and assumptions made about them. This frequently manifested in low expectations, misrecognition of behaviour and viewing young people as 'projects to be worked on'.

As the Arts Award is recognised on the Qualifications and Credit Framework, and hence deemed a valuable qualification by schools, the award is used as a tool in alternative education programmes to offer credentials to the young people, and provide a measurable outcome in return for the funding given by schools to accommodate its pupils. This performativity had particular implications for the participants' educational experience by focusing on ability-orientated goals rather than learning for the sake of it. Art activities that became goal-focused, with an emphasis on product rather than process, skill rather than enjoyment, and 'soft' skills over knowledge. Although within youth settings Arts Award gave the opportunity for young people to undertake more intensive and more creative work, programmes were clearly being used as a measurement in itself, as a benchmark for the projects' success to levy future funding. For example, showcasing and exhibitions as 'measurable outcomes' for youth projects and drew attention to the outcomes of young people undertaking positive activities, increasingly needing to be demonstrated as part of targeted work. However, the young people took a much less instrumental view of this experience and relished the opportunities for sharing the work they had created with others.

Hierarchies of Pedagogy

Figure 3 and Figure 4 present two separate artworks created in the Arts Award programme. Both seem to have been created through complex processes of layering, colour blending and composition of shapes. But one of the images was made by a young person copying an Adviser, using simplified 'paint by numbers' or step-by-step instructions, with limited materials and little scope for imagination. The other image was created by a young person with free rein over a range of diverse materials, different artistic processes, no parameters on what the final image would look like and undertaken with a sense of experimentation. The two approaches demonstrate different pedagogies for different learners.

Whilst Arts Award is presented as an open and flexible award where young people are free to make choices and follow up their own interests, my research has shown that these are often controlled and confined by the Adviser. It becomes a politics of pedagogy where teaching and learning becomes about control and regulation, as opposed to a pedagogy 'without criteria' (Atkinson 2017) which encourages artistic practice and dispositions. Within this hierarchy of pedagogy, the more 'dis-engaged' young people were programmed lower-level work and were 'taught' differently, with reduced opportunities for developing dispositions.

Throughout this article I have taken the position that pedagogy is an 'approach' through which the pedagogue, or Arts Award Adviser in this case, designs activities to enhance the learning of the young people on their programmes (Watkins & Mortimore 1999). The particular focus of this article has been on the specific



Figure 2

The Tick – step by step. Photograph of a young person being instructed how to create a spray-painted artwork.



Figure 3

'Space painting'. Created by young person undertaking Bronze Arts Award on an alternative education programme.

contexts of pedagogy: alternative and informal education projects and how Advisers running the Arts Award in these contexts adapted their pedagogical practices (often unintentionally). Despite boosting the achievement of dis-engaged learners



Figure 4

Untitled, laser cut plywood sandblasted on latex. Created by young person undertaking Gold Arts Award as an extracurricular activity.

through adopting a range of assessment practices, encompassing forms of coaching and mentoring, two-way feedback and the incorporation of young people's cultural interests, deficit pedagogies are deeply embedded within the pedagogical strategies of the settings in the study. This finding supports previous research on 'non-academic qualifications' or skills-based qualifications which has demonstrated that programmes designed to raise standards instead drove down attainment (Harrison et al. 2015).

Drawing on a range of theoretical frameworks including Artists' Signature Pedagogies (Hall et al. 2007; Thomson et al. 2012) and the Pedagogy of Poverty (Haberman 2010), this article has demonstrated that there were varieties in pedagogical practice for different groups of young people. This can be viewed as a hierarchy depending on young people's perceived behaviour and assumptions made about their ability and different kinds of cultural knowledge. Artists brought different ways of working and different practices to the programmes, which offered possibilities for demonstrating agency through potentially liberating and oppositional affordances of making art. Engaging with 'divergent pedagogy' (Danvers 2003; Sayers 2011), the Arts Award has the potential to empower learners through the co-creation of knowledge which is locally significant. However, the hierarchy of pedagogy, based on the often unacknowledged unequal starting points of young people, resulted in particular groups of young people experiencing the Pedagogy of Poverty.

Engaging with these theoretical frameworks was not intended to depict a binary, but instead to present a nuanced exploration into a current hybrid art education

initiative, designed to 'close the gap' in relation to broadening access to the arts and culture for a wider range of young people. However, the application and translation of the award within the sites in this study demonstrated the Pedagogy of Poverty, which has an adverse effect on 'inclusion', public pedagogy and social justice (Hochtritt et al. 2018). I have argued that despite Arts Award's intentions to 'level the playing field' as a practice-based qualification that holds currency for employment, educational inequalities continue to be reproduced through the pedagogical practices employed in particular sites of informal and alternative education.

Conclusion

This research has questioned the assumed benefit of arts programmes for 'dis-engaged' young people. It highlights issues of equity within youth arts programming and their differing pedagogies. I have argued that Arts Award represents an unequal offer for young people accessing the programme through low-level sites of education. Through this hierarchy of pedagogy those with strong advantage, for example those who take up the programme as part of gifted and talented or extracurricular activities, are further advantaged. Whereas those with less advantage, such as those who are aligned with the lower educational trajectories, are disadvantaged. I have demonstrated that for young people entering the programmes under deficit labels their experience of art education can become an instrumentalised and 'targeted' approach predominantly concerned with behaviour modification, rather than a universal programme for cultural and intellectual development. This has implications for art education policies which assume the arts are good for *all* young people as well as the particular pedagogies art education draws on for 'dis-engaged' young people.

Looking forward, it is clear that more needs to be done to work against the pedagogical practices employed by the Advisers in these sites and the application of art education for regulatory and political purposes. Whilst this study solely explored the young people's experiences, further research should be undertaken into the Advisers' perceptions of the young people, their own pedagogic values and how judgements were made. This has implications for future training and professional development of individuals who work with young people and the arts in order to address assumptions made about young people's artistic and academic abilities due to their social background or behaviour. Funding should be provided to include high-quality artists and arts experiences on these programmes as opportunities to boost artistic dispositions. To ensure that the content of these programmes is fairly distributed and an equal offer is set out for young people, future art education programmes should also aim to involve a pedagogy of more, not less; differing, not different; and an assets-based rather than deficit approach.

Frances Howard is a Lecturer in Youth Studies at Nottingham Trent University, UK. She has recently completed her doctorate at the University of Nottingham, who funded this research. She has previously worked in local authorities, arts education and youth work and is currently an Arts Award Adviser and Moderator. She continues to work with young people and arts programmes in informal contexts and is undertaking further research into music-making and wellbeing. Contact address: Nottingham Trent University School of Social Sciences, 50 Shakespeare Street, Nottingham NG1 4FQ, UK.
Email: Frances.Howard@ntu.ac.uk

References

- Anyon, J.** (1980) Social class and the hidden curriculum of work, *Journal of Education*, Vol. 162, No. 1, pp. 67–92.
- Arts Award** (2014) *Adviser Toolkit*. Available at: <https://www.artsaward.org.uk/site/?id=2682> (accessed 23 June 2020).
- Atkinson, D.** (2017) Without criteria: art and learning and the adventure of pedagogy, *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 141–52.
- Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.-C.** (1990) *Reproduction in Education, Culture and Society*. 4 London: Sage.
- Burnard, P. & Dragovic, T.** (2015) Collaborative creativity in instrumental group music learning as a site for enhancing pupil wellbeing, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol. 45, No. 3, pp. 371–92.
- Danvers, J.** (2003) Towards a radical pedagogy: provisional notes on learning and teaching in art & design, *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 47–57.
- Fleming, M.P.** (2008) *Arts in Education and Creativity: A Review of the Literature: a Report for Creative Partnerships*. Available at: <http://old.creativitycultureeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/arts-in-education-and-creativity-2nd-edition-91.pdf> (accessed 23 June 2020).
- Haberman, M.** (2010) The pedagogy of poverty versus good teaching, *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol. 92, No. 2, pp. 81–7.
- Hall, C., Thomson, P. & Russell, L.** (2007) Teaching like an artist: the pedagogic identities and practices of artists in schools, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 28, No. 5, pp. 605–19.
- Harrison, N., James, D. & Last, K.** (2015) Don't know what you've got 'til it's gone? *Skills-led qualifications, secondary school attainment and policy choices*, *Research Papers in Education*, Vol. 30, No. 5, pp. 585–608.
- Henley, D.** (2012) *Cultural Education in England* (online). Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cultural-education-in-england> (accessed 23 June 2020).
- Hochtritt, L., Ahlschwede, W., Halsey-Dutton, B., Fiesel, L. M., Chevalier, L., Miller, T. & Farrar, C.** (2018) Public pedagogy and social justice in arts education, *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, Vol. 37, No. 2, pp. 287–99.
- Hollingworth, S., Paraskevopoulou, A., Robinson, Y., Chalgianni, E. & Mansaray, A.** (2016) *Arts Award Impact Study 2012–2016: A Report for Trinity College London*. London: London South Bank University.
- Irwin, R. L. & O'Donoghue, D.** (2012) Encountering pedagogy through relational art practices, *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 221–36.
- James, D. & Simmons, J.** (2007) Alternative assessment for learner engagement in a climate of performativity: lessons from an English case study, *Assessment in Education*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 353–71.
- National Youth Agency** (2009) *Artwork with Socially Excluded Young People* (online). Available at: <http://www.nya.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/artwork-with-socially-excluded-young-people.pdf> (accessed 23 June 2020).
- Orr, S., Yorke, M. & 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 & Design Education*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 32–45.
- Riele, K. T.** (2006) Youth 'at risk': further marginalizing the marginalized? *Journal of Education Policy*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 129–45.
- Sayers, E.** (2011) Investigating the impact of contrasting paradigms of knowledge on the emancipatory aims of gallery programmes for young people, *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 409–22.

Simmons, R. & Thompson, R. (2011) *NEET Young People and Training for Work: Learning on the Margins*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Smyth, J., McInerney, P. & Fish, T. (2013) Blurring the boundaries: from relational learning towards a critical pedagogy of engagement for disengaged disadvantaged young people, *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 299–320.

Thomson, P. & Coles, R. (2018) *Life stories of young people engaged in the Circuit regional galleries programme (2015–2017)*.

Thomson, P., Hall, C., Jones, K. & Sefton-Green, J. (2012) *The Signature Pedagogies Project: Final Report: Creativity, Culture and Education, 2012* (online). Available at: http://old.creativitycultureeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/Signature_Pedagogies_Final_Report_April_2012.pdf (accessed 23 June 2020).

Thomson, P. & Pennacchia, J. (2015) Hugs and behaviour points: alternative education and the regulation of 'excluded' youth, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, Vol. 20, No. 6, pp. 622–40.

Torrance, H., Colley, H., Garratt, D., Jarvis, J., Piper, H., Ecclestone, K. & James, D. (2005) *The Impact of Different Modes of Assessment on Achievement and Progress in the Learning and Skills Sector*. Learning and Skills Development Agency (online). Available at: <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/71312/1/AssessmentModesImpact-libre.pdf> (accessed 23 June 2020).

Watkins, C. & Mortimore, P. (1999) Pedagogy: what do we know? in P. Mortimore [Ed.] *Understanding Pedagogy and Its Impact on Learning*. London: Sage, pp. 1–19.

Wenger-Trayner, E. & Wenger-Trayner, B. (2015) *Communities of Practice: A Brief Introduction*.