

Enhancing Professionalism in Education through the Living-Theories of Practitioner-Researchers.

Jack Whitehead, University of Cumbria.

A presentation to the Research Institute for Professional Learning in Education (RIPE) Summer Conference 18 June 2014, Carlisle with the theme of ‘Teacher Researchers: change agents at work’.

My thanks to the organizers of this year’s RIPE Summer Conference for the delightful opportunity to contribute to the theme of the conference on ‘Teacher Researchers: change agents at work’, with my address on ‘Enhancing Professionalism in Education through the Living-Theories of Practitioner-Researchers.’ I say ‘delightful’ because it enables me to reflect and share what I have learnt from some 47 years of professional engagement in education since writing, in 1967, my special study on my initial teacher education programme on ‘The Way To Professionalism In Education?’ in the library of St. Martin’s College that is now the Lancaster campus of the University of Cumbria. In 2013 I was pleased to accept a 5 year contract with the University of Cumbria as an Honorary Professor in Education with the role of supporting research and in fulfilling this role I identify with the Research Institute for Professional Learning in Education:

RIPE draws on a range of research methodologies with a particular emphasis on applied research for the improvement of practice. We use, and support serving teachers in using, a range of practitioner and action research methodologies including mixed methods approaches, ‘Living Theory’ action research, narrative enquiry and phenomenological enquiry. The purpose is to generate knowledge and evaluate practice in a wide range of professional contexts through practitioner, collaborative and child-centred methods. RIPE is particularly successful in supporting teachers and schools in using research as an intensive and effective form of continuing professional development. (<http://www.cumbria.ac.uk/Courses/SubjectAreas/Education/Research/RIPE/HowWeDoResearch.aspx>)

In supporting the purpose of RIPE to generate knowledge and evaluate practice in a wide range of professional contexts I shall focus on the contribution we could make, as contributors to RIPE, to enhancing professionalism in education. I shall suggest that at the heart of this contribution is the recognition of each other as educators.

In emphasising the importance of this recognition of each other as educators I am drawn to Fukuyama’s (1992) point:

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)

I have organized my presentation in terms of:

- i) Defining a profession.
- ii) What is educational?
- iii) What constitutes a living-educational-theory?¹
- iv) Enhancing professionalism in education through generating and sharing the living-theories of master and doctor educators.
- v) Responding to the 2014 BERA-RSA report on ‘Research and the Teaching Profession: Building the capacity for a self-improving education system’ (BERA, 2014).
- vi) Recognising each other as master and doctor educators.

i) Defining a profession

In my 1967 study of improving professionalism in education I used Fisher’s and Thomas’ (1966) four criteria for distinguish a profession:

- i) A long period of specialized training.
- ii) A broad range of autonomy for both the individual practitioners and for the occupational group as a whole.
- iii) An acceptance by the practitioners of broad personal responsibility for judgments made and acts performed within the scope of professional autonomy.
- iv) A comprehensive self-governing organization of practitioners.

In defining a profession of educators I shall add to the above criteria the fifth criterion of:

- v) Making a contribution to the professional knowledge-base.

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

The lack of progress in enhancing professionalism in education, since 1967 can be appreciated, for instance, by the decision of SSAT (The Schools Network) to launch a campaign to professionalise the teaching profession !

The most recent conference, held in Manchester on 5-6 December 2013 at Manchester Central, saw the launch of SSAT's campaign to professionalise the teaching profession. (see - <http://www.ssatuk.co.uk/>)

ii) What is educational?

Gert Biesta (2006) points to one of the challenges we have to face today, that is the disappearance of a language of education in the age of learning (p. 118). He points to one way of understanding education that helps us respond to this challenge. I would

¹ I also use living-theory as a shorthand for living-educational-theory. Living Educational Theory refers to the paradigm, methodology and methods used by individuals in creating their own unique living-educational-theory from the ground of their methodological inventiveness (Dadds & Hart, 2011).

like to take his argument further in developing our language of what is **educational** and so enhance professionalism through improving educational theorising and practice with living-educational-theories.

My introduction to the language of education was through Richard Peter's (1966) text on Ethics and Education in which he argued for a view of education that was distinguished by the transmission of something worthwhile to those committed to it, in a morally acceptable way that involved some degree of wittingness on the part of the learning. The view of educational theory, known as the disciplines approach that dominated teacher education courses in England during the late 1960 and 1970s was that it was constituted by the disciplines of the philosophy, sociology, psychology and history of education. In other words, unlike Biesta, I believe that we have a well developed language of education. However, we do not have a well developed language of what is educational.

Not all learning is educational. History shows us many examples in which individuals and cultures have learnt to commit crimes against humanity. I was born in 1944 at a time when millions of human beings were seen as sub-human and killed because of their difference to the dominant group. This has focused my attention on the responsibility of seeing what is educational as involving learning that carries hope for the flourishing of humanity. In other words I distinguish what is educational as involving learning and values that carry this hope. When I use the term educational knowledge I am meaning knowledge of learning that carries hope for the flourishing of humanity such as the value of becoming human described by Ginott (1972):

Dear Teacher,

I am a survivor of a concentration camp. My eyes saw what no man should witness:

Gas chambers built by learned engineers.

Children poisoned by educated physicians.

Infants killed by trained nurses.

Women and babies shot and burned by high school and college graduates.

So, I am suspicious of education. My request is: help your students become human. Your efforts must never produce learned monsters, skilled psychopaths, educated Eichmanns.

Reading, writing and arithmetic are important only if they serve to make our children more human. (p.317)

iii) What constitutes a living-educational-theory?

A living-educational-theory is an individual's explanation of their educational influence in their own learning, in the learning of others and in the learning of the social formations which influence the practice and the writings. I first put forward the idea of a living form of educational theory in an analysis of my educational development (Whitehead, 1985) and developed this idea into a living-educational-theory (Whitehead, 1989). I later made the distinction between Living Educational Theory as an approach to Educational Research and a living-educational-theory as an

individual's unique explanation of their educational influences in learning (Whitehead, 2013).

The following brief narrative of my professional learning in education serves to explain my interest in generating educational theories that include the practical principles that you and I use to explain why we do what we do. It also serves to emphasise the importance of bearing in mind the sociohistorical and socioculture pressures, often exerted by universities, that eliminate the practical principles of practitioners from what counts as educational theory. I make this point because of my own experience of succumbing to these pressures in my own research and of recognizing the importance of submitted explanations of educational influence to democratic forms of evaluation, in overcoming these pressures.

My professional engagement includes some 6 years teaching science in London Comprehensive Schools with three years as Head of Science in Erkenwald Comprehensive School in Barking. During this period between 1967-1973 I enhanced my professional learning and development through studying for the Academic Diploma in philosophy and psychology of education and the Master's Degree in the psychology of education at the Institute of Education of London University. This experience of academic study of education transformed my sense of vocation from being a science teacher in comprehensive schools to becoming an educational researcher in a University with a focus on the generation of educational theory. The transformation came about because of what I perceived as a mistake in the dominant view of educational theory in my academic study of education, known as the 'disciplines' approach to educational theory. In this approach educational theory was held to be constituted by the philosophy, psychology, sociology and history of education. Some 11 years after I joined the School of Education at the University of Bath, Paul Hirst (1983), one of the proponents of the disciplines approach to educational theory acknowledged the following mistake when he wrote that much understanding of educational theory will be developed:

... in the context of immediate practical experience and will be co-terminous with everyday understanding. In particular, many of its operational principles, both explicit and implicit, will be of their nature generalisations from practical experience and have as their justification the results of individual activities and practices.

In many characterisations of educational theory, my own included, principles justified in this way have until recently been regarded as at best pragmatic maxims having a first crude and superficial justification in practice that in any rationally developed theory would be replaced by principles with more fundamental, theoretical justification. That now seems to me to be a mistake. Rationally defensible practical principles, I suggest, must of their nature stand up to such practical tests and without that are necessarily inadequate. (p. 18)

The mistake was in replacing the practical principles used by teachers to explain their educational influences with the principles from the disciplines of education. I am suggesting that the language and logic of the academic study of education that generated this mistake, is also at work in the BERA-RSA (2014) inquiry I consider below.

My change in vocation was driven by a desire to contribute to enhancing professionalism in education by focusing on the generation of valid forms of educational theory that included the practical educational principles of professional practitioners.

The theme of the conference on 'Teacher Researchers: Change agents at work', resonates with my own concerns.

I first focused on the 'Teacher as Researcher' in 1972 in the conclusion of my Masters Dissertation on 'A preliminary investigation of the process through which adolescents acquire scientific understanding' (Whitehead, 1972):

It is perhaps unjustified to infer too much into the fact that of 111 projects reported to the Schools Council Document Projects in June 1971, 76 were situated in Universities, 11 in Colleges of Education and 2 in Schools. These figures would seem to be an indication, however, of at least one unquestioned assumption, educational research is best done in Universities. It may be that the effectiveness of the transmission of valued knowledge within schools would be improved by situating more projects within schools with teachers as educational researchers. (p.46)

This point can be related to the locations of the researchers who contributed commissioned papers to the BERA-RSA Inquiry and the researchers who formed the steering group (Appendix 1).

My first research project with the teacher as researcher driving improvements in schools was one of the first Local Curriculum Development Projects funded by the Schools Council in 1975-76. The draft and the final report I produced on the project show a transformation in my understandings of how to explain the educational influences of individuals in their own learning and in the learning of others. The draft report shows how I succumbed to the historical and cultural pressures of academic writing by using models of changes in teacher and learning, evaluation and innovation to explain the teachers' learning, whilst eliminating the practical principles the teachers used to explain their own learning. I had regressed as an 'academic researcher' to working within the limitations of the 'disciplines' approach to educational theory in eliminating the practical principles of the teachers I was working with.

Whitehead, J. (1976) An 11-14 Mixed Ability Project in Science: The Report on a local curriculum Development. DRAFT March 1976
<http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/jack/jwmaemarch1976all.pdf>

On submitting this draft report to the teachers for their critical reflections I was surprised by their response when they said that they recognized the academic quality of the report but could not see themselves in it. They asked me to go back to the data I had collected and reconstruct the report so that they could see themselves reflected in it.

With the help of Paul Hunt, a former PGCE student of mine who was working in his first year of teacher in one of the project schools the report was reconstructed to the liking of the teachers who affirmed its validity:

Whitehead, J. (1976) Improving Learning for 11-14 Year Olds in Mixed Ability Science Groups. Final Report August 1976

<http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/ilmagall.pdf>

The differences between the reports are most marked. The draft report explains professional learning in terms of the most advanced academic theories of the day and omits the practical principles of the teachers. The final report explains professional learning in terms of the practical principles of the teachers with insights from the most advanced academic theories of the day.

The differences between these two reports highlights a tension I have felt throughout my professional life in education. It is the tension between the historical and cultural pressures to explain educational influences in learning from within the theories of the disciplines of education and the recognition that explanations of educational influences in learning should include the practical principles of the practitioner who is working and researching to improve practice in enquiries of the kind, 'How do I improve what I am doing?' This question is missing from the titles of the papers below that were commissioned by the BERA-RSA Inquiry (Appendix 1). I am suggesting that the authors of the papers are constrained by historical and cultural pressures to keep within the accepted canons of academic writing that eliminates the 'I' and the practical principles, in the knowledge generated by practitioner-researchers.

My own resolution of this tension has been to focus on the explanations produced by an individual to explain their educational influence in their own learning, in the learning of others and in the learning of the social formations in which they work and research. I think that it is worth emphasising that I call these explanations living-educational-theories to distinguish them from the explanations derived from the theories of the disciplines of education. These explanations draw insights from the most advanced social theories of the day without being reduced to the explanations of any of these theories. I want to be clear about this point. I am suggesting that everyone present today has the capability of producing a valid explanation of their educational influence in learning and that a valid explanation will include insights from the most advanced social theories of the day. In saying this I am not devaluing the importance of these insights or the work of academic researchers in the disciplines of education who are generating these theories. What I am doing is making a clear distinction between education research and educational research. I am seeing education research in terms of such forms and fields of research as the philosophy, psychology, sociology, history, economics, theology, management, leadership and administration of education. I am seeing educational research in terms of educational enquiries that produce valid explanations of the educational influences of individuals in their own learning, in the learning of others and in the learning of the social formations in which we live and work.

The importance of addressing social issues in the generation of a living-educational-theory was highlighted by the late Susan Noffke when she wrote in a direct reference to living-educational-theories:

As vital as such a process of self-awareness is to identifying the contradictions between one's espoused theories and one's practices, perhaps because of its focus on individual learning, it only begins to address the social basis of personal belief systems. While such efforts can further a kind of collective agency (McNiff, 1988), it is a sense of agency built on ideas of society as a collection of autonomous individuals. As such, it seems incapable of addressing social issues in terms of the interconnections between personal identity and the claim of experiential knowledge, as well as power and privilege in society (Dolby, 1995; Noffke, 1991). The process of personal transformation through the examination of practice and self-reflection may be a necessary part of social change, especially in education; it is however, not sufficient.' (Noffke, 1997, p. 329)

I agree with Noffke that living-educational-theories should address issues of power and privilege in society. An example of how this can be done is in a recent living-theory Master of Technology Dissertation from Durban University of Technology on How do I use my living and lived experience to influence creative economic independence in others? by Bonnie Kaplan (2013-<http://www.actionresearch.net/living/living.shtml>), who engaged with issues of high unemployment in a South African context. I do hope that you will access Kaplan's dissertation to see who she fulfils one of the claims in her Abstract:

I have used autoethnography with action research to describe the interventions that I initiated, report on their implementation, as well as the evolution of new perceptions and understandings that developed as a result. By using my own and the participants visual data with still images and video with visual narrative I demonstrate the evidence of my living theory and self-study to influence creative economic independence in others and reflect critically on what has been done and achieved, and critically assess the way forward.

In relating 'The Teacher as Researcher: change agents at work', to Kaplan's research, I like the focus in Kaplan's study on Autoethnography, Action Research and Self-study in the generation of her own living-theory in her Narrative Inquiry. Autoethnography brings together a self-study with an emphasis on cultural influences. Action research focuses on the researcher's exploration of the implications of asking, researching and answering questions of the kind, 'How do I improve what I am doing?' Generating a living-theory involves the production of a valid explanation of the individual's educational influence in their own learning, in the learning of others and in the learning of the social formations which influence their writings and practice. You can also access the evidence of the generation of a living-theory in the context of medical education in Wolvaardt's (2013) thesis from the University of Pretoria on 'Over the conceptual horizon of public health: a living theory of teaching undergraduate medical students':

This research is a rich account of my complex context and my connected practice and through action research I claim to live my values of care and

agency. My living theory of practice as a form of meaning making could help others to look over their own conceptual horizons in search of wholeness.

Another way in which practitioner-researchers could engage with issues of power and privilege in generating their living-educational-theories is by holding themselves to account for living as fully as possible their value of global citizenship (Coombs, Potts & Whitehead, 2014).

What I now want to focus on is enhancing professionalism in education through the living-theories of practitioner-researchers.

iv) Enhancing professionalism in education through generating and sharing the living-theories of master and doctor educators.

A living-theory is grounded in an exploration of the implications of asking, researching and answering the question, ‘How do I improve what I am doing?’ I believe that everyone here today will recognize this question as one that they ask themselves. What I am suggesting is that enhancing professionalism in education requires fulfilling the four criteria above for distinguishing a profession, together with a focus on the fifth criterion of improving practice and making a contribution to the professional knowledge-base with our living-educational-theories as master and doctor educators.

The professional body for teaching in England between 1998 and 2012 was the **General Teaching Council for England (GTCE)**. The GTC was established by the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 with the two aims: of contributing to improving standards of teaching and the quality of learning, and to maintaining and improving standards of professional conduct among teachers, in the interests of the public. The GTC was abolished by the Government on 31 March 2012 with some of its functions being assumed by a new body known as the Teaching Agency, an executive agency of the Department for Education. This failure to create a comprehensive **self-governing** organization of practitioners marks the professions failure to fulfill of the above five criteria for distinguishing a profession. The failure also highlights a weakness in our professional autonomy for both ourselves as individual practitioners and for the occupational group as a whole in recognizing each other as master and doctor educators.

Whilst on a visit to South Africa in 2006 I visited the headquarters of the South African Council for Educators (SACE). SACE is the professional council for educators, that aims to enhance the status of the teaching profession through appropriate Registration, management of Professional Development and inculcation of a Code of Ethics for all educators. I am suggesting that we follow the lead of South African educators and create a Council for Educators. However, I think that we will need to go further than SACE in focusing on the relationships between the Council for Educators and the University accreditation of the contribution to the professional knowledge-base of master and doctor educators in the living-educational-theories we produce in our programmes of continuing professional development.

I am not underestimating the difficulties of establishing a relationship between a

Council for Educators and the universities role in accrediting the living-educational-theories of master and doctor educators in higher degrees that give academic recognition to the living-theories that are grounded in the embodied knowledge of educators. I believe that the difficulties are compounded by the way that the way the Research Excellence Framework - REF (and the previous Research Assessment Exercises - RAE), place educational research within the unit of assessment of Education for the allocation of funding for research in Universities. Even though 'impact' of research is now recognized in the REF the way that judgments have been made in the past for the allocation of funding has focused on education research, rather than educational research. This will disadvantage those University Departments of Education that focus on research that emphasises the accreditation of the embodied knowledge of educators together with its evolution. To emphasise this point I shall focus on the decision by the University of Bath to withdraw its PGCE programme with no new trainees joining the programme in September 2014. A programme which began some 48 years ago. The grounds given by the University focused on 'a lack of strategic fit with the university's research-led vision'. Given that there can be few more important activities for the future of a country than enhancing the quality of education through research, this leads me to question the 'research-led vision' of a university that can close down the possibilities of developing a research-led initial teacher education programme.

The present Head of the Department of Education at the University of Bath invited past and present colleagues from the Department to last night's gathering as an occasion of a positive, up-beat celebration that recognized the tremendous work that had been done by many PGCE tutors, PGCE administrators, Department of Education staff and others in supporting the development of thousands of successful teachers over many years. Here is one 'living legacy' from those years (Laidlaw, 1993) of a research-led contribution to the initial teacher education programme at the University of Bath. It is the booklet on Action Research in Initial Teacher Education (<http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/preserve.shtml>):

Teachers have an enormous fund of knowledge about their own practice, their children and their classrooms. Much of the time though, they are told by external forces what constitutes meaning in their own unique environments. Action Research empowers classroom teachers to construct their own knowledge and to make it available to others for their benefit and the benefit of their pupils.

This Guide aims to give practical advice to student teachers who wish to embark on an Action Research enquiry. It will be divided into four sections; the first will comprise a guide to those aspects which need to be borne in mind throughout the enquiry; the second will deal with individual aspects of the research; the third will look at a quality which always emerges with Action Research, that of collaboration; and the fourth will constitute some reflections by a P.G.C.E. student, Jonathan Jones (1990/91) about the process of working with Action Research. In addition this section will include some conclusions from the Final Reports of four students (1991-92) Throughout the Guide I will be using case-study material from Justine Hocking (1991/92), two of last year's P.G.C.E. students, Jayne Prior (1990/91) and Jonathan, of the enquiries that they conducted on first Teaching Practice, and from an Undergraduate

Biological Sciences student, Zac Watkins (1990/91) and the work he did on Second Teaching Practice. The whole Guide will take you through the various stages and try to answer the questions that have occurred most often in my experience of advising on Action Research.

So there will be explanatory notes first on the fusion between the two terms ‘**Action**’ and ‘**Research**’, the **Criteria for Success**, and also the importance of exercising your professional judgement about **confidentiality**, and in addition a section about the significance of **Validation Groups**. The Guide will look at the **framework of an enquiry** and then offer sections on the significant aspects. These will include **finding the question**, the **role of a ‘critical friend’** and that of the observer, and then subsequent ones on the use of **talk**, **writing**, and the notion of ‘**making public**’ which must be borne in mind during any enquiry, some words on collaboration and then Jayne’s and Jonathan’s reflections. This is followed by a section on the **validity** of an Action Research Enquiry and how it must relate to **pupil-learning**. (Laidlaw, 1993)

This booklet offers a route towards a kind of educational research theorizing that is grounded in the living-theories produced by practitioners. Living-theories draw insights from traditional forms of theorizing but with very different living standards of judgment (Laidlaw, 1996) to provide epistemological validity to the educational theorizing. The standards of judgment are grounded in the ontological values expressed in the educational relationships of practitioners.

To return to the problem of the funding of educational research. I believe that it will be necessary to face this problem by encouraging universities to continue to support initial teacher education programmes by developing research-led visions that include enhancing the professional knowledge-base of education in the living-educational-theories of master and doctor educators.

The procedures and criteria for accrediting the educational knowledge of master and doctor educators already exist within Universities. For example, most doctoral degrees are judged in terms of their original contribution to knowledge, the quality of the critical engagement with the ideas of others and for containing matter worthy of publication although it need not be presented in a way that is ready for publication.

These criteria have already been used to accredit the living-theories of the embodied knowledge of doctor educators with the award of a Ph.D., but the recipients cannot receive recognition as doctor educators because we do not have a Council of Educators in relationship with Universities for this public recognition. Procedures and criteria for the award of Masters Degrees have already been used but without the recognition as master educators.

My justification for claiming that the procedures and criteria already exist in Universities for accrediting the living-theories of master and doctor educators is in the evidence from teacher-researchers who have successfully completed their masters degrees in which they made public their embodied knowledge together with its evolution in their enquiries, ‘How do I improve what I am doing?’

You can access these successfully completed Masters Dissertations and Units at <http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/mastermod.shtml>.

For example, the University of Bath recognised these degrees as MA degrees in education. As far as I am aware there is no University in the UK that recognises the masters degree knowledge generated by teacher-researchers as the knowledge of a master educator. I am suggesting that this lack of recognition by universities of the embodied knowledge of educational practitioners as that of master educators is holding back professionalism in education and hence we need to create a Council of Educators to generate this recognition.

The University of Bath has also recognized the successfully completed Doctoral Degrees of teacher-researchers in the form of living-educational-theories and you can access these at:

<http://www.actionresearch.net/living/living.shtml>

As far as I am aware there is no University in the UK that recognises the doctoral knowledge generated by teacher-researchers as the knowledge of a doctor educator.

Because we have no professional body to recognize our practice in terms of being master and doctor educators it is a priority to develop a comprehensive self-governing organization of practitioners in a Council of Educators. In my experience of examining Master of Education and Doctor of Education programmes, there is still much to be done in recognizing the nature of the embodied educational knowledge of master and doctoral educators and distinguishing this knowledge from the education knowledge produced by university education researchers (Appendix 1) in the 2014 BERA-RSA research report (BERA 2014).

One of the ways we could contribute to the public and professional recognition of our embodied knowledge as educators is through our publications. If you would like to see an example of how this is being done do access the Educational Journal of Living Theories at:

<http://ejolts.net>

and the December 2013 issue at:

<http://ejolts.net/node/209>

As you can see the Editorial Board of EJOLTS have focused on the life-affirming and life-enhancing values embodied and expressed by Nelson Mandela. The Board is encouraging each one of us to generate and share our living-educational-theories as our living legacies:

December 2013, Volume 6, Issue 2 (special issue)

“What counts in life is not the mere fact that we have lived. It is what difference we have made to the lives of others that will determine the significance of the life we lead.” — Nelson Mandela

Nelson Mandela embodied the life-affirming and life-enhancing values of a world in which humanity might flourish, which members of the EJOLTs community aspire to live as fully as they can through their practice.

From 2010, the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) declared 18th July as Nelson Mandela International Day. Mandela Day is an annual celebration of Nelson Mandela's life and a global call to action for people to recognise their individual power to make a difference and help change the world around them for the common good.

Mahatma Gandhi also personified the principle of:

Being the changes he wanted to see in the world.

We want to contribute to the living legacies of Mandela and Gandhi by encouraging and supporting you to make public your living-theory accounts of what you are doing to live that change and the difference you are making to the lives of others. In the process we believe we will develop democratic ways of creating together and, '...inspire people to embrace the values of democracy and contribute towards the ideals of ensuring a just and fair society' (Nelson Mandela Centre of Memory, 2013). In the words of the Mandela Day's campaign slogan:

“Take Action; Inspire Change; Make Every Day a Mandela Day.”

Editorial board

Here are the contents of the December 2013 issue and I want to focus on the contributions to educational knowledge made by Jacqueline Delong, Elizabeth Campbell, Cathy Griffin and myself which I am claiming distinguish their contributions as those of master and doctor educators as they enhance professionalism in education through generating and sharing their living-theories.

Whilst Jacqueline Delong was a Superintendent of Schools in the Grand Erie District School Board in Ontario, she completed her living-theory doctorate at the University of Bath with my supervision (DeLong 2002). In 2012 Delong tutored both Elizabeth Campbell, a secondary school teacher, and Cathy Griffin, a primary school teacher, to the successful completion of their living-theory masters degrees which focused on improving their educational influences in the learning of their pupils.

These are the kind of contributions to enhancing professionalism in education with living-educational-theories that I believe will help us to create a profession of master and doctor educators.

Foreword (pp. i-vii)

Moira Laidlaw

Introduction to living theory action research in a culture of inquiry transforms learning in elementary, high school and post-graduate settings (pp. 1-11)

Elizabeth Campbell, Jacqueline Delong, Cathy Griffin & Jack Whitehead

Evolving a living-educational-theory within the living boundaries of cultures-of-

[inquiry](#) (pp. 12-24)
Jack Whitehead

[Transforming teaching and learning through living-theory action research In a culture-of-inquiry](#) (pp. 25-44)
Jacqueline Delong

[The heART of learning: Creating a loving culture-of-inquiry to enhance self-determined learning in a high school classroom](#) (pp. 45-61)
Elizabeth Campbell

[Transforming teaching and learning practice by inviting students to become evaluators of my practice](#) (pp. 62-77)
Cathy Griffin

[The significance of living-theory action research in a culture of inquiry transforms learning in elementary, high school and post-graduate settings](#)(pp. 78-96)
Jacqueline Delong, Cathy Griffin, Elizabeth Campbell & Jack Whitehead

The importance of such international collaborations and partnerships in enhancing professionalism, in generating living-educational-theories as transformational continuing professional development, has already been presented to a BERA conference (Huxtable & Whitehead, 2013):

An international continuing professional development (CPD) project, ‘Living Values Improving Practice Cooperatively’ has been established in response to the need to enhance professionalism in education with flexibility in offering content, tuition, assessment for accreditation and costings of programmes of continuing professional development. This is a research project for leaders, teachers and other professionals, from a variety of fields, who are committed to improving the life-chances and wellbeing of individuals and communities and to enhancing the professional knowledgebase of education, by enquiring individually, collaboratively and co-operatively into the processes of improving their practice and knowledge-creation in the creation of living-educational-theories. We understand these theories to be the explanations that individuals produce to 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, work and research.

I shall now relate the above contributions to enhancing professionalism in education, through generating and sharing our living-educational-theories, to the contributions and limitations of the BERA-RSA inquiry into ‘Research and the Teaching Professional: Building the capacity for a self-improving education system’ (BERA 2014) in contributing to the professional knowledge-base of education.

Responding to the 2014 BERA-RSA report.

I imagine that everyone here, who is committed to enhancing professionalism in education, will be interested in the findings of the 2014 BERA-RSA Report on ‘

‘Research And The Teaching Profession: Building the capacity for a self—improving education system’ (BERA 2014).

The contributions of the inquiry to educational knowledge are clearly set out in the Executive Summary (see Appendix 1) with the following recommendations:

4. Recommendations

In building a research-rich culture, practitioners and policymakers in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland face different challenges and begin from different starting points. For this reason, the Inquiry’s recommendations are jurisdiction-specific. These cover a range of issues, including: initial teacher education; continuing professional development; research leadership and capacity; practitioner engagement.

With regard to both initial teacher education and teachers’ continuing professional development, there are pockets of excellent practice across the UK but good practice is inconsistent and insufficiently shared. Drawing on the evidence, the Inquiry concludes that amongst policymakers and practitioners there is considerable potential for greater dialogue than currently takes place, as there is between teachers, teacher-researchers and the wider research community.

It also concludes that everybody in a leadership position – in the policy community, in university departments of education, at school or college level or in key agencies within the educational infrastructure – has a responsibility to support the creation of the sort of research-rich organisational cultures in which these outcomes, for both learners and teachers, can be achieved.

One of the weaknesses of these recommendations is that they ignore the educational knowledge already generated by practitioner-researchers such as DeLong (2002; 2010). DeLong has explored the implications of accepting this responsibility in supporting the creation of a research-rich organisational culture in the generation of a culture of inquiry within a large district school board in Canada.

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 (Appendix 2).

Each of these papers contributes knowledge within the field of interest defined by the titles.

I am suggesting 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 in understanding 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 influence the emergence of educational knowledge and theory (Whitehead, 2014).

I shall now suggest that the development of our profession will rest on recognizing each other as educators.

v) Recognising each other as master and doctor educators.

I began by thanking the organisers of this RIPLE conference for the invitation to present this keynote and the University of Cumbria for appointing me as an honorary Professor in Education. In relation to my sense of being recognised as a professional in education the title of Professor, in relation to my subject, education, is one that I value. However, I am suggesting that recognising each other as master and doctor educators and gaining this recognition by a professional body, linked to accreditation in higher education, is of crucial importance in enhancing professionalism in education.

Through Living Theory research the educator recognises, values and improves their own and other's contributions to the development of educational theory and practice. Living Theory research is concerned with creating and offering knowledge of self in and of the world as well as knowledge of practice – which is different to other forms of research and why it is so powerful as a way of engaging in continual professional development that keeps the professional connected with their values.

It may be that by the end of my contract with the University of Cumbria in 2018 we shall have earned the recognition of ourselves as master and doctor educators for both the quality of our educational practices and of our contributions to the professional knowledge-based of education.

I shall conclude by returning to focus on our contributions to fulfilling the purpose of RIPLE to generate knowledge and evaluate practice in a wide range of professional contexts through practitioner, collaborative and child-centred methods. In doing this I believe that RIPLE will be making a major contribution to enhancing professionalism in education through helping to make public and validate our living-educational-theories as practitioner-researchers. I am thinking of the role of the journal Practitioner Research in Higher Education in making public our embodied knowledge as master and doctor educators, and the role of the University in accrediting this knowledge as the knowledge of educators that is contributing to enhancing professionalism in education:

Practitioner Research in Higher Education publishes research and evaluation papers that contribute to the understanding of theory, policy and practice in

teaching and supporting learning. The journal aims to disseminate evaluations and research of professional practice which give voice to all of the participants in higher education and which are based on ethical and collaborative approaches to practitioner enquiry.

The audience consist of a wide range of professionals involved in teaching and supporting learning in higher education. The journal aims to encourage and support new researchers and writers in higher education, including colleagues working within educational partnership organisations. Papers submitted are peer reviewed by two anonymous reviewers. Click on the 'Archives' link above to view previous issues of the journal. (see- <http://194.81.189.19/ojs/index.php/prhe>)

By focusing on questions of the kind, 'How do I improve what I am doing?' in the context of professional educational practice, I am suggesting that we can all be change agents at work. As teacher-researchers, who are generating, sharing and gaining recognition for our living-educational-theories as explanations of our educational influence in learning, I am suggesting that we can all enhance our contributions to professionalism in education.

It has been a delight to share these ideas with you and to look forward to the rest of the RIPLE Conference.

Note.

Last night, on the 17th June 2014, there was a gathering at the University of Bath to mark the ending of the initial postgraduate education course. I contributed to this programme during my time at the University of Bath from 1973-2009 and I should like to mark the occasion by referring to the living legacies (Forester, 2014) of some students and staff who have made public their embodied knowledge as educators. You can access the knowledge of those I recognise as educators through making public their embodied knowledge in their masters degrees at:

<http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/mastermod.shtml>

and those I recognise as educators through making public their embodied knowledge in their doctoral degrees at:

<http://www.actionresearch.net/living/living.shtml>

In 1992/3 Moira Laidlaw produced her guide on Action Research in Initial Teacher Education for students in the Department of Education. This shows how pre-service teachers can generate their own living-educational-theories at:

<http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/preserve.shtml>

Moira Laidlaw (1996), a doctor educator, made an original contribution to living-educational-theories by showing how the embodied values that constituted living standards of judgment were themselves living and evolving in her 1996 doctoral thesis on How Can I Create My Own Living Educational Theory As I Offer You An

Account Of My Educational Development?

at:

<http://www.actionresearch.net/living/moira2.shtml>

References.

BERA (2014) Research And The Teaching Profession: Building the capacity for a self—improving education system’ . London; British Educational Research Association.

Biesta, G. J. J. (2006) Beyond Learning; Democratic Education for a Human Future. Boulder; Paradigm Publishers.

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

Delong, J. (2002) How Can I Improve My Practice As A Superintendent of Schools and Create My Own Living Educational Theory. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Bath. Retrieved 14 July 2012 from <http://www.actionresearch.net/delong.shtml>

Delong, J. (2010) Engaging Educators in Representing Their Knowledge in Complex Ecologies and Cultures of Inquiry. A paper presented at the 2010 Conference of the American Educational Research Association in Denver, Colorado. Retrieved 23 April 2014 from <http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/aera10/jddAERA20100402OKopt.pdf>

Forester, C. (2014) Living Legacies: Valuing Lives of Service. Ed.D. submission to Liverpool Hope University.

Ginott, H. (1972) Teacher and Child. New York: Macmillan.

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

Hirst, P. (Ed.) (1983) Educational Theory and its Foundation Disciplines. London;RKP.

Huxtable, M. & Whitehead, J. (2013) Living-educational-theories as Transformational Continuing Professional Development. A paper presented at the 2013 Conference of the British Educational Research Association Conference at the University of Sussex, UK. Retrieved 4 June 2014 from <http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/bera13/mhjwbera13joint.pdf> .

Kaplan, B. (2013) How do I use my living and lived experience to influence creative economic independence in others? Master of Technology Dissertation, Durban University of Technology. Retrieved 14 May 2014 from <http://www.actionresearch.net/living/living.shtml>

Laidlaw, (1993) Action Research In Initial Teacher Education. Retrieved 7 June 2014 from <http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/preserve.shtml>

Laidlaw (1996) How Can I Create My Own Living Educational Theory As I Offer You An Account Of My Educational Development? Ph.D. Thesis, University of Bath. Retrieved 2 June 2014 from <http://www.actionresearch.net/living/moira2.shtml>

Noffke, S. (1997) Professional, Personal, and Political Dimensions of Action Research in, Apple, M. (Ed.) (1997) Review of Research in Education, Vol. 22, Washington: AERA.

Peters, R. S. (1966) Ethics and Education. London; Allen and Unwin.

Whitehead, J. (1985) An analysis of an individual's educational development - the basis for personally orientated action research. Published in Shipman, M. (Ed.) Educational Research: Principles, Policies and Practice, pp. 97-108; Falmer; London.

Whitehead, J. (1989) Creating a living educational theory from questions of the kind, "How do I improve my practice?" Cambridge Journal of Education, 19(1); 41-52.

Whitehead, J. (2013) Evolving a living-educational-theory within the living boundaries of cultures-of-inquiry. Educational Journal of Living Theories, 6(2); 12-24.

Whitehead, J. (2014) How does the constraining power of education researchers influence the emergence of educational knowledge and theory? Presentation at the American Educational Research Association, April 2014 in Philadelphia. Retrieved 21 May 2014 from <http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/aera14/jwaera2014indiv110314.pdf>

Wolvaardt, J. E. (2013) Over The Conceptual Horizon Of Public Health: A Living Theory Of Teaching Undergraduate Medical Students. Ph.D. University of Pretoria. Retrieved 28 May 2014 from <http://www.actionresearch.net/writings/wolvaardtphd/Wolvaardtphd2013.pdf>

APPENDIX 1 – STEERING GROUP MEMBERS AND THE SEVEN PAPERS COMMISSIONED FOR THE BERA-RSA ENQUIRY

The membership of the Steering Group for the BERA-RSA inquiry and those responsible for ‘steering’ the inquiry were:

Professor John Furlong, University of Oxford (Chair);
Professor Ian Menter, University of Oxford;
Professor Pamela Munn, University of Edinburgh;
Professor Geoff Whitty, Bath Spa University;
Joe Hallgarten, Director of Education, RSA;
Nick Johnson, Executive Director, BERA.

The seven commissioned papers were:

- Paper 1: Policy and Practice within the United Kingdom, Professor Gary Beauchamp (Cardiff Metropolitan University), Professor Linda Clarke (University of Ulster), Dr Moira Hulme (University of Glasgow) and Professor Jean Murray (University of East London)
- Paper 2: The Role of Research in International Policy and Practice in Teacher Education, Dr Maria Teresa Tatto (Michigan State University)
- Paper 3: The Contribution of Educational Research to Teachers’ Professional Learning – Philosophical Understandings, Professor Christopher Winch (King’s College, University of London), Dr Janet Orchard (University of Bristol) and Dr Alis Oancea (University of Oxford)
- Paper 4: Review of ‘research-informed clinical practice’ in Initial Teacher Education, Dr Katharine Burn and Trevor Mutton (University of Oxford)
- Paper 5: The Contribution of Research to Teachers’ Continuing Professional Learning and Development, Philippa Cordingley (Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education)
- Paper 6: Teacher Quality and School Improvement: What is the Role of Research?, Dr Monica Mincu (University of Turin)
- Paper 7: Teachers’ Views: Perspectives on Research Engagement, Professor David Leat, Rachel Lofthouse and Anna Reid (Newcastle University)

APPENDIX 2 – BERA-RSA EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Introduction and context

This final report of the BERA-RSA Inquiry into the Role of Research in Teacher Education makes the case for the development, across the UK, of self-improving education systems in which teachers are research literate and have opportunities for engagement in research and enquiry. This requires that schools and colleges become research-rich environments in which to work. It also requires that teacher researchers and the wider research community work in partnership, rather than in separate and sometimes competing universes. Finally, it demands an end to the false dichotomy between HE and school-based approaches to initial teacher education.

The Inquiry brings a broad and inclusive definition to the term “research” (see Appendix 2). Overall, it has identified four main ways in which research can make a contribution to teacher education:

- First, the content of teacher education programmes may be informed by research-based knowledge and scholarship, emanating from a range of academic disciplines and epistemological traditions.
- Second, research can be used to inform the design and structure of teacher education programmes.
- Third, teachers and teacher educators can be equipped to engage with and be discerning consumers of research.
- Fourth, teachers and teacher educators may be equipped to conduct their own research, individually and collectively, to investigate the impact of particular interventions or to explore the positive and negative effects of educational practice.

In addition to this broad approach to research, the report’s recommendations relate to a range of teaching phases and contexts: early years through to further education; schools, colleges and specialist providers; mainstream, special and alternative

education. Its definition of “teacher education” is also inclusive: it spans initial teacher education programmes, however and wherever these are delivered, and programmes to support teachers’ continuing professional development and progression to leadership.

The evidence gathered by the Inquiry is clear about the positive impact that a research literate and research engaged profession is likely to have on learner outcomes. It is also clear that the expectation that teachers might ordinarily engage with, and where appropriate, in research and enquiry need not, and must not, become a burden on a profession that sometimes struggles with the weight of the various demands rightly or wrongly placed upon it.

Rather, this is about empowering teachers, school and college leaders, and all who work with them, to better understand how they might enhance their practice and increase their impact in the classroom and beyond. In short, it is about developing the capacity of teachers, schools and colleges, and education systems as a whole to self-evaluate and self-improve, through an ongoing process of professional reflection and enquiry.

2. Evidence

The Inquiry draws on a substantial domestic and international evidence base, outlined in an earlier interim report and further explored in this document. This includes: the findings drawn from a set of seven commissioned papers produced by leading experts in the fields of teacher education and educational research, in the UK and internationally, listed in Appendix 4; evidence arising from an open call for submissions which generated thirty-two written responses; and outcomes from a range of meetings with leading individuals and organisations from across the UK. In addition the Inquiry benefited from feedback from a Reference Group, which included representatives from many of the leading educational organisations in the UK, and from a set of Special Advisers, both detailed in Appendix 1.

This evidence confirms that:

- Internationally, enquiry-based (or ‘research-rich’) school and college environments are the hallmark of high performing education systems.
- To be at their most effective, teachers and teacher educators need to engage with research and enquiry – this means keeping up to date with the latest developments in their academic subject or subjects and with developments in the discipline of education.
- Teachers and teacher educators need to be equipped to engage in enquiry-oriented practice. This means having the capacity, motivation, confidence and opportunity to do so.
- A focus on enquiry-based practice needs to be sustained during initial teacher education programmes and throughout teachers’ professional careers, so that disciplined innovation and collaborative enquiry are embedded within the lives of schools

or colleges and become the normal way of teaching and learning, rather than the exception.

- **3. Vision and principles**

These findings lead to a vision and set of principles for developing a research-rich self-improving educational system. The principles are as follows:

Teaching and learning

In a research-rich, self-improving education system:

- Every learner is entitled to teaching that is informed by the latest relevant research.
- Every teacher is entitled to work in a research-rich environment that supports the development of their research literacy, and offers access to facilities and resources (both on-site and online) that support sustained engagement with and in research.

Teachers' professional identity and practice

In a research-rich, self-improving education system:

- Teachers share a common responsibility for the continuous development of their research literacy. This informs all aspects of their professional practice and is written into initial and continuing teacher education programmes, standards, and in registration and licensing frameworks.
- During the course of qualifying and throughout their careers, teachers have multiple opportunities to engage in research and enquiry, collaborating with colleagues in other schools and colleges¹ and with members of the wider research community, based in universities² and elsewhere.

School and college leadership

In a research-rich, self-improving education system:

- Research literacy has a prominent place in development programmes for governors, for parents' organisations and for senior and middle leaders, such that the development of

research-rich school and college environments is seen as a key leadership responsibility.

- The levers that hold schools and colleges – and other educational institutions and agencies – to account, notably inspection frameworks, explicitly recognise the importance of research literacy to teachers’ professional identity and practice. They also see research literacy as an important prerequisite for school and college improvement and a research-rich culture as a key feature of any school or college designated ‘outstanding’.

System-level responsibilities

In a research-rich, self-improving education system:

- Policymakers of all persuasions – and those who seek to influence policy – encourage, and are responsive to the findings of educational research, both in policy formulation and in implementation strategies.

¹ Here, the emergent networks of Teaching Schools in some UK jurisdictions offer an opportunity for collaborative and comparative research and for the dissemination of findings.

² ‘Universities’ does not just refer to departments, schools and institutes of education, but to the wider university – the intention is to foster a research-rich culture that enables, for instance, practitioners and practitioner networks (such as those provided by subject associations) to enhance their subject knowledge through partnerships with the relevant specialist departments and research units. There is a sustained and growing systemic capacity to support educational research at the level of the individual school or college, through local and regional networks, embedded in teachers’ terms and conditions and across the wider research community, based in universities and elsewhere.

Research production

In a research-rich, self-improving education system:

- Commissioners of education research build teacher engagement into commissioning processes, so that wherever possible teachers are active agents in research, rather than passive participants.
- Producers of new research knowledge, including universities, teaching school alliances, academy chains and local authorities, as well as individual schools, endeavour to make their research findings as freely available, accessible and usable as possible.

4. Recommendations

In building a research-rich culture, practitioners and policymakers in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland face different challenges and begin from different starting points. For this reason, the Inquiry’s recommendations are jurisdiction-specific. These cover a range of issues, including: initial teacher education; continuing

professional development; research leadership and capacity; practitioner engagement.

With regard to both initial teacher education and teachers' continuing professional development, there are pockets of excellent practice across the UK but good practice is inconsistent and insufficiently shared. Drawing on the evidence, the Inquiry concludes that amongst policymakers and practitioners there is considerable potential for greater dialogue than currently takes place, as there is between teachers, teacher-researchers and the wider research community.

It also concludes that everybody in a leadership position – in the policy community, in university departments of education, at school or college level or in key agencies within the educational infrastructure – has a responsibility to support the creation of the sort of research-rich organisational cultures in which these outcomes, for both learners and teachers, can be achieved.