Educational Review

Understanding learning cultures

Phil Hodkinson [a] , Gert Biesta [b] & David James [c]

[a] School of Continuing Education , University of Leeds , UK

[b] School of Education and Lifelong Learning , University of
Exeter , UK

[c] Centre for Education and Democracy , University of the West of
England , UK
Published online: 09 Nov 2007.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Understanding learning cultures

Phil Hodkinson[*a], Gert Biesta[b] and David James[c]

[a]*School of Continuing Education, University of Leeds, UK;* [b]*School of Education and Lifelong Learning, University of Exeter, UK;* [c]*Centre for Education and Democracy, University of the West of England, UK*

This paper sets out an explanation about the nature of learning cultures and how they work. In so doing, it directly addresses some key weaknesses in current situated learning theoretical writing, by working to overcome unhelpful dualisms, such as the individual and the social, and structure and agency. It does this through extensive use of some of Pierre Bourdieu's key ideas—seeing learning cultures operating as fields of force. This makes clear the relationality of learning cultures, and the fact that they operate across conventionally drawn boundaries of scale. The paper argues that this approach also paves the way for the full incorporation of individual learners into situated learning accounts.

Introduction

This paper follows the first paper in this special issue (Hodkinson *et al.*, this issue), which set out some of the main findings of the Transforming Learning Cultures in Further Education (TLC) research project, concerning the nature of the learning cultures we examined. That largely descriptive account begs the central questions: what do we mean by a learning culture, and how can learning cultures be best understood? This paper sets out to provide the answers, but because of space restrictions, the argument advanced relies upon that other paper to provide examples and empirical evidence. A fuller account of the TLC project can be found in James and Biesta (2007). The methodology is explained in Postlethwaite's (2007) article in this issue.

We began the research with the assumption, now confirmed through research evidence, that all of the following influences contribute significantly to learning and that in order to fully understand the learning in the different sites all these dimensions had to be taken into consideration in relation to each other.

- the positions, dispositions and actions of the students;
- the positions, dispositions and actions of the tutors;

*Corresponding author: School of Continuing Education, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK. Email: P.M.Hodkinson@leeds.ac.uk

- the location and resources of the learning site;
- the syllabus or course specification, the assessment and qualification specifications;
- the time tutors and students spend together, their inter-relationships, and the range of other learning sites students are engaged with;
- college management and procedures, together with funding and inspection body procedures and regulations, and government policy;
- wider vocational and academic cultures, of which any learning site is part;
- wider social and cultural values and practices, for example around issues of social class, gender and ethnicity, the nature of employment opportunities, social and family life, and the perceived status of further education (FE) as a sector.

In analysing and interpreting the data from this project, it became apparent that existing theoretical approaches to learning were all partially inadequate as a means of understanding the learning we were exploring in its full complexity. In this paper we are concerned with one part of that problem—the understanding of learning cultures. However, this needs to be done in ways which will readily accommodate the equally necessary cultural theory of learning.

The purpose of this theoretical development is heuristic. We argue that it facilitates three things. Firstly, it helps understand and explain the TLC research data and findings. Secondly, it opens up more productive ways of thinking about improving learning, which are more fully explored in James and Wahlberg (in this issue) and James and Biesta (2007). Thirdly, it helps resolve some difficulties with existing learning literature. In what follows, we have focussed primarily on this third purpose.

Problems with existing theories of learning

Central to understanding learning cultures is the way in which we grasp the relationship between how people learn, and the contexts or setting in which they learn. As Cobb and Bowers (1999) suggest, this inter-relationship is often conceptualized in one of two different ways. Cognitive theorists of learning, they argue, understand context as 'the direct metaphorical correlate of physical location' (Cobb & Bowers, 1999, p. 6). That is, context contains learning, but is separate from it. Furthermore, from this perspective, the central concern with position is the transfer of learning from one position to another. Thus, Sfard (1998) argues for the retention of what she terms an acquisition metaphor for learning, precisely because this is necessary, in her view, for us to understand transfer. This physical context approach is an inadequate starting place for the consideration of learning cultures. This is because our research showed that individuals and groups, be they students or tutors, were integral to the nature of those learning cultures, as is more fully explained later.

The main challenger to this cognitive approach to learning is variously termed situated learning (Cobb & Bowers, 1999) or learning as participation (Sfard, 1998). From this perspective, context is 'defined in terms of participation in a social

practice' (Cobb & Bowers, 1999, p. 5). As will become apparent in what follows, it is this participatory view of learning upon which this exploration of learning cultures is built. In so doing, we are directly addressing some weaknesses in the current situated learning literature, many of which are already well known. We do not have space to analyse this increasingly extensive literature in detail. Rather, we identify five broad problematic trends within it. Our argument is that though some writers in the participatory learning tradition address some of these problems, none successfully addresses them all. In participatory approaches to learning there is:

- A tendency for individual differences and individual learning to disappear, with the focus on social interactions, activities and participation (Anderson *et al.*, 1996).
- A tendency to focus on the particular site where learning takes place (such as a specific workplace), thus bracketing off and largely ignoring wider social, cultural and structural influences.
- A tendency to downplay issues of inequality and power relations within and beyond the site. An exception is Engeström's work on activity systems (e.g. 2001).
- A tendency to separate out the agency of individual learners from the social structures that they are seen to inhabit, focussing on one or the other, not both.
- A tendency for the majority of post-Vygotskian research and theorizing on learning to retain a concentration on cognition, rather than seeing learning as practical and embodied (see, for example, Rogoff, 2003; Edwards, 2005).

In this paper, we are concerned primarily with addressing the first three of these tendencies. However, for our work here to represent a significant advance on other theorizing, we also need to pave the way for the final two tendencies to be overcome.

The partial effectiveness of this existing theorizing relates to two underlying issues: (1) the need for a more holistic approach and (2) the problem of scale. These two issues are inter-related. By a holistic approach, we mean that a successful theory of learning needs to integrate both sides of three common dualisms. They are: the mind-body dualism, the division between the individual and the social, and the split between structure and agency. This is an essential step in incorporating individual learners into a participatory understanding of learning. For, as Beckett and Hager (2002) make clear in relation to the workplace, learning entails the embodied engagement with practice—what we might term, though Beckett and Hager do not, 'participation'. That is, participation entails doing and feeling, as well as thinking. However, as Hodkinson (2005) has argued, these embodied learners are also social beings. That is, it makes no sense to think of a person as lacking socially grounded dispositions, and no sense either to disaggregate them from their occupation of one or more social positions. This is perhaps most clearly seen in issues such as gender, social class and ethnicity, but also impacts in other less clearly structural ways. Both social positions and dispositions can and do change. Indeed, learning may be usefully understood as one of the ways in which dispositional change occurs. However, changing or unchanging, the inherently social nature of being human is

significant for learning. The dangers of separating structure and agency are superficially less apparent. What we mean by the integration of the two is that, following Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) structures do not simply contain the person, but are part of the person, and operate through the person. There are close parallels here with the situated learning view that learning cannot be separated out from its context. It follows that people are subject to structures even as they take agentic actions, and that any such agentic actions contribute to the on-going development/change/reinforcement of the social structures that are part of them, and part of the social settings where they live their lives. Educational institutions are full of good examples of this, for example through the way in which a less academic student might make a free choice to do course A instead of course B, and in doing so reinforces both a self perception and the meaning of the distinction between A and B, in which course A is seen to be right for 'less academic' students.

By writing about scale, we are using the metaphor of map-making. Different maps are drawn for different purposes and show different things. But whatever the subject of a map is, it will appear different, sometimes dramatically different, at different scales. Imagine a map to show the position of an FE classroom. A large-scale map might show the layout of the college and the position of this room within it. A smaller scale might show the position of the college in the region, with roads and towns shown in relation to it. A smaller scale again might show the position of the hometown in the UK or even, if the scale was small enough, in Europe. Each time the subject is the same, but what we can see on the map, and indeed what aspects the map can illustrate about items and the relationships between them, is very different. If we envisage differentially scaled maps of learning, the same should be true. The largest scale might focus on the learning of one individual. The next scale down might focus on the site where the person learns—which might be a community of practice in Wenger's (1998) sense, but might not be. Decrease the scale again, and perhaps the whole organization or activity system (Engeström, 2001) is the focus. Decrease it further, and we might be looking at learning in relation to wider social or economic structures and power-relations, including globalization.

The problem for maps of learning is that some of those different scales roughly correspond to different and partial understandings of what learning is, many of which need to be integrated. Thus, if the scale is the individual, the tendency is to overlook the social, and to privilege agency over structure. Similarly, if the scale is drawn around a local site, there is a tendency to focus on the social, but to bracket off wider issues of social structure, and overlook individuals and individual agency. If smaller scales still are used, we tend to get studies of activity systems, of structural inequalities in access to learning and in qualification achievement and of global capitalism, so that individual agency and individual learning are nowhere to be seen. The risk is that rather than being different scale maps of the same thing, each scale of investigation results in a different and partial version of what learning is. The challenge is to develop an understanding of learning that overcomes this partiality, which is precisely what the cultural approach to learning advanced in this paper aims to achieve.

The notion of 'culture' as related to learning cultures

To make learning cultures an object of study requires clarification of the notion of 'culture'—'one of the two or three most difficult words in the English language' (Williams, 1983, p. 87). Williams suggests three broad definitions. These are culture as 'a general process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development', culture as 'a particular way of life, whether of a people, a period or a group', and culture as 'the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity' (Williams, 1983, p. 90). Our approach comes closest to the second, anthropological definition of culture as 'a way of life'. We see culture as being constituted—that is, produced and reproduced—by human activity, often but not exclusively, collective activity. To think of culture as human practice does not necessarily entail an agency-driven view of culture, that is, a view which reduces culture to the intentions and actions of individual agents. As we discuss in more detail later, Bourdieu's notions of field and habitus are meant to overcome the 'either–or' of subjectivist (agency) and objectivist (structure) readings of culture. What our approach does suggest is that cultures exist in and through interaction and communication (Biesta, 1994, 1995, 2004; Carey, 1992).

From this it follows that a learning culture is not the same as a learning site. Rather, it is a particular way to understand a learning site as a practice constituted by the actions, dispositions and interpretations of the participants. This is not a one-way process. Cultures are produced, changed and reproduced by individuals, just as much as individuals are produced, changed and reproduced by cultures. Individuals are differently positioned with regard to shaping and changing a culture—in other words, differences in power are always at issue too. Cultures, then, are both structured and structuring, and individuals' actions are neither totally determined by the confines of a learning culture, nor are they totally free. A key question that a cultural approach to learning brings to the fore is that of the interplay between 'constraints' and 'affordances' in a learning culture (Wertsch, 1998, p. 45).

One of the most important implications of this is that a learning culture should not be understood as the context or environment within which learning takes place. Rather, learning culture stands for the social practices through which people learn. We agree with Lave and Wenger (1991, p. 35), when they state that:

> In our view, learning is not merely situated in practice—as if it were some independently reifiable process that just happened to be located somewhere; learning is an integral part of generative social practice in the lived-in world.

Our claim that cultures are constituted by actions, dispositions and interpretations and exist in and through interaction and communication does not mean that learning cultures are invented 'on the spot' or that they can be re-invented at will. Cultures have history and endurance. Artefacts and institutions are not only expressions of cultural practices; they also embody and reify such practices and thus play an important role in the continuation of cultures. Yet artefacts and institutions need to be used and enacted in order to exert their influence. However, the meaning of artefacts and institutions is not completely malleable. Actors always operate within systems of expectations: the expectations they bring to the situation and the

expectations that others have about their activities and practices. Teachers engage with their tasks on the basis of ideas about what it means to be a teacher, just as students do not come to college as *tabulae rasae* but with ideas about what 'appropriate' student behaviour consists of. Similarly, governments, policy-makers, employers, administrators, funding agencies and 'the public' have ideas and expectations about the educational system in general, and FE in particular. Such expectations influence, structure and limit what is possible for those working inside the system. Expectations are not necessarily consciously held. They exist as 'ways of doing' and 'ways of being' that are considered to be 'normal'. This, finally, also means that learning cultures are governed by values and ideals, by normative expectations about good learning, good teaching, good leadership, and so forth—and again, these are from 'within' and 'outside' any particular setting.

What follows from this use of the concept of 'culture', is that cultures exist everywhere that people live. Just as it makes no sense to think of a person as somehow being non-social, it makes no sense to think of people participating in a cultural vacuum. Furthermore, if we accept the arguments of Colley, Hodkinson and Malcolm (2003) and Coffield (2000) amongst others, that informal learning is likely in all forms of human activity and in all locations where humans participate, then any culture can support learning. Put differently, any site or setting has its own learning culture. To talk about a learning culture is nothing more that focussing our gaze on cultural practices with learning at the centre of our concerns.

If, as we contend, a learning culture should be understood as the practice through which people—students and tutors—learn, then it follows that the key task for a cultural approach to learning is to understand how particular practices impact upon the learning opportunities of the participants. One central question is what forms of learning are made possible within a particular learning culture, and what forms of learning are made difficult or impossible. To answer this question we need an understanding of the dynamics of learning cultures and how they 'work'. We need to understand how particular learning cultures come into existence, how they stay in existence, how they change over time—both as a result of deliberate attempts and as the result of intervening events and unintended consequences of actions—and how learning cultures decline and eventually disappear. To do so we need a theory of learning cultures that is able to operate across the different scales through which learning can be understood. We need an understanding of the ways in which learning happens through participation in a learning culture. We have only space to sketch this in outline in this paper.

Learning cultures as fields of force

In the TLC our prime focus was on the practices of learning and teaching within the 17 sites. In this respect our approach was in keeping with many other studies of learning as participation, which tend to focus on the specifics of a localized setting. Despite the considerable diversity of sites (some were classrooms, some combined classrooms and workplaces, some were individuals in scattered workplaces, others

were virtual, being interactions between tutor and students via the internet), the idea of a learning site has high resonance with conventional notions of how learning is 'bounded', or located. In all cases, the site was drawn at a fairly large scale, as it had to be, if the detailed ways in which learning took place were to be understood. However, the boundaries of the learning cultures identified in the sites could not be so easily drawn. A quick look at the list of dimensions with which we started this paper shows that amongst the factors that potentially impact upon a particular learning site and hence constitute the learning culture, there are many that operate and largely originate from outside the site itself. Put differently: while learning sites can have relatively clearly defined boundaries, the factors that constitute the learning culture of any particular site do not. They spread well beyond the site itself.

One way to grapple more effectively with the difficulty of scale and learning culture is through Bourdieu's concept of field. Though occupying social and geographical space, a field as Bourdieu defines the term has more in common with a force field. In this paper, we see field as a tool to understand how learning cultures work. This is broadly consistent with Bourdieu's own work, the central focus of which was to understand cultural reproduction.

Field as a general theoretical tool

The metaphor of field has its origins in the physical sciences, where it represented a 'real intellectual advance over [Newtonian] mechanics' by acknowledging the operation of energy in space (Mey, 1972, p. 3). At its simplest, this means that instead of seeing the properties of objects or things as the main focus, the relationships between them are seen as key to understanding. In physics, these relationships are to do with the distribution of forces or energy.

Field theory became one of the most important ideas in social psychology and in Gestalt therapy, particularly through the work of Kurt Lewin (Parlett, 1991). For Lewin (1951), field theory starts with a characterization of a whole situation, rather than abstracting isolated elements from that situation. In ways reminiscent of hermeuetics, he argued that the meaning of single elements could not be understood without reference to the total situation. There are problems with this notion of whole or total, which we address later, in relation to the imprecise boundaries of many fields.

Field, though, provides a very useful metaphor for a dynamic system, in which various items (say people or practices) are positioned relationally and in a dynamic tension or perhaps a more or less temporary equilibrium. The relationships (or 'forces' in the field) are as important as the 'things' or people, even though they might be less visible. This encourages us to pay attention to the mutual dependency in a field: If we change one thing, everything else changes. Introduce something new, and all kinds of changes and redefinitions follow, including to the thing introduced.

Field in Bourdieu

Vandenberghe (2000) notes that Lewin was a student of Cassirer, and it is no coincidence that Bourdieu draws upon both. He refers to Cassirer to explain the

need for a relational—as opposed to a substantialist or essentialist—understanding of the social world (Bourdieu, 1998, pp. 4–5). But where Lewin implies the possibility of equilibrium and harmony in a field, Bourdieu's fields generally involve struggle or tension. Fully in keeping with the more general thrust of Bourdieu's social theory, field (with its conceptual partner, habitus) is an attempt to break out from dominant subjectivist and objectivist tendencies in social theory (Bourdieu, 1985). Bourdieu's social theory is an attempt to embrace both sides of this coin simultaneously, whilst transcending the limitations of each.

The most useful analogies for understanding this notion of field are those of 'market' and 'game', though both can be misleading if pressed too hard. A field is like a market because it is a defined social space in which there is inequality but also mutual dependency. Individual customers differ in how much purchasing power they have, by virtue of having different characteristics, backgrounds and tastes. 'Purchasing power' may take the conventional form of economic capital, but can just as much mean social capital (e.g. your position plus who you know, who knows you and who else they know) or cultural capital (e.g. valued markers and facilities plus knowing the deeper and often less obvious ways in which the field works). The notion of game draws attention to the idea that people are in competition for the maintenance or increase of capital of one sort of another, and over the rules of the game. These 'rules' are both written and unwritten, denoting a general agreement in the expectations and presuppositions of the contestants. They can and do change. There are also alliances and more or less permanent cooperative agreements within the larger competition. Moreover, as in a game, the field is in flux (there is something to 'play for') rather than presenting a set of foregone conclusions, and the parties 'believe in the game they are playing and in the value of what is at stake in the struggles they are waging' (Vandenberghe, 2000, p. 399). However, this is not the same thing as seeing the game for what it is, and this is where the analogy breaks down. Lots of social practices appear as one thing whilst achieving something else, with the people involved not necessarily seeing how this works. Bourdieu's term for this is misrecognition. In the learning sites we studied, there were several social practices that meant one thing to the immediate participants whilst appearing rather differently if analysed with the theoretical tools we brought to bear (see, for example, Colley *et al.*, 2003).

Bourdieu wrote that a field is a 'configuration of relations between positions objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon the occupants, agents or institutions' (1992/1996, pp. 72–73). Grenfell and James (2004) note that the medium of these relations and determinations is some form of capital, that time operates in several different ways through a field, and that fields can be more or less autonomous—that is, fields vary in how much they depend on other fields to define them. However, all fields are related to some extent to the field of power. In most of the examples one can read in Bourdieu's own work, field refers to large entities mapped out using a small scale (as in 'the field of education'). In the TLC project we use field to assist in analysis at several scales, including the individual, local and institutional. For us, field is a conceptual tool for understanding

learning cultures. If we focus on field within English FE, then colleges and the learning sites are positioned within it, as are a long list of quasi-autonomous government organizations and many individuals and groups of individuals, including students and tutors.

The learning cultures in the sites we studied were part of several overlapping fields. Those wider fields operated beyond the site and also within it, so that though the site could be bounded, the learning culture could not. Field dynamics impacted differently from site to site, and some struggles that were highly important in site A were hardly present in site B. Not only were the internal dynamics of sites different, so were their positions, relative to each other and to these wider fields. Consequently, to understand the learning culture of any one site, it was necessary to understand the field of FE as a whole, and the relationship of the site to that field, and to other fields of which it was part or with which it interacted. For example, the vocational sites were also part of the employment fields that they targeted. Sometimes a vocational site had very close links with particular types of employers. This was the case in a nursery nursing course and the result was highly effective learning related to doing the job, but also severe restrictions on the extent to which tutors could challenge or even question the existing practices in that field. In an electronic engineering course, specific employer demands led to a highly responsive course re-structuring, converting a 2-year programme into a 1-year version. However, this was in the context of a longer term process of decline, linked to fundamental shifts in the industry, such as changes in the nature of its products and changes in international location of manufacturing. These changes reinforced a continuing lack of synergy between course content and workplace need, and a lack of student-perceived relevance of the course. By contrast, one business studies course was almost completely detached from the employment field it claimed to serve. This made job progression and the integration of learning with actual occupational practices very difficult. These examples show how the processes and practices of a field operated within each site, and how they contributed to the construction the learning culture.

The fields of force operating in the sites and FE are also related to wide social and economic pressures. Bourdieu wrote about the field of power, which interpenetrates all others. This is the field of macro-political decision-making, and of power broking by major multinational corporations and the media, amongst others. Put another way, FE and the colleges and sites within it are interpenetrated by issues of social class, gender and ethnicity, and issues of globalization that cut across society as a whole. This interpenetration across scales is a major reason why it is a mistake to think of a learning culture or field as having precise boundaries, or that in some way we can define the 'whole' or 'total' culture.

The learning field

In this way, any learning culture functions and is constructed and reconstructed through the forces of one or more fields. Seeing fields as primarily concerned with

forces, as having imprecise and overlapping boundaries, and as existing at all scales, overcomes several of the weaknesses in existing participatory view of learning. It locates power relations at the heart of understanding learning, can operationalize the links between learning cultures and wider social structures, whilst retaining the possibility of a large scale focus on localized learning sites, where, as Lave (1996, pp. 161–162) correctly argues,

> There are enormous differences in what and how learners come to shape (or be shaped into) their identities with respect to different practices. ... Researchers would have to explore each practice to understand what is being learned, and how.

An often overlooked but important issue of difference between learning cultures relates to their stability. On the one hand, significant cultural change often happens slowly, as can be seen in the long-term changing expectations about students in English education: from passive recipients to more active participants. On the other hand, the number of influences involved in the field of force of a learning culture strongly suggests that cultural change is likely. Only in rare circumstances would all these influences and the interactions between them stay the same. However, cultural changes vary in significance and intensity. Thus, when considering the main characteristics of any learning culture, the field of force can be relatively stable, with forces in rough equilibrium for a lengthy period of time, or the culture can change both radically and rapidly, as the field of force shifts. Put differently, any learning culture can be understood over time through the relationships between continuity and change. Both are almost always present, but their inter-relationship varies from learning culture to learning culture.

For us, a key issue is how different learning cultures enable or disable different possibilities for the people that come into contact with them. The notion of field acts as a constant reminder that a course or an institution is not just a place or a context for learning, but is positioned in relation to others. This in turn means that a learning culture will permit, promote, inhibit or rule out certain kinds of learning. However, this view of learning cultures is still lacking, for as presented thus far, it shares with Engeström's model of activity systems, the tendency to marginalize individual learners, and to overlook learner agency. The solution to this problem takes us beyond the scope of this paper. However, we conclude by providing a few pointers to how the theorizing here can contribute towards bringing individual learners back in.

Incorporating individuals

To incorporate individuals and their learning into a theory of learning cultures requires an integrated cultural theory of learning. Bourdieu's thinking can help with this too, though the history of the English reception of his ideas makes this difficult to appreciate. As Robbins has explained, the arrival of Bourdieu's ideas in an exclusively educational framework, disconnected from both their philosophical underpinnings and their status as worked examples to develop tools, produced a great deal of initial misconception of them (Robbins, 2006, p. 508). One such misconception is that Bourdieu is a structural determinist, or a structural Marxist.

However, even a brief engagement with a cross-section of Bourdieu's work shows neither of these to be the case. Bourdieu's central concern is with the 'constant reciprocity or dialectic between agency and structure' (Robbins, 2006, p. 511). Thus, when he writes about individuals, as in *The Weight of the World* (Bourdieu, 1999), they are never confined to their uniqueness, and they illustrate the lived and embodied social relations of economic fields and at the same time their contribution to the maintenance of those fields (see Grenfell, 2004). Many researchers have made use of Bourdieu's thinking tools in ways that incorporate individuals (see, for example, Hodkinson *et al.*, 1996; James, 1998; Reay, 1998; Charlesworth, 2000; Bloomer & Hodkinson, 2002; Reay, *et al.*, 2005). Bourdieu himself was quite clear that the dispositions which make up a person's habitus can and do change. We would argue that learning is one major mechanism what can bring about such change. When used in this way, Bourdieu's thinking itself facilitates the integration of individuals into learning cultures and helps us understand the ways in which individual learners are mutually constitutive parts of any learning culture they participate in. It helps us to see that participation is embodied and practical, including the cognitive and emotional, as the whole person engages with the learning culture, in different ways. This argument still holds in those cases where participation entails distancing the self from many aspects of the practices that make up that culture, as when some students maintained a detached and largely uninvolved stance towards the formal learning in the AS psychology site. In this and other FE sites, the embodied nature of the learning can be seen in the ways that what is often termed informal learning is largely inseparable from what is often termed formal learning (Hodkinson & Colley, 2005).

To move the argument further, we need to deal with the fact that individuals live and learn outside any particular learning site under investigation, and in a variety of different and possibly overlapping learning cultures. Rather than see an individual transferring learning from one context to another, as in cognitive learning theories, it is more helpful to see the person as moving, in two senses. Within any learning culture, the person can move over time within it. Only one variation of such internal movement is what Lave and Wenger (1991) termed legitimate peripheral participation—moving from being a newcomer to being a full member. Also, people often move between learning cultures. This can sometimes be sequential, as when a student leaves college to start a full-time job, but can also take other forms, as when a person regularly and routinely moves from the learning culture of a college site to that of the family and home. Thus, the position of the person changes, over time.

We would argue that learning is one major mechanism through which dispositional changes come about. At the same time, changes in position and disposition can contribute to new learning. In any learning culture, the learning taking place depends significantly on the position, dispositions and relevant capital of the learner, and in turn contribute to that person's influence on the nature of the learning culture itself. That is, the learning of individuals can be understood as a process of continual becoming, through participation in several different learning cultures over time.

Acknowledgements

References

Anderson, J. R., Reder, L. M. & Simon, H. A. (1996) Situated learning and education, *Educational Researcher*, 25(4), 5–11.

Beckett, D. & Hager, P. (2002) *Life, work and learning: practice in postmodernity* (London, Routledge).

Biesta, G. J. J. (1994) Education as practical intersubjectivity. Towards a critical-pragmatic understanding of education, *Educational Theory*, 44(3), 299–317.

Biesta, G. J. J. (1995) Pragmatism as a pedagogy of communicative action, in: J. Garrison (Ed.) *The new scholarship on John Dewey* (Dordrecht, Kluwer), 105–122.

Biesta, G. J. J. (2004) ''Mind the gap!'' Communication and the educational relation, in: C. Bingham & A. M. Sidorkin (Eds). Foreword by Nel Noddings, *No education without relation* (New York, Peter Lang), 11–22.

Bloomer, M. & Hodkinson, P. (2002) Learning careers and cultural capital: adding asocial and longitudinal dimension to our understanding of learning, in: R. Nata (Ed.) *Progress in education* (vol.5) (Hauppauge, NY, Nova Science).

Bourdieu, P. (1985) The genesis of the concepts of *habitus* and of *field*, *Sociocriticism*, 2(2), 11–24.

Bourdieu, P. (1992/1996) *The rules of art* (Cambridge, Polity Press).

Bourdieu, P. (1998) *Practical reason* (Cambridge, Polity Press).

Bourdieu, P. (1999) *The weight of the world. Social suffering in contemporary society* (Oxford, Polity Press).

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992) *An invitation to reflexive sociology* (Cambridge, Polity Press).

Carey, J. W. (1992) *Communication as culture. Essays on media and society* (London, Routledge).

Charlesworth, S. (2000) Bourdieu, social suffering and working class life, in: B. Fowler (Ed.) *Reading Bourdieu on society and culture* (Oxford, Blackwell).

Cobb, P. & Bowers, J. (1999) Cognitive and situated learning perspectives in theory and practice, *Educational Researcher*, 28(2), 4–15.

Coffield, F. (Ed.) (2000) *The necessity of informal learning* (Bristol, Policy Press).

Colley, H., Hodkinson, P. & Malcolm, J. (2003) *Informality and formality in learning: a report for the Learning and Skills Research Centre* (London, Learning and Skills Research Centre).

Colley, H., James, D., Tedder, M. & Diment, K. (2003) Learning as becoming in vocational education and training: class, gender and the role of vocational habitus, *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 55(4), 471–497.

Edwards, A. (2005) Let's get beyond community and practice: the many meanings of learning by participating, *The Curriculum Journal*, 16(1), 49–65.

Engeström, Y. (2001) Expansive learning at work: towards an activity-theoretical reconceptualisation, *Journal of Education and Work*, 14(1), 133–156.

Grenfell, M. (2004) *Pierre Bourdieu—agent provocateur* (London, Continuum Books).

Grenfell, M. & James, D. (2004) Change *in* the field–chang*ing* the field: Bourdieu and the methodological practice of educational research, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4), 507–523.

Hodkinson, P. (2005) Learning as cultural and relational: moving past some troubling dualisms, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 35(1), 107–119.

Hodkinson, P. & Colley, H. (2005) Formality and informality in college-based learning, in: K. Kuenzel (Ed.) *International yearbook of adult education 31/32, 2005: informal learning, self-education and social praxis* (Koeln, Boehlau Verlag), 165–182.

Hodkinson, P., Sparkes, A. C. & Hodkinson, H. (1996) *Triumphs and tears: young people, markets and the transition from school to work* (London, David Fulton).

James, D. (1998) Higher education *field*-work: the interdependence of teaching, research and student experience, in: M. Grenfell & D. James (Eds) *Bourdieu and education: acts of practical theory* (London, Falmer).

James, D. & Biesta, G. (Eds) (2007) *Improving learning cultures in further education* (London, RoutledgeFalmer).

Lave, J. (1996) Teaching, as learning, in practice mind, *Culture and Society*, 3(3), 149–164.

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

Lewin, K. (1951) *Field theory in social science* (New York, Harper and Row).

Mey, H. (1972) *Field-theory: a study of its application in the social sciences* (D. Scott, Trans.) (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul).

Parlett, M. (1991) Reflections on field theory, *The British Gestalt Journal*, 1, 68–91. Available online at: http;//www.elementsuk.com/reflectionsonfie.html (accessed 11 September 2005).

Postlethwaite, K. (2007) Boundary crossings in research: towards a critical understanding of the research project 'Transforming Learning Cultures in Further Education', *Educational Review*, 59(4), 483–499.

Reay, D. (1998) Cultural reproduction: mothers involvement in their children's primary schooling, in: M. Grenfell & D. James (Eds) *Bourdieu and education: acts of practical theory* (London, Falmer).

Reay, D., David, M. E. & Ball, S. (2005) *Degrees of choice: social class, race and gender in higher education* (Stoke on Trent, Trentham Books).

Robbins, D. (2006) *On Bourdieu, education and society* (Oxford, The Bardwell Press).

Rogoff, B. (2003) *The cultural nature of human development* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

Sfard, A. (1998) On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one, *Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 4–13.

Vandenberghe, F. (2000) 'The real is relational': an epistemological analysis of Pierre Bourdieu's generative structuralism, in: D. Robbins (Ed.) *Pierre Bourdieu* (vol.2) (London, Sage), 381–427.

Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of practice: learning, meaning, and identity* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Wertsch, J. W. (1998) *Mind as action* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

Williams, R. (1983) *Keywords* (London, Fontana).