

Learning ‘To Studio’: The Role of Creative Pedagogy in Delivering Future Skills And How To Make It Happen

AYLIFFE, Maggie, BRACEY, Andrew, LEE, Joanne <<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0607-2032>>, MAIER, Danica and ONIONS, Laura

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/36962/>

This document is the Accepted Version [AM]

Citation:

AYLIFFE, Maggie, BRACEY, Andrew, LEE, Joanne, MAIER, Danica and ONIONS, Laura (2026). Learning ‘To Studio’: The Role of Creative Pedagogy in Delivering Future Skills And How To Make It Happen. AMPS Proceedings Journal Series, 43 (1), 1-11. [Article]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

LEARNING ‘TO STUDIO’: THE ROLE OF CREATIVE PEDAGOGY IN DELIVERING FUTURE SKILLS AND HOW TO MAKE IT HAPPEN

Author:

MAGGIE AYLIFFE, ANDREW BRACEY, JOANNE LEE, DANICA MAIER, LAURA ONIONS

Affiliation:

LIVERPOOL JOHN MOORES UNIVERSITY, UK. UNIVERSITY OF LINCOLN, UK. SHEFFIELD HALLAM UNIVERSITY, UK. NOTTINGHAM TRENT UNIVERSITY, UK. UNIVERSITY OF WOLVERHAMPTON, UK.

INTRODUCTION

This research project sought to take a fresh look at the Fine Art Studio and perhaps, on a hunch, find a ‘useful’ perspective to support our own practices but what we also found was that this much contested space of learning and knowledge creation may also hold value for a wider academic sector struggling to embed creative, open-ended thinking into its ‘taught’ curriculums. Our data was revealing that the conditions for creative learning, the ability ‘to studio’ with others, although often at the front line of cost cutting exercises in university and community settings could actually prove important to future educational strategy. ‘Studio-ing’ is a pedagogic model that provides a platform for a transferable and interdisciplinary approach to learning that brings the human interface to the fore and uses disciplinary knowledge and artificial intelligence as powerful tools in collective problem solving. In this scenario, learning ‘to studio’ and experienced artists who can ‘studio’ and lead ‘studio-ing’ become an important resource across a range of subjects looking to future proof learning and employment.

This research aimed to consider the contemporary Fine Art studio in higher education to understand how creative arts education and our studio-based pedagogy might be understood as ‘useful’ to the development of graduate attributes widely acknowledged to be important to sustainable and equitable futures in the creative sector. We use the term ‘useful’ advisedly, considering Sara Ahmed’s assertion that “use is an ongoing commitment to learn about things from things,” and that “use requires we rethink how we give value to things.”¹ One of the motivations for this research was to find a pragmatic language to resist the romantic fetishisation of the artist studio and its easy defamation by institutions as an elitist, redundant and expensive resource.

Fundamentally, we set out to find a new language, a voice of ‘the studio’ that might support our own sector to argue for the maintenance of studio time, space and resources within common HEI business models. Through our work with colleagues across the sector we aimed to identify the values fostered by studio-based learning and demonstrate how they sit in tandem with demonstrate how they align with the OFS² and broader governmental objectives while also, importantly aiming to identify a clear set of conditions that allow for inclusivity and creative learning to happen in a studio-based environment.

Through our research we have come to reflect on the ‘studio’ in and expanded field of practice and as a transferable pedagogic method, separate from the different subject specific teaching activities that might intermittently happen in the creative studio such as crits/skills workshops/tutorials. In this

research, we are refiguring the studio as a verb, thinking about how students learn ‘to studio’, what skills are acquired in ‘studio-ing’ and importantly what are the conditions that allow for all and any willing student to participate and learn ‘to studio’ effectively? We also want to ‘resist’ the idea that time ‘to studio’ should somehow sit outside of taught programmes, belonging in the shady world of the hidden curriculum resourced on free will and for those that can afford it.

METHODOLOGY

As a research team of experienced Fine Art academics, we thought we knew everything there was to know about the studio and indeed we have used studio practice as a basis in prior projects for exploring and extrapolating the characteristics of ‘studio-ing’ for creating and challenging knowledge.³ However, for this project we wanted evidence, and the voices of teaching colleagues to support and bring forth the embedded and innate knowledge we all carry, and to look for consensus, if there was one, to define ‘studio-ing’ as pedagogy and to define the requirements for making a space ‘to studio’. We knew, however, that our colleagues were time poor and would have little energy for more questionnaires and justifications – so we took a different and perhaps more unconventional route to gathering our research material. We began our work with two calls for short one minute films – the first to simply document contemporary university and educational studios and the second to reveal how artist-teachers go about their ‘studio-ing’ and the spaces they use ‘to studio’.

We went on to share these films in a series of conferences, workshops and seminars for lecturers in the creative disciplines, with academic leaders and managers, and in conversations with students (Note 1 – list of conferences?). At these events our audience became participants and while playing, in one instance with bread dough (image), and, watching themselves and others at play and consciously ‘studio-ing’, we asked them to reflect on what had been made visible and to consider their own day-to-day experience of working in studios to identify which aspects of its use are the most valued and most difficult to manage. We gathered the responses in formats that prompted wide-ranging, informal and honest conversation – the kind you might get over lunch with colleagues – providing printed table cloths and paper plates for participants to draw and write as the discussion progressed. (Image: table cloth/plates)

Our research process allowed us the opportunity to engage with an extended community of Fine Art lecturers and artists but importantly also with participants in workshops and conferences hosted by the wider creative and humanities sector. In this environment, we found a recognition that in addition to high level disciplinary knowledge, graduates today also need to have the skills to apply and ‘create’ knowledge in interdisciplinary teams and settings to respond to the complex ‘wicked’ problems that we face.

The importance of developing a creative skill set for graduates across all subjects has been much heralded by government and industry. As the World Economic Forum notes, “creative thinking and resilience, flexibility and agility are also rising in importance, along with curiosity and lifelong learning.”⁴ Similarly, the OECD’s Future of Education and Skills 2030 project highlights well-being, co-agency with peers, teachers, parents and communities, and student agency as key orientation points for future learning.⁵ Many of our core learning outcomes in art and design—such as curiosity, analysis, criticality, reflection, peer-to-peer learning, and student agency—align with these priorities and have been identified as essential attributes for surviving and thriving in the future world of work.

This paper is a practical tool; it aims to speak to the value of studio-based working as an important experience in the process of learning how to ‘be creative’ and an important ‘future skill’. This paper also aims to outline the necessary conditions for activating a studio-based learning methodology or ‘the space to studio’ based on analysis of the research data gathered during the timeline of the project. The conditions that we will outline in this paper describe an infrastructure for creative learning that can be

adapted to different subjects and situations. Importantly we consider inclusivity as a core value within this context and identify the support and conditions required for students from all social and subject backgrounds to ‘usefully’ develop imaginative and creative future skills.

The research team analysed and debated the research material gathered during the research period in a two-day residency. During this period, we identified five key themes that relate to the conditions for learning ‘to studio’ and the factors necessary for meaningful, engaged, and sustainable creative education. In this paper, they are explored under the headings: *Time and Space*, *Valuing the Process*, *Co-Learning*, *Quality* and *Inclusion*. The choice of terminology is deliberate, making clear that we are trying to work in dialogue with institutional drivers, rather than act in opposition. We want to foreground the values that are essential for cultivating the kind of learning environments that both students and staff recognise as vital in their development as creative makers and thinkers and from which knowledgeable and experienced graduates will be able to contribute to the creative workforce and make change.

TIME AND SPACE: CONDITIONS FOR ATTENTION AND CREATIVITY (Clip film 1)

Time and space are not abstract pedagogical ideals but practical necessities for fostering creativity. This theme acknowledges the institutional challenge of allocating resources within constrained funding models, shifting priorities, and a culture of metrics, but insists that time and space are essential, not optional. Students and staff both require unregulated time: time that allows for risk, reflection, and the ‘not-yet’ to occur. The demand for productivity and measurable outcomes risks flattening the very conditions that support creativity, deep learning and personal development. Space, too, is not just about square footage but about the kinds of social and practical environments we foster—safe spaces for mess, material storage, rest, contemplation, and conversation. Such spaces can support creativity by accommodating how creative people actually work. When reduced to efficiency, we lose the environments that make slow, thoughtful learning possible⁶.

Maslow’s *Hierarchy of Needs*⁷ made clear that if basic needs—time, space, security—aren’t met, creative self-actualisation is compromised. Our research has shown how students juggling jobs, financial stress and poor mental health struggle to fully engage and that staff overwhelmed by administrative demands or employed precariously cannot offer the attention that learning and learners require. These pressures reflect a broader neoliberal shift in education, where knowledge is increasingly defined by its market utility. As the Critical Hive Manifesto argues, this “vandalism of arts and humanities” redefines knowledge as “that which an individual can bring to the economy.”⁸ Neoliberal academic planning limits both pedagogical depth and artistic possibility. Nancy Kline’s *Time to Think*⁹ reminds us that giving clear and focused attention itself is a crucial pedagogical and developmental act. By valuing unstructured time and fit-for-purpose space, universities can affirm their commitment to meaningful, process-led education. We argue not against the institution, but alongside it—for a model that recognises attentiveness and spaciousness (both time and place) as being vital to creative learning. By identifying time in the studio as essential learning, students and staff can better engage with the course amongst other commitments.

VALUING THE PROCESS: EMBRACING UNCERTAINTY AND SPECULATION

To support creative learning, we must value process *over* outcome. This point affirms that creativity emerges not despite failure, unlearning, messiness, or uncertainty—but because of them. These are not weaknesses to avoid but strengths to nurture. As Jenny Walden argues, there is “something about finding the space for unlearning and trying to approach things entirely differently... building a set of values and a sense of culture which we are in terrible danger of losing. We probably need to be very bold and proud about that value proposition.”¹⁰ Juhani Pallasmaa similarly emphasises that “un-learning

is just as important as learning, forgetting as important as remembering, uncertainty as important as certainty,”¹¹ suggesting that knowledge becomes creatively useful only when it is absorbed and then forgotten—allowing the artist to encounter the world anew. By affirming process, we align with core governmental goals for education: developing critical, reflexive, and resilient learners, humans, artists, and workers who can navigate the world’s complexity with curiosity and care.

Teaching process requires space and time for experimentation, risk, and play. Paulo Freire reminds us that education is an ongoing activity rooted in our awareness of being “unfinished, uncompleted beings in and with a likewise unfinished reality.”¹² This framing positions creative learning not as a linear acquisition of knowledge, but as a continual process of becoming—one that embraces uncertainty, transformation, and the not-yet-known. Tacit knowledge¹³, speculation, and vulnerability¹⁴ cannot be measured by simple rubrics, but they are essential to artistic growth. We must hold space for what is uncertain, what might not work, and what cannot be rushed. Jeroen Lutters describes artistic knowing as being “in the process of knowing... like a piece of clay,”¹⁵ where formal rationality obstructs rather than supports creativity. This highlights the need for imaginative, embodied engagement in learning—something studio-based education is uniquely positioned to foster. In doing so, we prepare students not only for academic achievement in Fine Art courses but for sustainable creative practice beyond the university.

This doesn’t oppose the institution—it reinforces its mission. Valuing process is central to cultivating graduates who are adaptable, resourceful, and innovative. The studio (and its analogues) is a site for process replete with potential for dialogue, reflection, and the capacity for returning to what remains unfinished. In an educational setting this facilitates the relational, responsive, and situated nature of learning.

CO-LEARNING: SHARED AGENCY IN KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION

Co-learning recognises that staff and students are both learners and contributors within a creative ecosystem. As Mike Neary argues, we are (or should be) producers of knowledge, not passive consumers¹⁶. This theme supports a shift away from top-down, delivery-based models toward an egalitarian studio culture, where knowledge is co-created through dialogue, proximity, and shared inquiry. This aligns with what Orr and Shreeve describe as the “sticky curriculum,” where knowledge is tacit, explicit, and experiential—including “the known, the unknown and the search for the ‘not yet known.’”¹⁷ In such a model, learning is not linear or easily mapped; it is shaped by the student’s direction, context, and evolving understanding. This ambiguity is not a flaw but a feature of creative education, where co-learning thrives in the space between what is known and what is yet to be discovered.

Rather than resisting institutional aims, co-learning amplifies the university’s broader mission to nurture independent, critical thinkers and foster collaboration. It values mutual presence over hierarchy, where spontaneous insight, peer exchange, and informal reflection are seen as educationally rich—not extra to the curriculum, but central to it. While this kind of learning may have historically occurred informally, outside of scheduled teaching, we want to structurally embed it within core hours.

Crucially, it also challenges entrenched hierarchies. When tutors and students learn together by ‘being alongside’¹⁸ each other—through shared making, experimenting, and problem-solving—they model horizontal learning relationships. This levelling fosters community, dissolves rigid boundaries, and supports an accessible culture where everyone can meaningfully contribute. As Heidegger writes, “teaching is more difficult than learning because what teaching calls for is this: to let learn. The real teacher, in fact, lets nothing else be learned than – learning.”¹⁹ This ethos of “letting learn” underpins co-learning, where the educator’s role is not to dictate outcomes but to create the conditions for discovery, dialogue, and shared transformation.

Creating the conditions for co-learning requires structural recognition of its value: time, space, and permission to dwell in the uncertain and what we are yet to know. Emily Ogden offers a resonant perspective on this, describing “unknowing” not as a lack of information but as “a capacity to hold the position of not knowing yet – possibly of not knowing ever... living with the dimness that I will mostly inhabit.”²⁰ This framing supports the ethos of co-learning as a shared, open-ended inquiry rather than a fixed transfer of knowledge. When this is in place, we see not just collaborative outputs, but communities of practice²¹ that extend beyond the studio. These networks reflect the best ambitions of higher education—supporting not just what students make, but how they come to understand their place as thinkers and makers within a shared, evolving field that extends beyond the university and into the world. As Graham and Goldsberry argue, for encounters in the art classroom to be “meaningful, generative, disruptive, and productively disturbing,” both students and educators must “lean into conditions and encounters with events, objects and spaces that put them in relation to an outside—the unforeseen, unthought, and unmade.”²² This type of openness is central to co-learning, where the educator is not a transmitter of fixed knowledge but a co-navigator of emergent possibilities.

QUALITY: FIT-FOR-PURPOSE ENVIRONMENTS FOR CREATIVE LEARNING

Quality in studio education can often be misunderstood as luxury or excess. In reality, it refers to the baseline conditions necessary for meaningful creative learning. This theme repositions quality as infrastructure, not indulgence—encompassing materials, facilities, and people that can support experimentation, failure, and growth.

We align with the university’s aspiration for excellence by advocating for environments that are fit-for-purpose. Budgetary constraints, shrinking course allocations, reduced technical support, and metric-driven accountability systems risk reducing “quality” to what can be counted—attendance, module outcomes, student satisfaction surveys - but what is measurable in this way is not always what matters most in studio learning.

A high-quality creative education depends on access to materials and resources (enough studio space, workshops, things to make with) that invite and allow process rather than requiring outcome. It requires tools, materials, and the space to make so that ideas can be tried, can fail, and can be tried again. Likewise, quality relies on time and space for staff to attend to students’ evolving trajectories, not just to deliver predetermined content. Quality emerges when staff have the capacity to offer attentive, responsive guidance—something that cannot happen when their time is fragmented across too many demands. Experienced staff and skilled technicians who are not ‘run off their feet’ are vital.

Central to this is trust: trust in staff to exercise academic judgement in recognising what students need, and trust in students to navigate uncertainty as part of their creative development. Institutions must have the confidence to allow educators to teach in ways they know foster deep learning even when these outcomes can’t be tracked on a spreadsheet and may only be fully recognised by students long after they’ve graduated. Quality thrives when staff have the autonomy to shape teaching according to the context of the field, rather than conforming to externally imposed requirements. Too many enforced modules and paperwork-heavy systems risk replacing attentiveness with administration, thereby lowering quality and diverting energy away from the very conditions that nurture meaningful learning. This is not a call for indulgence, but an articulation of what supports rich, complex, and lasting learning. Quality is not the cherry on top—it is the soil in which creativity takes root. By framing it as foundational rather than aspirational, we affirm our shared commitment to educational environments where students and staff alike can thrive.

INCLUSION: ACCESS AS A CREATIVE PREREQUISITE

Inclusion within studio-based education is not simply about who can enrol, but about who is able to fully participate and how they are able to do so. Meaningful inclusion requires time, materials, funding and support structures that enable students to genuinely engage with creative learning. Financial pressures, physical and mental health challenges, caring responsibilities, and systemic inequities of race and class all shape who can make the most of their education. While these issues are widespread beyond the university, we recognise a shared institutional aspiration to support all learners.

True inclusion expands access not only to physical spaces, but to opportunities for reflection, failure, experimentation, and growth - through time, space, attention, and appropriate materials. It reaffirms that creative education must meet students where they are—and then support them to go where they otherwise could not. When time, materials, or mental space are lacking, the studio becomes a site of constraint rather than possibility.

Inclusion, then, is not positioned in opposition to the university—it is a mutual goal, one requiring practical, thoughtful strategies that recognise the lived realities “on the floor.” It means student-focused learning opportunities rather than financially driven top-down delivery. Flexible timetables, appropriate support, materials budgets and accessible pathways—especially for those with work, care, or health needs—are not ‘add-ons’, but conditions for equity. Confident graduates with clear expectations of support and inclusion can further effect change in creative industries and beyond, diversifying the workforce and the voices that are heard.

INTERSECTIONS AND INTEGRATIONS

At the heart of this is a pressing paradox: creativity is now identified as one of the four essential skills for future employment. The studio and studio-ing exemplifies how this skill is cultivated, yet the very conditions that make it possible—time, space, materials, and attention—are being steadily and institutionally eroded. Inclusion is therefore both a value and a structural necessity, vital for delivering the very graduate outcomes the university is committed to achieving. These conditions are not extras—they are the groundwork of innovation. While each of these five themes stands on its own, together they articulate a shared recognition: creativity does not emerge from nowhere. It requires fit-for-purpose conditions—time, space, attention, materials, and an inclusive environment—that can support uncertainty, curiosity, and growth.

As artists, when we say to creative colleagues ‘I’m going to the studio’ or ‘I’m having a studio day’ there is an understanding that this encompasses a range of activities, a way of being that might or might not result in immediate outcomes. In ‘studio-ing’ we are describing a practice-based methodology where ‘the studio’ is not just a place – it is a state of mind or way of thinking and being. The task of teaching creative practice is designated a specific space, but the institutional focus is too often on that location as a quantifiable physical resource rather than a pedagogic method in itself for learning how to be creative.

This confusion of resource and pedagogy causes problems. Specialist space is institutionally accounted for in timetables and footfall but learning ‘to studio’ is not something that can fit neatly into a module or timetable envelope; as students get confident in ‘studio-ing’ they understand that they need to negotiate their own working patterns and behaviours as creative practice. We see this shift most dramatically at undergraduate level between first year and final year but it may begin at school where the art room (or music or drama spaces) can be a place to hang out and work independently²³. We believe that such ‘studio-ing’ enables people to develop essential strategies for imagination, reflection, critical thinking and advanced creativity, and that ‘studio-ing’ of some sort is an underpinning methodology for most creative practices that needs to be taught.

The studio provides a space to work with others or on your own, time to be and test your creativity. In this body of research, we have found some consensus on why the studio continues to be an important

space for teaching the creative thinkers of the future. As defined earlier, our research has also helped provide consensus about the conditions for this teaching to happen. How attention to some basic conditions could open creative careers and creative thinking to students facing a diverse set of barriers and challenges and enable them to perform creatively at an advanced level.

Taken together, these themes form a coherent, values-led framework for sustaining and reimagining studio-based education. We identify the practice and means of ‘studio-ing’ as a potential route to delivering the transferable future skills advanced by many employability reports. The conditions outlined advocate not for more, but for better—for recognising that quality creative learning is not a luxury, but a necessity. The studio is ‘the sand pit’ that everyone needs to think afresh and amongst peers. The right ‘to studio’ is not rhetoric – it is a fundamental tool of creative practice and thinking. When recognised, resourced, and respected, the studio can fully reflect the university’s best ambitions for all students: a space for critical inquiry, collective learning, and the kind of creativity that responds to—and shapes—the world.

NOTES

¹ Sara Ahmed, 'A Useful Manifesto', Substack newsletter, *Feministkilljoys* (blog), 11 July 2025, <https://feministkilljoys.substack.com/p/a-useful-manifesto>.

² The OFS (Office for Students) is the independent regulator of higher education in England, responsible for ensuring that students receive high-quality education and outcomes.

³ Maggie Ayliffe and Christian Mieves, 'Dirty Practice: A Painting Workshop and the Hidden Curriculum', in *Teaching Painting: How Can Painting Be Taught in Art Schools?*, ed. Ian Hartshorne, Donal Moloney, and Magnus Quaife (London: Black Dog Publishing, 2016), 52–57; Christine Stevens and Danica Maier, 'The Effect of Summer Lodge on Artistic Research and Pedagogy at NTU and Beyond.', *Research Catalogue*, n.d., 2016.

⁴ Till Leopold, 'Future of Jobs Report 2025: The Jobs of the Future – and the Skills You Need to Get Them', World Economic Forum, 8 January 2025, <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2025/01/future-of-jobs-report-2025-jobs-of-the-future-and-the-skills-you-need-to-get-them/>.

⁵ OECD, 'Future of Education and Skills 2030/2040', OECD, accessed 17 July 2025, <https://www.oecd.org/en/about/projects/future-of-education-and-skills-2030.html>.

⁶ Shari Tishman, *Slow Looking: The Art and Practice of Learning through Observation* (New York, NY; Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2018).

⁷ Abraham H. Maslow, 'A Theory of Human Motivation', *Psychological Review* 50, no. 4 (1943): 370–96; Saul Mcleod, 'Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs', *Simply Psychology*, 29 December 2020, <https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html>.

⁸ Basak Ertur, 'The Nomadic Hive Manifesto', *Critical Legal Thinking*, 11 December 2010, <https://criticallegalthinking.com/2010/12/11/the-nomadic-hive-manifesto/>.

⁹ Nancy Kline, *Time to Think: Listening to Ignite the Human Mind*, Business Personal Development (London: Cassell Illustrated, 2014); Nancy Kline, *More Time to Think: A Way of Being in the World* (London: Cassell, 2015).

¹⁰ NAFAE, 'Roundtable On Collaboration Between Mainstream and Alternative Art School: A Roundtable Discussion Between Members of The National Association of Fine Art Education', in *Co-Operative Education, Politics, and Art Creative, Critical, and Community Resistance to Corporate Higher Education*, ed. Richard Hudson-Miles and Jackie Goodman, Routledge Research in Arts Education (Abingdon, Oxon New York, NY: Routledge, 2025), 34, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032655352>.

¹¹ Juhani Pallasmaa, *The Thinking Hand: Existential and Embodied Wisdom in Architecture*, AD Primers (Chichester, U.K: Wiley, 2009), 143.

¹² Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. Myra Bergman Ramos, Published in Penguin Classics 2017, Penguin Modern Classics (New York London New Delhi Sydney: Penguin Books, 2017), 57.

¹³ Michael Polanyi, *The Tacit Dimension*, Revised ed. edition (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2009); Michael Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*, New edition (London: Routledge, 1998).

¹⁴ Dom Heffer, 'Identifying Transferable Qualities from Studio Practice to Teaching: Inwards Looking, Outwards Facing', in *Co-Operative Education, Politics, and Art Creative, Critical, and Community Resistance to Corporate Higher Education*, ed. Richard Hudson-Miles and Jackie Goodman, Routledge Research in Arts Education (Abingdon, Oxon New York, NY: Routledge, 2025), 112–21, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032655352>.

¹⁵ Jeroen Lutters, *No University: A Creative Turn in Higher Education* (Arnhem Netherlands: ArtEZ Press, 2021), 41.

¹⁶ Mike Neary, 'Student as Producer: Research- Engaged Teaching Frames University- Wide Curriculum Development.', *The Council for Undergraduate Research Quarterly* 35, no. 2 (2014): 28–34; Mike Neary, *Student as Producer: How Do Revolutionary Teachers Teach?* (Winchester, UK: Zero Books, 2020).

¹⁷ Susan Orr and Alison Shreeve, *Art and Design Pedagogy in Higher Education: Knowledge, Values and Ambiguity in the Creative Curriculum*, Routledge Research in Education (London; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2018), 148.

¹⁸ Andrew Middleton and Cilla Ross, 'Exploring Perceived Identities of Art Educators: Outsiders on the Inside and Alongside?', in *Co-Operative Education, Politics, and Art Creative, Critical, and Community Resistance to Corporate Higher Education*, ed. Richard Hudson-Miles and Jackie Goodman, Routledge

Research in Arts Education (Abingdon, Oxon New York, NY: Routledge, 2025), 59–74, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032655352>.

¹⁹ Martin Heidegger, *Basic Writings: Martin Heidegger*, Routledge Classics (London: Routledge, 2011), 120.

²⁰ Emily Ogden, *On Not Knowing: How to Love and Other Essays* (London: Peninsula Press, 2022), 4.

²¹ Étienne Wenger, *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*, 18th printing, Learning in Doing Social, Cognitive, and Computational Perspectives (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

²² Mark Graham and Clark Adam Goldsberry, eds., *Reimagining the Art Classroom: Field Notes and Methods in an Age of Disquiet*, New edition (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2023), 111.No Reference

²³ Simon Thake, ‘Sheffield: Parent and Pupil Backlash over Reduced Arts Teaching’, BBC News, 13 May 2025, <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/clygjzke048o>; N8 Research Partnership, ‘Child of the North 2024/25 Campaign - Report 12’, *N8 Research Partnership* (blog), accessed 13 May 2025, <https://www.n8research.org.uk/research-focus/child-of-the-north/2024-campaign/arts-creativity/>.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ayliffe, Maggie, and Christian Mieves. ‘Dirty Practice: A Painting Workshop and the Hidden Curriculum’. In *Teaching Painting: How Can Painting Be Taught in Art Schools?*, edited by Ian Hartshorne, Donal Moloney, and Magnus Quaife, 52–57. London: Black Dog Publishing, 2016.

Ertur, Basak. ‘The Nomadic Hive Manifesto’. *Critical Legal Thinking*, 11 December 2010. <https://criticallegalthinking.com/2010/12/11/the-nomadic-hive-manifesto/>.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos. Published in Penguin Classics 2017. Penguin Modern Classics. New York London New Delhi Sydney: Penguin Books, 2017.

Graham, Mark, and Clark Adam Goldsberry, eds. *Reimagining the Art Classroom: Field Notes and Methods in an Age of Disquiet*. New edition. Bristol: Intellect Books, 2023.

Heffer, Dom. ‘Identifying Transferable Qualities from Studio Practice to Teaching: Inwards Looking, Outwards Facing’. In *Co-Operative Education, Politics, and Art Creative, Critical, and Community Resistance to Corporate Higher Education*, edited by Richard Hudson-Miles and Jackie Goodman, 112–21. Routledge Research in Arts Education. Abingdon, Oxon New York, NY: Routledge, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032655352>.

Kline, Nancy. *More Time to Think: A Way of Being in the World*. London: Cassell, 2015.

———. *Time to Think: Listening to Ignite the Human Mind*. Business Personal Development. London: Cassell Illustrated, 2014.

Leopold, Till. ‘Future of Jobs Report 2025: The Jobs of the Future – and the Skills You Need to Get Them’. World Economic Forum, 8 January 2025. <https://www.weforum.org/stories/2025/01/future-of-jobs-report-2025-jobs-of-the-future-and-the-skills-you-need-to-get-them/>.

Lutters, Jeroen. *No University: A Creative Turn in Higher Education*. Arnhem Netherlands: ArtEZ Press, 2021.

Maslow, Abraham H. ‘A Theory of Human Motivation’. *Psychological Review* 50, no. 4 (1943): 370–96.

McLeod, Saul. ‘Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs’. *Simply Psychology*, 29 December 2020. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/maslow.html>.

Middleton, Andrew, and Cilla Ross. ‘Exploring Perceived Identities of Art Educators: Outsiders on the Inside And Alongside?’ In *Co-Operative Education, Politics, and Art Creative, Critical, and Community Resistance to Corporate Higher Education*, edited by Richard Hudson-Miles and Jackie Goodman, 59–74. Routledge Research in Arts Education. Abingdon, Oxon New York, NY: Routledge, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032655352>.

N8 Research Partnership. ‘Child of the North 2024/25 Campaign - Report 12’. *N8 Research Partnership* (blog). Accessed 13 May 2025. <https://www.n8research.org.uk/research-focus/child-of-the-north/2024-campaign/arts-creativity/>.

NAFAE. ‘Roundtable On Collaboration Between Mainstream and Alternative Art School: A Roundtable Discussion Between Members of The National Association of Fine Art Education’. In *Co-Operative Education, Politics, and Art Creative, Critical, and Community Resistance to Corporate Higher Education*, edited by Richard Hudson-Miles and Jackie Goodman, 49–58. Routledge Research in Arts Education. Abingdon, Oxon New York, NY: Routledge, 2025. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032655352>.

Neary, Mike. *Student as Producer: How Do Revolutionary Teachers Teach?* Winchester, UK: Zero Books, 2020.

- . ‘Student as Producer: Research- Engaged Teaching Frames University- Wide Curriculum Development.’ *The Council for Undergraduate Research Quarterly* 35, no. 2 (2014): 28–34.
- OECD. ‘Future of Education and Skills 2030/2040’. OECD. Accessed 17 July 2025. <https://www.oecd.org/en/about/projects/future-of-education-and-skills-2030.html>.
- Ogden, Emily. *On Not Knowing: How to Love and Other Essays*. London: Peninsula Press, 2022.
- Orr, Susan, and Alison Shreeve. *Art and Design Pedagogy in Higher Education: Knowledge, Values and Ambiguity in the Creative Curriculum*. Routledge Research in Education. London; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2018.
- Pallasmaa, Juhani. *The Thinking Hand: Existential and Embodied Wisdom in Architecture*. AD Primers. Chichester, U.K: Wiley, 2009.
- Polanyi, Michael. *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. New edition. London: Routledge, 1998.
- . *The Tacit Dimension*. Revised ed. edition. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Stevens, Christine, and Danica Maier. ‘The Effect of Summer Lodge on Artistic Research and Pedagogy at NTU and Beyond.’ *Research Catalogue*, n.d., 2016.
- Thake, Simon. ‘Sheffield: Parent and Pupil Backlash over Reduced Arts Teaching’. BBC News, 13 May 2025. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/clygjzke048o>.
- Tishman, Shari. *Slow Looking: The Art and Practice of Learning through Observation*. New York, NY; Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2018.
- Wenger, Étienne. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. 18th printing. Learning in Doing Social, Cognitive, and Computational Perspectives. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.