Creating a profession of educators with the living-theories of master and doctor educators

Jack Whitehead, Marie Huxtable

Abstract

In our last paper in GEI we presented an argument for teachers to engage in Living Educational Theory research as Continuing Professional Development. In this paper we extend our analysis to show how this can empower educators to improve their practice and, by offering as a gift the knowledge they generate in the process, contribute to the creation of a profession of educators. The extension is grounded in the idea of enhancing professionalism in education through recognising and accrediting accounts of living-educational-theories as knowledge generated by professional practitioners as master and doctor educators. We distinguish Living Educational Theory research from a living-educational-theory. Living Educational Theory research refers to the conceptual principles that distinguish the research approach. A living-educational-theory is a values-based explanation offered by an individual of their educational influence in their own learning, the learning of others and the learning of social formations. It is argued that for this knowledge to be legitimated by universities, in the form of accredited awards, an extension and transformation will be required in the dominating forms of knowledge. It is also argued that educators teaching in continuing professional development programmes need to develop their talents, knowledge and expertise by researching their own practice in the same way as the teachers they are supporting. In doing so they exemplify an educational pedagogy appropriate to providing gifted education internationally for students of any age.

Keywords

Living Theory research, professional development, educational research

Introduction

In our last paper (Whitehead and Huxtable, 2013) we presented an argument that Living Educational Theory research offers a transformational approach to Continuing Professional Development (CPD). This approach enables educators to improve their practice and offer the knowledge, expertise and talents they develop in the process, as educational gifts to their students and the profession. This form of professional development is educational for the educator and provides the basis of an inclusive, emancipating and egalitarian approach to the development of knowledge, expertise and talents as gifts by students. We offer an educational pedagogy and criteria for judging the professional development of educators in terms of them becoming master and doctor educators. We explore implications for the professional knowledge-base of education of seeing educators as knowledge-creators as well as users of existing knowledge. We contrast this approach with the idea that a knowledge-base is intended to help professionals and a professional community in capturing

the essential knowledge that is needed to underpin and improve their professional practice (Lunenberg et al., 2014: 89).

Creating and acquiring knowledge are often seen as discrete processes. Drawing on the idea of Renzulli's (Renzulli and Reis, 1997) three types of learning opportunities, we propose an approach that supports teachers to develop their talents and create and contribute knowledge as professional educators. One type of learning opportunity is the opportunity to play with ideas and to extend one's cognitive range and concern. Another involves learning opportunities with planned learning outcomes, such as workshops, seminars, Massive Online Open Courses (MOOCs), which are concerned with acquiring skills, knowledge, expertise and concepts of a field or discipline. A third provides opportunities to enquire as an expert: opportunities to create knowledge of the world, self and self in and of the world by researching questions of personal interest, in a disciplined manner, within a time frame and with valued outcomes. The valued outcomes are the validated knowledge created made public. The knowledge created is the practitioners' values-based explanation of improving praxis (Huxtable, 2012) and educational influences in learning (Whitehead, 1989). These explanations include the educational reflexivity of the educator (Whitehead, 2014a).

These opportunities are not rigid categories nor are they sequentially organised but provide a useful tool to consider the learning supported and encouraged by professional development programmes. For instance, it can be seen that a great deal of attention is currently given to training teachers. Such courses and workshops have planned learning outcomes with predetermined content delivered or transmitted in easily digestible chunks and/or through a form of apprentice learning. The quality of this form of professional development is usually assessed in terms of the cost-effectiveness of the procedures used to enable the teacher to acquire the 'received wisdoms' and mimic accepted practice. As Menter (2013) points out in an issue of Research Intelligence, the newsletter of the British Educational Research Association, which focuses on challenge and change in teacher education:

The attack on educational research takes two forms. First, through reducing the university input, teaching is in danger of becoming deprofessionalised and not having a strong enquiry-based orientation. The emphasis that the current [English] Secretary of State has put on teaching as a craft is perhaps based on his prejudices against educational theorising and his view of teaching as largely being about the transmission of (incontestable) subject knowledge. (p. 8)

All the papers in the summer 2013 issue of Research Intelligence focus on teacher education and all have a similar limitation. They fail to acknowledge teachers as experts developing their expertise by researching their praxis to improve it and generating educational knowledge that contributes to the knowledge-base of education. For example, Winch's (2013) answer to the question 'What kind of occupation is teaching?' includes a focus on judgment without any recognition of the importance of the knowledge created by professional educators of their praxis for improving education:

The ability to make sound professional judgments in educational contexts is central to good teaching. Teachers with a more complete understanding of their practice will create better learning opportunities in the classroom more consistently than the pure craftworker or executive technician. Such teachers will require, among other forms of understanding: a good grasp of the conceptual field of education and debates concerning its interpretation; a good grasp of the philosophical underpinnings of and debates about the foundations of the subjects that they teach; a critical

understanding of the scope and limits of empirical educational research; the way in which such research can and should warrant professional judgment and a good grasp of the ethical dimension of their work. (Winch, 2013: 14)

This failure to give appropriate recognition to the knowledge-creating capacities of professional educators is also pointed to by Whitehead (2014c) in a response to the British Educational Research Association-Royal Society of Arts (BERA-RSA) inquiry into research and the teaching profession (BERA, 2014):

The contributions made by the BERA-RSA inquiry, to the professional knowledge-base of education, can also be evaluated in relation to the following limitation, which has already been overcome by practitioner-researchers who are enhancing their professionalism in the generation of their living-educational-theories. This limitation, described below, and the educational knowledge generated by practitioner-researchers that has overcome these limitations, is not however recognised in the inquiry.

A major source of evidence for the contributions of the inquiry was provided in the seven academic papers that were commissioned in the course of the inquiry. Each of these papers contributes knowledge within the field of interest defined by their titles.

I suggest that a major limitation of this knowledge is that the papers omit explorations by practitioner-researchers of the educational knowledge they have created in exploring the implications of asking, researching and answering questions of the kind, 'How do I improve what I am doing?' The major limitation is that the evidence-base of the inquiry omitted any understanding of the epistemological transformations in educational knowledge and of the processes of enhancing professionalism in education that has already been provided by practitioner-researchers. I have examined elsewhere how the constraining power of education researchers, as distinct from educational researchers, influences the emergence of educational knowledge and theory (Whitehead, 2014). (Whitehead, 2014c: 15).

In BERA publications, and similarly in many CPD programmes, there is little value placed on supporting or encouraging teachers as knowledge creators researching to enhance their own practice and that of others by contributing to an educational epistemology for the professional knowledge-base of education. Even when teachers are working on masters dissertations or doctoral theses they are often more concerned with acquiring and applying the theories of others than understanding, developing and making public their own. The acquisition of knowledge of a specific field of practice is important but not a precursor to practitioners learning to create knowledge and develop expertise as an expert. Knowledge and practice of an expert is developed in the process of enquiring as an expert, not as a novice, however this is not to deny a developmental process. Recognition of development, and signposts of what constitutes excellence along that journey, not only makes the journey tenable but also is affirming for the individual. It is also educational for the individual and community as the educator makes their knowledge public for criticism and validation.

Teachers engaged in this form of professional development are recognising, improving and modelling the educational process they are espousing. We are locating this educational process within a notion of gifted education which is international; a notion of gifted education that transcends the idiosyncrasies of local and national cultures, in the same way that Crompton (2010),

drawing on Schwartz's work, shows people express similar values of humanity irrespective of their country of origin. The intrinsic values that are life-affirming and life-enhancing help to distinguish what counts as educational. Our notion of 'gifted education' is that it is the process engaged in by individuals creating and offering as 'gifts' their narratives of their learning to develop their talents, expertise and knowledge in which they explain their educational influences in their own learning, in the learning of others and in the learning of the social formations in which we live and work. We refer to these explanations as living-educational-theories (Whitehead, 1989). 'Gifted education' is the process/context/provision/practice which supports/enables individuals to learn to create and offer their living-theories as gifts; gifts as outcomes/products and gifted education as process.

In this paper we discuss:

1. gifted education as CPD for professional educators;
2. the purposes of education that distinguish what counts as educational;
3. what distinguishes Living Educational Theory (Living Theory) research and what is a living-educational-theory (living-theory);
4. what distinguishes the practice of a teacher as that of a professional educator;
5. the accreditation of knowledge of master and doctor educators in enhancing professionalism – how can the embodied knowledge of educators be made public?;
6. pedagogies for teachers in schools and higher education engaged in Living Theory research as CPD.

1. Gifted education as CPD for professional educators

We take a constructivist, systemic view of 'gifted education'. 'Talents' is the label given to values-laden skills/abilities/expertise. 'Gifts' labels the knowledge talents are used to create as contributions to the flourishing of humanity. 'Gifted education' is the process that supports students to learn lifelong how to develop and offer knowledge of the world, of self and self in and of the world, as gifts.

Our notion of gifted education is of international relevance as it transcends cultural differences and contributes to the evolution of educational knowledge and practice for the flourishing of humanity. It is consistent with the leading edge work of educationalists such as Hymer (2007, 2013) and Wallace (2008); of academic psychologists such as Deci and Ryan (2000), and Dweck (2006); and that of philosophers such as White (2007) and Biesta (2006).

The communication of the underlying beliefs and ontological and relational values of researchers, practitioners and theorists are often implicit but it is the resonance between the values and beliefs of author and reader, rather than an appeal to dispassionate intellectual reasoning, that can often explain the attraction and influence that writings have. That is not to say that each does not present their argument in a scholarly and academic fashion but rather that is not sufficient in itself to explain the educational influence of people or their work in the learning of others or in the learning of social formations; 'gifted education' exemplifies this point.

Gifts and talents are values-laden words and as such are unusual in recent English government documents and strategies concerning education. Therefore, rather than resist using such language

we want to bring it more into the discourse in the hope of evoking and working with deep frames (Lakoff, 2004) of life-affirming and life-enhancing values that should be the touchstones of education and the development of educational praxis. White (2007) points out that the content of the curriculum in England is tackled without reference to the social and cultural contexts, which inform the aims and purposes of education establishments, such as schools, colleges and universities. Many philosophers over the years, such as White (2006) and Biesta (2006), have argued coherently that the aims of education are values-based yet there continues to be a lack of focus on the development of educational theory, practice and provision that is explained and judged by values. Living Educational Theory research (Whitehead, 1989) offers a way of retaining that focus in creating a profession of educators.

As Living Theory researchers, educational practitioners research their practice to improve it and in the process generate and offer their living-theory accounts as contributions to the growth of an educational knowledge-base. An individual's living-educational-theory is the values-based explanation an individual offers for their educational influence in their own learning, the learning of others and the learning of social formations (Whitehead, 1989). The values that are clarified as they emerge in the course of the researchers' enquiries are those that are ontological and relational, that are life-affirming and life-enhancing; those that Crompton (2010), drawing on Schwartz, calls 'intrinsic'. Hymer (2013: 108) shows what we mean in his GRACE model of gift-creation:

1. G – Grow (formerly Generative-transformational)
2. R – Relate (formerly Relational)
3. A – Act (formerly Activity-orientated)
4. C – Challenge (formerly Contradictory/Dialectical)
5. E – Exert (formerly Temporal/Social)

Similarly, Wallace (2008) shows these values in practice in her TASC model of enquiry:

1. T – Thinking
2. A – Actively in a
3. S – Social
4. C – Context

These models enable learners to recognise, value, develop and offer their unique contribution; their 'i' within an i~we relationship where the individual 'i' is neither subordinated to the collective nor promoted to an elite but is recognised and valued as much as 'i am because we are' as 'we are because i am'; the 'i' not being egotistical or individualistic but rather a celebration and valuing of diversity. The 'i' researched by Living Theory researchers is the 'i' that the professional educator seeks to bring forth from their student or, as Beista (2006) might put it, to bring their student fully into presence, as they enable their students to learn to create and offer knowledge in their area of enquiry.

In the course of researching their practice, Living Theory researchers generate knowledge of the world (educational theory, practice and provision, and related matters such as instructional and curriculum design), their self and their self in and of the world, which makes this of relevance to all irrespective of age or field of enquiry.

Accrediting accounts of master and doctor educators confers recognition and valuing of the contribution professional educators make to the evolution of educational theory, practice and provision.

When we refer to 'recognition' we are bearing in mind Fukuyama's (1992) ideas:

Human beings seek recognition of their own worth, or of the people, things, or principles that they invest with worth. The desire for recognition, and the accompanying emotions of anger, shame and pride, are parts of the human personality critical to political life. According to Hegel, they are what drives the whole historical process. (p. xvii)

The existence of a moral dimension in the human personality that constantly evaluates both the self and others does not, however, mean that there will be any agreement on the substantive content of morality. In a world of thymotic moral selves, they will be constantly disagreeing and arguing and growing angry with one another over a host of questions, large and small. Hence thymos is, even in its most humble manifestations, the starting point for human conflict (pp. 181–182).

This is also expressed in the theories offered by many positive psychologists such as Deci and Ryan:

Self-determination theory (SDT) maintains that an understanding of human motivation requires a consideration of innate psychological needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness… Social contexts and individual differences that support satisfaction of the basic needs facilitate natural growth processes including intrinsically motivated behavior and integration of extrinsic motivations, whereas those that forestall autonomy, competence, or relatedness are associated with poorer motivation, performance, and well-being. (Deci and Ryan, 2000: 227)

At the heart of 'recognition' in the living-educational-theories of master and doctor educators, is what counts as 'educational' so we now turn to the purposes of education that we use to distinguish what counts as 'educational'.

2. What are the purposes of education that distinguish what counts as educational?

At the heart of our arguments for creating a profession of educators with the living-theories of master and doctor educators, is our understanding of the purposes of education. We draw insights from our understanding of these purposes from the work of Biesta (2006, 2011, 2014) and from Reiss and White (2013) where they stress relational as well as ontological values:

What are schools for? In very general terms, their aims are the same as those of a home with children. The task of both institutions is two-fold and simplicity itself, to equip each child:

to lead a life that is personally flourishing;

to help others to do so, too. (Reiss and White, 2013: 1)

We also agree with White (2007) when he says that:

We want all young people to have a successful life. This means success in worthwhile activities and relationships which they have freely engaged in and which they pursue wholeheartedly. (p. 33)

We extend these purposes to our educational purposes in CPD for adults.

Whilst we are also in agreement with White about the shift from professional to political control of the curriculum in 1988 making good sense, we are arguing for the development of a profession of educators with more autonomous powers independent of governmental control than at present. We are doing this because of the irresponsibility of the UK government in closing the General Teacher's Council as the latest professional body that could have enhanced professionalism in education in the UK. For White it is for the democratic electorate to make decisions about the curriculum and he says that a teacher should have no more voice in this than a postman. White believes in a clear division of labour between politicians and professionals. The role of government is to map out the larger contours of a national curriculum – its overall aims, underlying values, broad framework of requirements. It should leave more detailed content and implementation to teachers (p. 15).

To enhance professionalism in education and the status of the profession we are arguing that a profession of educators should also be responsible for clarifying, communicating and expressing their values that carry hope for the flourishing of humanity. We do not believe that the values of a profession of educators should be solely determined by a political decision, which in the UK is increasingly market driven, rather than consideration for the flourishing of humanity.

We also believe that individual educators have a responsibility to clarify, communicate and express their values that carry this hope. In doing this we agree with Polanyi (1958) that it is necessary for each individual to take a decision to:

…understand the world from my point of view, as a person claiming originality and exercising his personal judgement responsibly with universal intent. (p. 327)

With Biesta (2006) we agree that:

…education is not just about the transmission of knowledge, skills and values, but is concerned with the individuality, subjectivity, or personhood of the student, with their 'coming into the world' as unique, singular beings. (p. 27)

We also agree that:

The main problem with the new language of learning is that it has facilitated a redescription of the process of education in terms of an economic transaction, that is, a transaction in which (1) the learner is the (potential) consumer, the one who has certain 'needs', in which (2) the teacher, the educator, or the educational institution is seen as the provider, that is, the one who is there to meet the needs of the learner, and where (3) education itself becomes a commodity – a 'thing' – to be provided or delivered by the teacher or educational institution and to be consumed by the learner. (pp. 19–20)

The language of economics dominates educational discourse in the UK, Singapore, the USA and in many other countries. This is in sharp contrast with the language of education, which expresses the values of countries such as Finland, the Pestalozzi programme in Europe and the articles in the Educational Journal of Living Theories. These focus on the generation of living-educational-theories with values that carry hope for the flourishing of humanity.

3. What is Living Educational Theory (Living Theory) research and what is a living-educational-theory (living-theory)?

By Living Educational Theory research (often abbreviated to Living Theory research) we mean research that is focused on the generation of valid and evidence-based explanations by individuals of their educational influences in their own learning, in their own learning and in the learning of the social formations, which influence their practice and writings. We refer to such explanations (lower case and hyphenated), as living-educational-theories (Whitehead, 2014c). Living Theory research refers to conceptual understandings of the research approach that influence the generation of living-educational-theories. The conceptual understandings should not be seen as defining an individual's living-educational-theory. They should be understood as guidelines for the conduct of the research and locating within a paradigm, not strict criteria that must be applied. This distinction is important because each living-educational-theory is produced by a unique and irreplaceable individual with the development of a living-theory-methodology that is clarified and communicated in the course of its emergence in practice. The generation of a living-theory-methodology can draw insights from other methodologies that are often used in educational research such as narrative inquiry, self-study, case study, ethnography, phenomenology, autoethnography, grounded theory, critical theory and action research. The vital point in the use of such insights is that they are appropriate for answering the researcher's question. Such questions in the generation of a living-educational-theory are often of the kind, 'How do I improve what I am doing?'

When we use 'i' we are referring to the ontological and relational 'i' in the sense of an individual giving meaning and purpose to their lives through their loving relationships and productive work. The 'i' is relational in the sense described by Buber (1970):

…how beautiful and legitimate the vivid and emphatic I of Socrates sounds! It is the I of infinite conversation, and the air of conversation is present on all its ways, even before his judges, even in the final hour in prison. This I lived in that relation to man which is embodied in conversation. It believed in the actuality of men and went out toward them. Thus it stood together with them in actuality and is never severed from it. Even solitude cannot spell forsakenness, and when the human world falls silent for him, he hears his daimonion say You.

How beautiful and legitimate the full I of Goethe sounds! It is the I of pure intercourse with nature. Nature yields to it and speaks ceaselessly with it; she reveals here mysteries to it and yet does not betray her mystery. It believes in her and says to the rose: 'So it is You' – and at once shares the same actuality with the rose. Hence, when it returns to itself, the spirit of actuality stays with it; the vision of the sun clings to the blessed eye that recalls its own likeness to the sun, and the friendship of the elements accompanies man into the calm of dying and rebirth.

Thus the 'adequate, true, and pure' I-saying of the representatives of association, the Socratic and the Goethean persons, resounds through the ages. (p. 117)

Living Theory research embraces the existence of an 'i' that can at times be experienced as a living contradiction in the generation of a valid explanation of educational influence. The contradiction is always experienced as internal even when the source of the contradiction may be located within the

constraints of the social context. This embrace of 'i' as a living contradiction is significant when seen in relation to the 2500 years of argument between formal logicians and dialecticians. Formal logicians refuse to permit the existence of contradictions in valid theories. Dialecticians insist that contradictions are the nucleus of such explanations. Living Theory research recognises that an individual 'i' can hold together the values that carry hope for the flourishing of humanity together with their negation. Living Theory research can draw insights from self-study research in being focused on an explanation of the individual's educational influence. It can draw insights from ethnography in recognising the importance of sociohistorical and sociocultural influences in the generation of a valid explanation of influence. It can draw insights from autoethnography in including both the influences of the individual in their own practice and the influences of cultural influences in that practice. It can draw insights from phenomenology in generating explanations from within the experience of the educational phenomena that the individual is explaining. It can draw insights from action research in using action reflection cycles and responding to the questions:

What is my concern?

Why am I concerned?

What am I going to do about it?

As I act what data will I gather to make a judgment on my effectiveness?

How do I evaluate the effectiveness of my action?

What modifications to my concerns ideas and actions will I make in response to my evaluations?

What are my responses to the validation group when I submit my explanation of educational influence?

To strengthen the validity of an explanation in Living Theory research four questions derived from Habermas's (1976) four criteria of social validity can be used:

1. How can I improve the comprehensibility of my explanation?
2. How can I strengthen the evidence I use to justify my assertions?
3. How can I extend and deepen my sociohistorical and sociocultural understandings of their influences on my practice and writings?
4. How can I enhance the authenticity of my explanations to show that I am truly committed to the values I claim to hold?

And we often add to these questions two more:

Do I offer a well-reasoned and reasonable explanation of why I do what I do?

As you engage with this account, has your imagination been stimulated and might those thoughts contribute anything to your educational journey as you seek to improve your educational contexts and relationships?

In Living Theory research explanatory principles are clarified, communicated and evolved in the course of their emergence in practice in enquiries that include the living 'i' as fully as possible, living

values that carry hope for the flourishing of humanity. This clarification, communication and evolution require the embodied knowledge of educators to be made public.

As teachers who are professional educators we are offering an approach to the professional development of teachers, educators and teacher educators that can be distinguished from the analysis offered by Lunenberg et al. (2014) in their review study of the professional development of teacher-educators with the three research questions that guided their study:

What professional roles of teacher educators can be identified?

What are the critical features determining the professional roles of teacher educators and the accompanying professional behaviour?

What are the critical features determining the development of the professional roles and the accompanying professional behaviour of teacher educators?

On the basis of their analysis, Lunenberg et al. (2014) give an overview of blind spots in the current research and offer suggestions for further research. We are suggesting that a blind spot in their analysis concerns the role of teacher educators in making public the embodied knowledges and their evolution of master and doctor educators.

We are also concerned with what we see as a blind spot in a report from BERA together with the RSA on 'Research and the teaching profession: Building the capacity for a self-improving education system' (BERA, 2014). The report is focused on contributions to educational knowledge. The contributions of the inquiry to educational knowledge are clearly set out in the executive summary with recommendations that are jurisdiction-specific on initial teacher education; CPD; research leadership and capacity and practitioner engagement. The recommendations also focus on the potential for greater dialogue than currently takes place amongst policymakers, practitioners, teacher-researchers and the wider research community.

We are suggesting that a blind spot in these recommendations is that they ignore the educational knowledge already generated by teacher-researchers, as exemplified by the other articles in this issue of GEI.

The contributions made by the BERA-RSA inquiry, to the professional knowledge-base of education, can also be evaluated in relation to the following limitation, which has already been overcome by practitioner-researchers who are enhancing their professionalism in the generation of their living-educational-theories. This limitation, described below, and the educational knowledge generated by practitioner-researchers, which has overcome these limitations, is not however recognised in the inquiry.

A major source of evidence for the contributions of the inquiry was provided in the seven academic papers that were commissioned in the course of the inquiry. Each of these papers contributes knowledge within the field of interest defined by their titles.

We are suggesting that a major limitation of this knowledge is that the papers omit explorations by teachers as professional educators of the educational knowledge they have created in exploring the implications of asking, researching and answering questions of the kind, 'How do I improve what I

am doing?' The major limitation is that the evidence-base of the inquiry omitted any understanding of the epistemological transformations in educational knowledge and of the processes of enhancing professionalism in education that have already been provided by teachers as professional educators. One of us has examined elsewhere how the constraining power of education researchers, as distinct from educational researchers, influences the emergence of educational knowledge and theory (Whitehead, 2014d). In developing our case that we must go beyond these limitations in the 2014 BERA-RSA inquiry, we shall distinguish the practice of a teacher as that of a professional educator.

4. What distinguishes the practice of a teacher as that of a professional educator?

In his 1967 study of improving professionalism in education, Whitehead used Fisher's and Thomas' (1965) four criteria for distinguishing a profession:

1. A long period of specialized training.

2. A broad range of autonomy for both the individual practitioners and for the occupational group as a whole.

3. An acceptance by the practitioners of broad personal responsibility for judgments made and acts performed within the scope of professional autonomy.

4. A comprehensive self-governing organization of practitioners. (p. 325)

In defining a profession of educators we are adding a fifth criterion:

5. Making a contribution to the professional knowledge-base of education.

This fifth criterion is at the heart of our case for enhancing professionalism in education when we focus on the importance of continually creating and making public our embodied knowledge as educators through our practitioner-research.

We are using this fifth criterion to distinguish the practice of a teacher as that of a professional educator. Following one's initial accreditation as a teacher in England and Wales there is no requirement to engage in masters and/or doctoral degree studies in a lifelong process of CPD. In some countries, such as Finland and Iceland, the government funds teacher education programmes for a masters profession. But these are exceptions around the world. We distinguish the practice of a teacher as that of a professional educator with the accreditation of the evidence-based living-educational-theories that explain the educational influences of a teacher as educator in their own learning, in the learning of others and in the learning of the social formations in which the practice is located.

We are proposing a further distinction between master and doctor educator to enhance professionalism by focusing on making public the embodied knowledge of educators together with its evolution. We believe that the self-studies of teacher educators have an important role to play in making public this embodied knowledge. The Proceedings of the self-study of teacher education practices (Garbett and Ovens, 2014), special interest group of the American Educational Research Association, show the contributions of Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices (S-STEP) members

to the knowledge-base of education. What we are arguing (Whitehead, 2014a; Whitehead and Huxtable, 2014) is that the self-studies of teacher educators could make further contributions to the professional knowledge-base of education, by gaining accreditation for the explanations of educational influence in making public the embodied knowledge of master and doctor educators. In focusing on the living-educational-theories of master and doctor educators we are going beyond the limitations in Research Intelligence (BERA, 2013) of BERA on 'Challenge and change in teacher education' with its focus on the craft dimensions of teachers' practices and seeing teachers as 'technicians'.

5. The accreditation of knowledge of master and doctor educators in enhancing professionalism – How can the embodied knowledge of educators be made public?

We are making a clear distinction between degrees that are 'professional qualifications' but are not concerned with the creation and improvement of educational theory practice and provision, and the recognition of teachers whose practice is that of master and doctor educators. For example, you can be awarded a professional doctorate without generating knowledge of practice that makes a contribution to the professional knowledge-base of education. Our own professional masters' degrees were not related to our professional competence as educational professionals, whilst in contrast to this our living-theory PhDs provided evidence-based explanations of our educational influences.

We are not suggesting that master and doctoral degrees have no relevance to the development of the profession of educator – quite the contrary. We see the scholarship and rigour of enquiry demanded by the Academy making a significant contribution to the gifted education of teachers as educators by offering criteria by which they can recognise excellence in the development of their talents and knowledge as gifts to support educational learning of their students. We exemplify as follows:

Recognising master educators

Whilst tutoring the masters in education units and dissertations in the School of Education of the University of Bath we used the following assessment elements and level statements provided by the university. These, when used with respect to the public embodied knowledge of the educators, are what we are meaning by recognising the professional knowledge of a master educator:

Overall

1. Scholarship: The extent of knowledge and depth of analysis.
2. Perspective: The breadth of view, critical perception and insight.
3. Coherence: The synthesis and control of material and the persuasiveness of arguments.
4. Content: Relevance of the topic to the content of the unit and the participant's experience.

Structure

The structure and the way it enables arguments to develop logically and lead to reasoned conclusion.

Presentation

1. Clarity: Communication of ideas, use of syntax and typographical presentation.
2. Style: Use of language.
3. Appearance: Visual impression and clarity of layout.
4. Length: Number of words specified for the assignment.
5. Referencing: Accuracy in citation and attribution, and the application of academic conventions.

Analysis

1. Argument: The line of argument within an appropriate conceptual framework.
2. Interpretation: The development of a perspective through a reflective consideration within an appropriate conceptual framework.
3. Evaluation: The weighing of evidence, exploration of other options and the basis of judgements.
4. Application: Where appropriate, the application of findings and arguments in a reflective manner to the improvement of educational practices.

Use of sources

1. Scope and number: Familiarity with a range of literature germane to the topic.
2. Types of sources: The range of different types of sources used.
3. Methodology and methods (For dissertations and assignments based on empirical study)
4. Methodology: The explanation of the kind of study undertaken and the justification of the methodology.
5. Design: The explanation and justification of the chosen methods and the overall design.
6. Critique: The consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of methodology, design and underpinning theories.

Recognising doctor educators

Whilst completing our doctoral research in the School of Education of the University of Bath and supervising doctoral research at the University of Cumbria we apply the following criteria to the public embodied knowledge of the educators, to show what we are meaning by recognising the professional knowledge of a doctor educator.

Most universities around the world are consistent in the criteria they use for the award of a doctoral degree. These criteria include making an original contribution to knowledge with a comprehensible methodology. They include evidence that the thesis shows a critical engagement with appropriate literature. They require that the thesis contain matter worthy of publication although it need not be included in a form ready for publication.

The process of making public the embodied knowledge of educators appears simple. All it requires is for an individual educator to be exploring the implications of asking, researching and answering a question of the kind, 'How do I improve what I am doing?' in the context of professional practice. There are many methodological approaches that can provide insights in such enquiries, such as action research, self-study, narrative enquiry, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology,

ethnography and authoethnography. Whilst these approaches can provide insights, each individual will creative their own methodological approach to enquiring into their unique question. Dadds and Hart have referred to this creativity in terms of methodological inventiveness:

Perhaps the most important new insight for both of us has been awareness that, for some practitioner researchers, creating their own unique way through their research may be as important as their self-chosen research focus. We had understood for many years that substantive choice was fundamental to the motivation and effectiveness of practitioner research (Dadds 1995); that what practitioners chose to research was important to their sense of engagement and purpose. But we had understood far less well that how practitioners chose to research, and their sense of control over this, could be equally important to their motivation, their sense of identity within the research and their research outcomes. (Dadds and Hart, 2001: 166)

In our tutoring and supervision of teacher-researchers we stress the importance for each individual of producing their own living-theory-methodology in the generation of their own living-educational-theory. This emphasis on the knowledge-creating capacities of professional educators is not at the expense of acknowledging and using insights, where appropriate, from existing theories and methodologies. In what follows we show how our pedagogies, drawing on such insights and our own theories and methodology, have influenced practitioners evolving and making public their embodied knowledge.

6. Pedagogies for tutors engaged in living theory research as CPD

Our pedagogies as Living Theory researchers are consistent with our intentions and pedagogies as educators; enabling students (young as well as adult) to learn to live loving, satisfying, productive and worthwhile lives and able to recognise, value and make their unique contributions to a world in which humanity can flourish.

Teachers, tutors and supervisors can support the generation of living-educational-theories by grounding their pedagogies within the recognition of the importance of the methodological inventiveness of their students (Dadds and Hart, 2001: 169). In supporting this form of professional development we keep our educational intent in sharp focus. We are careful to also keep in mind that organisations, institutions and practitioners are primarily required by government to concern themselves with improving instruction and training rather than education.

As you engage in the organic phase of CPD (Huxtable, 2014) through creating your living-theories you may, at various times, or at the same time, be gathering and organising what is known in your field, implementing a plan of action or clarifying your concerns. You may use qualitative and quantitative methods developed by social scientists, and draw on those theories and knowledge developed by academics and practitioners in various fields and disciplines.

The tendency is to want to dash to the end and write to explain yourself to a reader that is to produce a 'readerly text' as distinct from a 'writerly text'. A 'readerly text' is a text, or multimedia narrative, intended to attract and hold the attention of the reader, and communicate the knowledge created educationally. To create a 'readerly text' begins by creating a 'writerly text'. A writerly text is produced in the first place, not with an audience in mind but to enable you, as practitioner-

researcher, to recognise, value and work with the knowledge you have created in the process of researching your practice to improve it. As the writings are produced a focus begins to emerge and as you engage in the systematic phase of Living Theory research you draw in and add to work created in the organic phase.

In the organic phase of Living Theory research numerous multimedia narratives may be created, which may appear to have no coherence or even relevance at the time. These may be created when you don't have a focus or even an intention to create an account. You may begin by telling often apparently disconnected stories of what is important to you. Later this provides places of reflection, which will enable you to recognise the knowledge you have acquired and have created and embodied. It also provides a source of data to draw on as evidence when you come to create a readerly text. You may produce a brief autobiographical story to help you begin to clarify your values and beliefs. You may begin a systematic phase of enquiry when you see you are living a contradiction or experiencing a contradiction to your values: you decide you need to do something differently, imagine possibilities, act accordingly, evaluate and so on.

In the organic phase of research, stories may be created variously as time, other commitments and interests move. On one occasion, you may be reading work that excites you and create notes for yourself while working on an action-reflection cycle dictated by circumstances or interest. On another occasion, you may get an idea of something you might do, but do not follow through in action although this took your thinking forward. As you move through life and create trails in the form of narratives, notes, images and videos and come to create a readerly text, you may find you have data scattered round to draw as did Hymer (2007). Working with video and accompanying text to produce a multimedia narrative further clarifies the thinking and praxis (Huxtable, 2012) for you and for others.

As we have said, we go through two phases in our pedagogies and researching that are distinguishable but are dynamically inter-related. Research is often thought by educators to start with 'exploration', laying out what is already known, or as TASC would have it, 'gather and organise'. We take Whitehead's ideas of values and embodied knowledge being revealed and evolved through researching to improve practice, and suggest that a common starting place is with reflecting on and 'learning from experience'. As we reflect over what has been, we ask ourselves questions such as:

What have I learnt about my values, myself, my passions?

What skills and understandings have I extended?

What talents have I developed and which do I need to develop?

How does what I have learnt connect with other ideas?

What knowledge have I created that I value?

How have I affected others?

How have I contributed to and benefited from my own learning and the learning of others?

What are my embodied educational theories and beliefs?

What do I want to explore now?

The understandings are carried up into the heart of the enquiry, where the questions concerning what is of current importance, and why, begin to emerge as the researcher connects with the anticipated audience of the account. The why is an important question to pose and comes directly from the Living Theory research process which emphasises the importance of ontological and relational values as those values that the individual uses to give meaning and purpose to their life. We have seen the influence that posing that question has had on students beginning to enquire into what is important to them. It deepened their understanding not only of the discipline related enquiry but their understanding of themselves and how they want to be in the world. The influence on the research of teachers engaged in their CPD can be seen in the other articles in this edition of GEI and the masters assignments at http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/mastermod.shtml.

Our pedagogies reflect the continuously evolving nature of living-educational-theories as we encourage the extension and deepening of the individual's cognitive range and concern. In this encouragement we draw attention to the original contributions to educational knowledge made by other Living Theory researchers as can be found on http://actionresearch.net/living/living.shtml.

We are also mindful of the vital importance of including life-affirming and life-enhancing ontological and relational values with their accompanying emotions in the explanatory principles that individuals use to explain their educational influences in learning, in different cultural contexts (Coombs et al., 2014). In our experience many Living Theory researchers initially shy away from including values such as love and compassion as explanatory principles in their academic and scholarly work. In our tutoring and supervision it has become increasing clear to us just how important it is to 'love what we are doing' (Lohr, 2006), 'being loved into learning' (Delong et al., 2013: 78) and to express 'compassion' (Naidoo, 2005) towards ourselves and others in our educational practice. We are also mindful of the significance of clarifying and communicating cultural values from societies different to our own yet where the contribution of each person is valued. For instance, we are thinking here of the embodied expressions of the meanings, rather than a solely lexical expression of meaning using words alone, of justice as offered by Sullivan (2006) from an Irish perspective and of Ubuntu offered by Charles (2007) from an Afro-Caribbean perspective. We also want to draw attention to insights emerging from different epistemologies, such as Inoue's (2012) arguments for the inclusion of insights from East Asian epistemologies within western ways of knowing.

Interim conclusion

In offering the above ideas for creating a profession of educators with the living-theories of master and doctor educators we realise that it will be important to establish a professional body of educators that can give this recognition. Until this professional body is established we are suggesting that we, as individual educators, should recognise each other as master and doctor educators as we offer accounts of praxis (Huxtable, 2012), which fulfils the criteria set out above. In particular we have focused on the knowledge-creating capacities of master and doctor educators for generating their contributions to a professional knowledge-base in the form of their living-educational-theories. All the living-educational-theories discussed above include the life-affirming and life-enhancing ontological and relational values of the educators as explanatory principles and living standards of

judgment (Laidlaw, 1996). These living-educational-theories have been offered as gifts, freely accessible on the web (for instance from http://www.actionresearch.net), to the knowledge-base of education in the hope that you will find them useful in generating and sharing your own.

References

BERA (2013) Challenge and Change in Teacher Education. Research Intelligence 121: 1–32, Summer.

BERA (2014) Research and the teaching profession: Building the capacity for a self-improving education system. London: British Educational Research Association.

Biesta GJJ (2006) Beyond Learning; Democratic Education for a Human Future. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Biesta GJJ (2011) Philosophy, exposure, and children: How to resist the instrumentalisation of philosophy in education. Journal of Philosophy of Education 45 (2): 305–319.

Biesta GJJ (2014) The Beautiful Risk of Education. London: Paradigm.

Buber M (1970) I and Thou. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark

Charles E (2007) How can I bring Ubuntu as a living standard of judgment into the academy? Moving beyond decolonisation through societal reidentification and guiltless recognition. PhD Thesis, University of Bath, UK. Available at: http://www.actionresearch.net/edenphd.shtml (accessed 10 August 2014).

Coombs S, Potts M, Whitehead J (2014) International Educational Development and Learning through Sustainable Partnerships: Living Global Citizenship. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Crompton T (2010) Common cause: The case for working with our cultural values. Available at: http://www.wwforg.uk/change (accessed 8 August 2014).

Dadds M, Hart S (2001) Doing Practitioner Research Differently. London: Routledge Falmer.

Deci EL, Ryan RM (2000) The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. Psychological Inquiry 11: 227–268.

Delong J, Griffin C, Campbell E, (2013) The significance of living-theory action research in a culture of inquiry transforms learning in elementary, high school and post-graduate settings. Educational Journal of Living Theories 6(2): 79–96. Available at: http://ejolts.net/archive (accessed 8 August 2014).

Dweck CS (2006) Mindset: The New Psychology of Success. New York: Random House.

Fisher L, Thomas DR (1965) Social Foundations of Educational Decisions. California: Wadsworth

Publishing Company, Inc.

Fukuyama F (1992) The End of History and the Last Man. London: Penguin.

Garbett D, Ovens A (eds) (2014) Proceedings of the tenth international conference on self-study of teacher education practices, University of Auckland, New Zealand, 4–6 August 2014. Available at: www.castleconference.com (accessed 9 August 2014).

Habermas J (1976) Communication and the Evolution of Society. London: Heinemann

Huxtable M (2012) How do I evolve living-educational-theory praxis in living-boundaries? PhD Thesis, University of Bath, UK. Available at: http://www.actionresearch.net/living/mariehuxtable.shtml (accessed 10 August 2014).

Huxtable M (2014) Exploring the implications of supporting educational research for developing professional practice. In: British Educational Research Association conference on creating an educational epistemology through living educational theories, Institute of Education, University of London, UK, 23–25 September 2014.

Hymer B (2007) How do I understand and communicate my values and beliefs in my work as an educator in the field of giftedness? DEdPsy Thesis, University of Newcastle, UK. Available at: http://actionresearch.net/living/hymer.shtml (accessed 18 July 2014).

Hymer B (2013) An act of GRACE? What do contemporary understandings in psychology have to contribute to the future of gifted education? Gifted Education International 29 (2): 108–124.

Inoue N (2012) Mirrors of the Mind: Introduction to Mindful Ways of Thinking Education. New York: Peter Lang.

Laidlaw M (1996) How can I create my own living educational theory as I offer you an account of my educational development? PhD Thesis, University of Bath, UK. Available at: http://www.actionresearch.net/living/moira2.shtml (accessed 11 August 2014).

Lakoff G (2004) Don't Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green.

Lohr E (2006) Love at work: What is my lived experience of love, and how may I become an instrument of love's purpose? PhD Thesis, University of Bath, UK. Available at: http://www.actionresearch.net/lohr.shtml (accessed 10 August 2014).

Lunenberg M, Dengerink J, Korthagan F (2014) The Professional Teacher Educator: Roles, Behaviour and Professional Development of Teacher Educators. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Menter I (2013) What is going on? Critical times in teacher education and educational research. Research Intelligence 121: 8.

Naidoo M (2005) I am because we are (a never ending story). The emergence of a living theory of

inclusional and responsive practice. PhD Thesis, University of Bath, UK. Available at: http://actionresearch.net/living/naidoo.shtml (accessed 11 August 2014.)

Polanyi M (1958) Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Reiss M, White J (2013) An Aims-Based Curriculum: The Significance of Human Flourishing for Schools. London: IOE.

Renzulli J, Reis S (1997) The Schoolwide Enrichment Model: A How to Guide for Educational Excellence. Connecticut, MA: Creative Learning Press.

Sullivan B (2006) A living theory of a practice of social justice: Realising the right of traveller children to educational equality. PhD Thesis, The University of Limerick, Republic of Ireland. Available at: http://www.jeanmcniff.com/items.asp?id=47 (accessed 11 August 2014).

Wallace B (2008) The early seedbed of the growth of TASC: Thinking Actively in a Social Context. Gifted Education International 24 (2/3): 139–155.

White J (2006) Intelligence, Destiny and Education: The Ideological Roots of Intelligence Testing. London: Routledge.

White J (2007) What Schools are For and Why. London: Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain.

Whitehead J (1967) The way to professionalism in education? Unpublished special study from the Dip. Ed. programme at the University of Newcastle, UK.

Whitehead J (1989) Creating a living educational theory from questions of the kind, 'How do I improve my practice?' Cambridge Journal of Education 19: 41–52.

Whitehead J (2014a) Enacting educational reflexivity in supervising research into creating living-educational-theories. Educational Research for Social Change 3(2): 81–93. Available at: http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/jwERSC6-2-031014.pdf (accessed 20 October 2014).

Whitehead J (2014b) A self-study contribution to a history of the self-study of teacher education practices. In: Garbett D, Ovens A (eds) Proceedings of the tenth international conference on self-study of teacher education practices, University of Auckland, New Zealand, 4–6 August 2014. Available at: www.castleconference.com (accessed 9 August 2014).

Whitehead J (2014c) Enhancing professionalism in education through the living-theories of practitioner-researchers. Keynote address to a conference of the Research Institute for Professional Learning in Education (RIPLE) of the University of Cumbria, Cumbria, UK, 18 June 2014. Available at: http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/jwcumbria180614.pdf (accessed 11 August 2014).

Whitehead J (2014d) How does the constraining power of education researchers influence the emergence of educational knowledge and theory? A presentation at the 2014 annual conference of

the American Educational Research Association, Philadelphia, USA, 6 April 2014, at a session of the Philosophical Studies in Education SIG on Educational Responses to Epistemological Issues. Available at: http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/aera14/jwaera2014indiv110314.pdf (accessed 11 August 2014).

Whitehead J, Huxtable M (2013) Living educational theory research as transformational continuing professional development. Gifted Education International 29(3): 221–227. Available at: http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/jwmhGEIarticle141012.pdf (accessed 10 August 2014).

Whitehead J, Huxtable M (2014) Generating living-educational-theories from changing practices for changing times: Past, present and future possibilities of self-study research. In: Garbett D, Ovens A (eds) Proceedings of the tenth international conference on self-study of teacher education practices, University of Auckland, New Zealand, 4–6 August 2014. Available at: www.castleconference.com (accessed 9 August 2014).

Winch C (2013) What kind of occupation is teaching? Research Intelligence 121: 13–14.