

Chapter 2

Carving Out the Territory for Educating the Deliberate Professional

Franziska Trede and Celina McEwen

Introduction

Our writing of the deliberate professional builds on a long history of well-established ideas of critical pedagogy and deliberative democracy; it is foregrounded by ideas of awareness raising, critical thinking and autonomous learning that engage with social and moral contexts of professional practice. With this chapter we reinterpret these theoretical ideas in the context of a contemporary university education that emphasises professional education and relies on workplace learning (which is student learning that occurs in authentic workplaces under some form of supervision) to deliver the future workforce.

In what follows, we carve out the territory for educating deliberate professionals. Deliberate professionals are aware of the complex interrelationship between self and others as well as between competent skill mastery and capability for deliberation and deliberate action. They understand the need to maintain the tension and constant struggle in professional practices between technical, economic and moral imperatives. We do this by first providing a critical comment of the current conditions constraining university education in an increasing number of countries. These conditions include constantly and rapidly changing structures and parameters through globalisation and digitalisation, the collapse of long-term thinking in favour of a focus on short-term goals, and an emphasis on individualism. We discuss this growing global trend and its associated tighter connections between university education and the labour market. We then explore ideas of ‘knowing’, ‘doing’, ‘saying’ and ‘relating’ from various practice theory perspectives. Rather than assume that nothing can change the conditions for practice, we argue for a pedagogy of deliberateness that opens up possibilities for change. This new learning and teaching

F. Trede (✉) • C. McEwen
The Education For Practice Institute, Charles Sturt University,
Sydney, NSW, Australia
e-mail: ftrede@csu.edu.au; celinamcewen@gmail.com

framework is designed to prepare practitioners for uncertain future practices and to thoughtfully understand and act on social, cultural and political aspects of professional practice in a society that is increasingly complex.

The Current Social Context of University Education

The current worldwide social trend towards globalisation, digitalisation and an emphasis on individualism are increasingly impacting on the role and identity of universities. This trend can be linked to what Bauman (2005) describes as *liquid times*, a period where structures, thoughts and actions liquefy before they have a chance to solidify. Liquid times are defined by constant and rapid changes that result in a focus on short-term goals, an obsession with quick fixes, the collapse of long-term thinking, a disregard for long-term consequences, and a shift of the burden of liability and responsibility onto the individual.

In liquid times, the Habermasian (1972) university, that cultivates an understanding of self for students, teachers and professionals, and an understanding of the wider social conditions that shape professions, their practices and social interactions at large, is under threat from the neoliberal ideals of individualism and self-interest that erode commitments to moral principles and actions that nurture the common good for human kind. In liquid times, although global economic imperatives are played out differently in different countries, there is a growing shift in universities' missions towards preparing for work-readiness and increasing employability, away from educating for global citizenship and social responsibility. The imbalance of university course offerings between education for a profession and liberal arts is increasing, with the latter slowly disappearing (Collini, 2012).

These changes have led to universities being positioned in a force field of competing interests. On the one hand, they are seen as part of society and, thus, needing to contribute to economic imperative and future workforce just like employers need to participate in producing work-ready graduates. On the other, they are managed as enterprises that compete with each other to attract and retain fee-paying consumers of degrees delivered through technology-mediated learning programs.

Under these volatile and constantly changing conditions, universities are seeking to cater to a wide range of demands and interests from stakeholders, such as those of students, governments, industries and professional accreditation bodies. Students want to be challenged in their learning, but predominantly seek career progression after graduation. Professional bodies demand that university curricula teach towards their professional requirements. Industries want a skilled, educated and resourceful workforce and governments want universities to contribute to economic, environmental and social wellbeing.

In this context, universities are also expected to teach towards national quality frameworks and preparing for work is privileged over educating for citizenship and social justice. This has led, in many cases, to favouring a narrow technical, instrumental competence approach to education. Pedagogical approaches that engage

students in complexities, ambiguities, diversity and uncertainties of future practices motivated by a desire to contribute to the public good or develop responsible global citizenship are difficult to argue for and sustain in a university landscape that needs to comply with graduate learning outcomes and competence achievements. Tensions are inevitable when finding a balance between the social and economic benefits to society. An education that reproduces social privilege and produces technical experts is in conflict with an education that nurtures socially responsible thinkers. By favouring a technico-instrumental approach, there is a risk that current university education is poorly equipping students to deal with the emerging social and economic challenges of our uncertain and rapidly changing times.

Globalisation has led to structural changes, such as the international standardisation of programs through the Bologna process and universities' increased focus on managerialism, as evidenced by their adoption of global quality frameworks and measurable graduate learning outcomes (Karseth, 2008). Another change includes the gradual and incremental transformation of autonomous academics into a divided workforce of research or teaching-focused individuals and the academisation of emerging professions (McEwen & Trede, 2014). The massification and diversification of the student body is yet another change that has seen the arrival of a growing body of undergraduate students who are part-time workers with family commitments and whose reasons for studying are predominantly related to getting a job or progressing their career. They read less and acquiring a broad general education is not foremost on their studying agenda (James, Krause, & Jennings, 2010).

Infrastructural changes have also followed, seeing universities adapting their teaching and learning strategies to digital technology. Though technology-mediated learning is hailed as the vehicle to democratise education due to its potentially free access to information and interactive affordances, it can also be said that universities are delivering their programs through closed online learning management systems (LMS) or massive open online courses (MOOCs) and other forms of popular and mass cultural free and open programs (Kalantzis & Cope, 2008) to deal with the changes and give themselves a 'competitive edge'. However, an unreflected stance towards technology is threatening to reduce learning to a tool-based notion of access and connectivity where technology drives educational design rather than the other way round. It is important to remember that increased volume of and access to knowledge does not equate to understanding knowledge let alone selecting the relevant knowledge for a given practice situation. In the digital age, learners need to be able to interpret and distinguish relevant from irrelevant information, and make decisions about practice in increasingly trans-disciplinary and interprofessional arenas (Allen & van der Velden, 2011).

Another consequence of universities seeking to align their 'business' with industry needs has been the pursuit of industry partnerships to provide credibility to courses and strengthen student's work-readiness by enabling them to have workplace learning experiences. Not only does this provide added value to courses through work experience, but it also helps universities attract guest lecturers and create new research opportunities. Benefits of these partnerships for industry include reduced labour cost, simplified recruitment and induction processes. Benefits for

students include integrated socialisation into professional practice and networks, early adoption of practice roles and learning about professional responsibility. Despite these benefits, university-industry partnerships are uneasy alliances because of their often latent opposing approaches, conditions and values.

The alliance between universities and industries can be seen as a homology of fields of practice. Bourdieu (Swartz, 1997) defines ‘homology’ as a familiar course of action that occurs between fields of practice that appear to share or have complementary interests, beliefs, attitudes, values and ideologies. It is a two-way relationship where members bring with them into the other field some elements of discourses and practices dominant within their original field. Members can gain great advancements in competing for specific resources (capital) within their main field of interest by forming temporary relationships across other fields. Establishing these inter-field relationships is one way in which members of related fields can find some greater personal and professional autonomy and legitimacy. That is, they are able to gain a certain level of autonomy and legitimacy by demonstrating that their practices have a value and an effect outside of their field. Evidence of such a homology between universities, more traditionally operating within the field of education, and the industry sector, operating within the field of economics includes a seemingly shared interest in educating the next generation of people participating in the ‘workforce’. Although there is a need to engage with the blurred boundary between university and industry, the movement in and out of or across fields can prove to be problematic because, by taking the practices and discourses out of their usual context, members can experience a decrease in the legitimacy of their professional values and an increase in the lack of autonomy of their practice (Moore, 2004).

However, these new forces at play can also be seen as learning and teaching opportunities about how to engage with these competing values between universities and industry sector. For example, workplace learning and placements, can provide a fertile environment to educate deliberate professionals by having students reflect and safely act on what they see and experience in practice settings (Trede & McEwen, 2015).

Scoping Professional Practice

If professional practices were stable, repetitive and predictable, never requiring adaptation, improvement or change, we would only ever need to follow rules and enact best practices. This is, however, not the case. The nature of practice always remains, to a degree, uncertain and unpredictable. Thus uncertainty is something practitioners need to learn to engage with, be curious about and sceptical of. They should not use this as a licence to act accidentally or irresponsibly. Rather it should be seen as an invitation to engage deliberately with practice and, to reach thoughtful decisions and purposeful actions. The deliberate professional understands that current practices are not isolated from the complex conditions and meshing of traditions, interests and deliberations that shaped them.

Drawing on Schatzki, Bourdieu and Kemmis and Grotenboer, we locate professional practice in social and critical perspectives. Professional practices are more than technical skills and theoretical knowledge mastered by individual experts. Professional practices shape and are shaped by social, cultural, economical conditions within which they are carried out. Professional practices are not conducted in isolation, but are created with others. Schatzki (2002, 2012) describes professional practices as open-ended, spatially-temporally dispersed nexuses of doings and sayings. Professional practice is a social practice conducted by people fulfilling distinctive roles in designated professional relationships. On the one hand, practices are socially organised and structured. On the other hand, with time and through experiences, practices emerge, persist and dissolve. Professionals act individually within a social network in time and space. Social practices are rhythmic or cyclical renewals and as uninterrupted happenings they are inseparable from material arrangements. The focus on practice has shifted from what people know to what people do, say and how they relate to each other and within space and time and the material world.

Bourdieu's concepts of 'field', 'capital' and 'interest' (Bourdieu, 1984, 1994) are useful in exploring the time and space within which professional practices take place. With his concept of 'field', (Bourdieu, 1984, 1994; Swartz, 1997) helps us understand practice as a space of human activities, events and relationships that is constructed around a common history and a common understanding of given rules and rewards. However, a field of professional practice is not free of conflict and thus can be seen as a competitive environment where members strive to acquire various types of capital that enable them to act professionally as well as provide them with certain social advantages and status, according to particular (although contestable) ways of doing, saying and relating.

Kemmis and Grotenboer (2008) also bring 'relating', 'doing' and 'saying' to the forefront of their theorising about professional practice. Professional practice is a human activity that is constituted through sayings (language), relatings (power) and doings (activity). The language medium of practice is the cultural-discursive dimension, which explores how professionals communicate and talk; the activity medium is the material-economic dimension and explores how professionals interact with objects; the power medium is the socio-political dimension and explores power relations and what counts as legitimate (Kemmis, 2012). Together these dimensions shape practices. Knowledge implies practice and practices imply knowledge, and so much more. It is important to understand these strongly interwoven connections between notions of practice and notions of knowledge, for example, technical knowledge produces instrumental practices.

The discursive dimension of practice occurs in an intersubjective space. Self-talk or self-reflection might be a good starting point for discursive practices, but falls short of engaging with subjectivities and tensions that arise in collective interpersonal dialogues. Discursive aspects here mean conversations with others. Language is the medium used to articulate positions, explain reasons and actions, find shared understanding or values, and expose beliefs that lead to disagreements. What people talk about provides a sense of the practices that these people are involved in.

Dialogues that are underpinned by critique of self and others, awareness of social conditions, collaborative critical reasoning can stimulate agency for change and foster just, moral and responsible practices. The discursive dimension of practice creates dialogical spaces for critical transformative dialogues through deliberative reflections and deliberate actions where participants can shape new discourses (Trede, Higgs, & Rothwell, 2009). Discursive practices enable deliberate professionals to position themselves in a professional group and are closely interwoven with relational practices.

The relational dimension of practice does not only occur between subjects, but also between subjects, objects and symbolic entities (Fenwick, Nerland, & Jensen, 2012; Knorr Cetina, 1999; Latour, 2005). For example, in a chemical laboratory practitioners engage with physical and material components. These include tools such as the pipette, computer software and protective uniforms. Organisational entities such as schools or hospitals provide structures for arranging human group activities where professional practitioners, consumers, students and patients engage with systems, hierarchies, and structures. Relational lenses highlight the complex, interwoven assemblages between human and object activities (Schatzki, 2002). However, even though we give significance and value to material objects, we contend that humans deliberately invest in them. As Schatzki writes (Schatzki, 2002, p. 119) 'things can be otherwise' and 'human activity takes the lead'. He rejects the notion of post-humanism and an object-driven dominant perspective on practice. When studying practice and educating the deliberate professional it is important to recognise that focusing on one perspective of practice, for example discursive, and one aspect of the deliberate professional, for example deliberating, provides a contribution rather than providing the complete picture of practice and deliberate professional respectively. The deliberate professional is someone who draws on and integrates all components of practice—'relating', 'doing' and 'saying'.

An examination of professional practice would not be complete without an examination of power and the way in which it infuses the doing, saying, relating and knowing of practice. Power shapes, contains, constrains and enables professional practices. Current liquid times of constant change and uncertainty, can lead to more reflexivity, stronger autonomy and increased flexibility but they can also lead to insecurities and submission. Reflexivity, autonomy and flexibility are traits of the deliberate professional and have a different dynamic in liquid times compared to a stable world (Bauman & Haugaard, 2008). The domination of uncertainty and constant change has implications for power relations. In liquid times, the notion of power needs to be reassessed. Becoming a deliberate professional means learning to understand what and who is steering constant changes and for what purpose. Power is related to members' access to and accumulation of valued and legitimised resources (material or symbolic) that are traded and exchanged within a given profession. Power is embodied and enacted by those dominant members of society who have greater autonomy. These members interact within a given field following their own interest and according to regulatory principles they have been instrumental in setting up. This position gives them an advantage in competing for the means to impose or maintain their rules or vision (Swartz, 1997).

Students need to develop an awareness of these complex conditions and relational dimensions in practice to help them think, talk and relate to self, others and the wider context around them as professionals. The deliberate professional considers unique practice situations with all their complexities, understands the various options and possibilities in order to act and avoid inaction, sometimes imposed by rigid practices, or paralysis through too many possibilities. For this to happen, there is also a need for collective deliberations.

Professional practice can be seen in relation to a series of actions required to get the ‘job done’. These are the more routine-like aspects of practices. This is what newcomers to a profession notice about what already exists about practice. Many parts of professional practices are mechanical and routine, where outcomes are deemed predictable and guaranteed. Practitioners can be seduced to approach their practice as a routine where a list of daily activities needs to be ticked off. Although this would make practice efficient and productive, routine practices are not effective in all practice situations. Unexpected situations necessarily interrupt the pace and routine of practices (Frank, 2012). Disruption invites deliberation and can be an opening to change ineffective mechanical practices. Becoming a deliberate professional means learning to be prepared to be interrupted and to deliberately interrupt rhythms of routine practice when they seem inappropriate in unique practice situations. Becoming a deliberate professional enables students to exercise a deliberate conduct and question why they do what they do and with whom and to what end, rather than only looking to find out what they are doing and how. It requires students to understand what is probable, possible and impossible and think about the past to enable actions for the future (McEwen, Trede, & Sheehan, 2012).

The deliberate professional understands that their position, or type of membership, within a given field of practice—whether it is ‘inherited’, imposed, ‘earned’ or ‘taken’—is indicative of their capacity to accumulate cultural, symbolic or economic capital. They understand the need to be conscious about their position and stance within their field of practice and to be cautious of unreflected appreciation of current practices, which cannot bring about a moral and just future. Ethical conduct is not enough because it might constrain professionals too much into normative behavioural codes. Educating deliberate professionals, therefore, occurs in learning spaces where not anything goes, but where students are encouraged to understand the diverse complex perspectives, learn to take sides and explore the consequences of their actions or inactions.

Towards a Pedagogy of Deliberateness

Arendt (1996) warns us that there is no such thing as being neutral, because inaction favours dominant practices and allows things to happen. The danger lies in knowing but not taking action accordingly. The key to knowing needs to be followed by making up one’s mind and acting. Preparing future professionals to deliberate on complexity and ambiguity and deliberately act to meaningfully contribute towards

future practices is therefore essential and one way to reclaim the Habermasian university. The deliberate professional is aware of complex and ever-changing relational dimensions in practice that shape the way practitioners think, talk and relate to self, others and the wider context around them; behave thoughtfully and courageously; resist unreflected conformity and notions of neutrality, repair and change conditions; and not disavow accepted practices, but rather acknowledge, appreciate, critique and change aspects of practices that need improving.

Knorr Cetina (1999) argues that there will always be tensions between cultural and technical ways of practising, legal-scientific and ethical-professional systems, and logic efficiency and cultural reasoning. Learning about these tensions cultivates professionals who are able to deal with competing purposes, expectations and goals, and then, eventually, take a deliberate stance. To encourage learners to think for themselves and critically appraise situations with the aim of becoming more agentic and deliberate can be seen as pedagogical strategies that fill the gaps in an overly employability-driven curriculum. To act on morally infused deliberations is similar to praxis. But beyond praxis, the pedagogy of deliberateness is also about knowing when to and when not to act and to challenge existing ways of doing, saying, relating and knowing. It is about understanding what and when change is possible, probable or proscribed.

There are three pedagogical concepts that underpin the educational aim of deliberating: (1) critical consciousness-raising; (2) autonomy and self-directed learning; and (3) critical thinking. In Freire's (1973) writing, consciousness-raising is a collective dialogical process that first of all leads to insights about why things are the way they are and how knowledge and facts are informed by values and beliefs. Critical consciousness-raising is no isolated, internalised reflection, but a process that clarifies why and how things happen. It enables participants of this process to suspend decisions by listening to each other, asking questions and deliberating. Freire asserts that in this process people identify what is good and should continue and what is oppressive and should discontinue.

Autonomy and self-directed learning reminds us that learners engage in learning from an already developed concept of who they are and what values define them (Candy, 1991). Self-concepts are not a homogeneous entity but are shaped by competing discourses of self (Holland, Skinner, Lachicotte, & Cain, 2001). A pedagogy of deliberateness starts from the premise that individuals' concepts of self are dynamic and can be shaped by social and professional relationships and institutional structures. A pedagogy of deliberateness addresses these competing discourses. It integrates the teaching of technical skills and objective knowledge with becoming critically aware of what drives them. Adult learners may not have the specialised disciplinary professional knowledge and technical skills, but nor are they an empty vessel. The aim of deliberating is to equip learners to draw on the many different ways of knowing such as technical, practical, emotional and political, to inform what is probable, possible and impossible. Teaching one-dimensional ways of knowing excludes diversity of values and beliefs. It makes deliberating on other possibilities and complexity appear as an unnecessary process. The goal of

deliberateness is to educate for ethical as well as for logical decisions and actions with eyes, mind and heart wide open.

There are rhetorical, persuasive, pragmatic yet also critical and courageous issues at stake in professional practice. Educating deliberate professionals is about exposing students to informed risk taking, getting them in touch with passion and compassion as well as fear. Professional judgments and decisions are defining parts of practice. Decisions such as whether to act and speak up or whether to be silent and not act need to be made. Ethical deliberations and decisions evolve around social justice and considerations about 'otherness'. Courageous decisions require engagement with knowledge, passion, fear as well as the consequences. Deliberate professionals consider issues of participation, inclusion, collaboration and engagement; they consider complex problems that not only alleviate inequality and injustices, but also run the risk of transforming themselves and/or others.

Critical thinking is the third pedagogical concept for educating the deliberate professional. It builds on autonomous thinking of already existing self-concepts of learners. Developing critical thinking skills is about 'getting students ... to recognize and question, the assumptions that determine how knowledge in that discipline is recognized as legitimate' (Brookfield, 2012, p. 28). As Brookfield argues, developing critical thinking is about connecting it to moral action. Critical thinking in the deliberate professional framework means thinking for self and with others, and not allowing others to think for us. It means, in the first instance, questioning the traditions and motivations that shape practices. Beyond questioning, critical thinking also involves imagining other possibilities to current practices. Critical thinking is a process that engages with complexity, diversity and ambiguity that enables learners to take an informed, ethical stance and to decide to act by shaping other possibilities for future practices and not to act by reproducing current practices (Trede & McEwen, 2015).

A pedagogy of deliberateness is based on four key ideas: (1) deliberating on the complexity of practice and workplace cultures and environments; (2) understanding what is probable, possible and impossible in relation to existing practices, others in practice and to change practice; (3) taking a deliberate stance in positioning oneself in practice as well as in making technical decisions; and (4) being aware of and responsible for the consequences of actions taken or actions not taken in relation to the doing, saying, knowing and relating in practice.

Deliberating on complexity means becoming conscious of class, race, gender, time and space that shape dominant practices. Understanding what is possible or impossible is expressed in diverse ways of knowing, such as embodied knowing, and not purely based on rational-logical reasoning. Taking a deliberate stance is based on deliberations and exploring choices for action. Learning to take a stance strengthens the formation and further development of professional identity through nurturing an action-oriented self-understanding. And finally, being aware and responsible for stances and actions nurtures a sense of citizenship and being an active change maker of unjust, ineffective practices. These four ideas are strongly interwoven and have fluid boundaries; they can be seen as reliant on processes that

primarily draw on learning through experiences, deliberations, meaning-making and action.

Deliberations are not immediately action-focused. Rather than searching for quick solutions the purpose of deliberating is to allow learners to explore a problem or issue from various perspectives. Deliberations include responsive listening and strategic questioning. Responsive listening implies more than hearing other people's voices. In addition to letting other people speak, the responsive listener thinks about and responsibly reacts to what has been said. Deliberate professionals engage in a respectful dialogue where one utterance is a response to previous utterances and where claims are scrutinised for the assumptions that inform them. Within the context of university education, academics need to work with students to facilitate the development of listening, questioning and reflecting skills.

Learning reflective practice while on work placements seems to provide an ideal opportunity that is often missed or neglected (Trede & Smith, 2012). When taught as a process (completing journal entries, reporting on practices, etc.), students are articulate about reflective practice and they easily identify its usefulness. However, most often students only develop a technical and practical reasoning approach applied to affirm current practices rather than a kind of deliberation that problematises and calls current practices into question as such.

Developing listening skills requires helping students expand from a mostly appreciative repertoire, which tends to affirm each other's work towards a more inquisitive stance. Although listening originates from a place of tolerance and appreciation, the deliberate professional needs to be well versed in critical ways of listening. To accept practice and others, people need to be able to understand them and be satisfied that current practice is good and other possibilities are improbable at that time.

Critical listening, thus, requires a culture of questioning. Without questioning there would be no critical understanding of current practices and searching for future ways of practising. There are many ways to pose questions. The purpose of strategic questioning is to get to the bottom of things in a mindful and appropriate manner. Strategic questions intend to make the purpose and intentions behind claims explicit and transparent. They invite speakers to further explain themselves and provide more contextual and personal information. Rather than asking, 'Why did you say this?', a strategic questioner would ask, 'How did you come to these conclusions or this way of thinking? What motivated you to make this claim?' When listening to others or reading policies deliberate professionals seek to separate rhetoric with disguised intentions from plain talk with explicit intentions. Responsive listening and strategic questioning leads to an understanding of one's own and others' values and interests in relation to where we stand and where we wish to go, against the backdrop of personal, historical, political and economic conditions.

To have an intentional and informed approach to practice necessitates to deliberate and understand what is a wise decision and practical action in a given situation. Reflections can focus on technical, procedural and on receptive and critical aspects of practice experiences. Reflections can be intentionally orchestrated to foster analytical intelligent reasoning, or to foster moral, critical, emotional and creative

reasoning, or to facilitate a blend of both to enable reasoned, passionate and practical decisions. Our conceptualisation of professional practices describes practice as a human activity that is relational, political, embodied, discursive and contextual.

Becoming a deliberate professional cannot be realised in isolation without discursive and relational activities. To understand what is said and how people relate to each other and objects as well as to build supportive professional and learning relationships between students, academics and practitioners is essential to becoming a practitioner. To become a deliberate professional, however, requires having a sense of place within a field of practice. It means being able to participate legitimately in practice and voice questions and uncertainties about the context within which one is called to perform.

Becoming a professional member of a community of practice is another core aspect to preparing students for future practice (Loftus, 2010). The deliberate professional pays attention to traditions and norms about professional relationships, dialogues and actions. The theory of communicative action (Habermas, 1984, 1987) is helpful here because it postulates three ideal conditions for communicative action that blends dialogue with reflections and actions. These conditions are: (1) a willingness and capacity to articulate reason rather than misuse power and use misleading rhetoric; (2) a self-reflective stance; and (3) a curiosity of otherness. Discursive activity, underpinned by these conditions, leads to critical meaning-making and intentional actions. Habermas's concern about distorted dialogues, just like Marcuse's (1965) caution of democracy, is a reminder that engagement, participation and dialogue in themselves do not necessarily or automatically lead to better learning outcomes, democratic relations and emancipation. There is a danger that dialogues and participation in academic classrooms or in the workplace can easily be distorted especially when communications are conducted within taken-for-granted value frameworks and rigid power relations, and directed towards narrowly defined assessment criteria. Dialogues and student participation can be conforming and replicating current practices if they are conducted without questioning or challenging existing value frameworks and work practices. Dialogues happen in relationships and who talks and who is silenced is one indicator of concepts of hierarchy and power. Deliberative reflections and deliberate actions can enable conditions and capabilities not only for robust debates that mediate differences, but for deliberate actions that lead to change.

We are aware that becoming deliberate is a delicate process that requires finding ways of reconciling the, sometimes, irreconcilable differences between learner autonomy (the personal) and social interdependencies (the situational and social). We are also aware that becoming deliberate might place students and practitioners at risk of being isolated and excluded from participating in education and professional practice. Educating the deliberate professional can be criticised, because it is confronting and challenging to ask students to be sceptical and questioning at times when they are newcomers in a community of professional practice. Being deliberate needs to be strategically timed and based on the recognition of its consequences on learning, teaching and assessing. In order not to marginalise the deliberate professional or teach students that critical thinking is not a core part of their practice, it is

better to introduce and develop the qualities of the deliberate professional early in the curriculum rather than postponing them till the final year of a course or addressing critical thinking and questioning as an add-on. The pedagogy of deliberateness needs to be strongly interwoven in the course curriculum allowing space for discussion about social justice and citizenship issues.

Teachers, mentors and supervisors together need to take on the role of mediators and work with and through themes emerging in the personal-political, personal-situational, and self-others spheres. It means teaching discontinuity, to keep looking for new ways of doing, saying, knowing and relating to things. It means moving students and teachers outside of their comfort zone (uncomfortable learning), drawing on diverse resources (distributed learning) and making the tensions and conflicts in professional practices and memberships visible.

Conclusion

Educating the deliberate professional takes into consideration socio-historical, economical and political forces at play, operates across learning spaces, using digital technology to bridge the classroom and workplace learning environments and asks students to scrutinise practices through technical, practical and critical lenses. Deliberateness is not about disavowing accepted practices, but rather about acknowledging and appreciating as well as critiquing traditions in order to enrich and improve existing and future conditions. Deliberateness places awareness, responsibility and ownership of action and inaction at the centre of practice as a way of dealing with uncertain and rapidly changing times. The deliberate professional, whether they are students, teachers or practitioners, engages with contemporary conditions and competing interests through deliberations and weighing up probable, possible and impossible actions and based on collective reflections makes good decisions and acts.

Being deliberate in thinking and acting requires slowing down. Unlike workplaces that can be seen as places of business, high turnover and productivity, university education can perhaps be seen as a place to slowdown for reflection outside of the rapidly changing world of work so that students can make critical sense of practice experiences.

The pedagogy of deliberateness provides a framework where students are seen as citizens, academics are seen as autonomous professionals who facilitate learning and change, and workplace learning educators are seen as critical practitioners. Educating the deliberate professional, accordingly, offers universities a professional education framework that is necessary for our contemporary times.

References

- Allen, J., & van der Velden, R. (Eds.). (2011). *The flexible professional in the knowledge society: New challenges for higher education*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
- Arendt, H. (1996). *Ich will verstehen: Selbstauskünfte zu leben und werk*. Ursula Ludz. Munich, Germany: Piper.
- Bauman, Z. (2005). Education in liquid modernity. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 27, 303–317.
- Bauman, Z., & Haugaard, M. (2008). Liquid modernity and power: A dialogue with Zygmunt Bauman 1. *Journal of Power*, 1(2), 111–130.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Questions de sociologie*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.
- Bourdieu, P. (1994). *Raisons pratiques: Sur la théorie de l'action*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.
- Brookfield, S. D. (2012). *Teaching for critical thinking: Tool and techniques to help students question their assumptions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Candy, P. (1991). *Self-direction for lifelong learning: A comprehensive guide to theory and practice*. Oxford: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Collini, S. (2012). *What are universities for?* London: Penguin.
- Fenwick, T., Nerland, M., & Jensen, K. (2012). Sociomaterial approaches to conceptualising professional learning and practice. *Journal of Education and Work*, 25(1), 1–13.
- Frank, A. W. (2012). Reflective healthcare practice: Claims, phronesis and dialogue. In A. E. Kinsella & A. Pitmas (Eds.), *Phronesis as professional knowledge* (pp. 53–60). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Habermas, J. (1972). *Towards a rational society* (J. J. Shapiro, Trans.). London: Heinemann.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action (volume 1): Reason and the rationalization of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Oxford: Polity Press.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action (volume 2): The critique of functionalist reason* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Oxford: Polity Press.
- Holland, D., Skinner, D., Lachicotte, W., & Cain, C. (2001). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- James, R., Krause, K. -L., & Jennings, C. (2010). *The first year experience in Australian universities: Findings from 1994 to 2009*. Retrieved from http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/research/experience/docs/FYE_Report_1994_to_2009.pdf
- Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2008). *New learning: Elements of a science of education*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Karseth, B. (2008). Qualifications frameworks for the European higher education area: A new instrumentalism or 'much ado about nothing'? *Utbildning & Demokrati*, 17(2), 51–72.
- Kemmis, S. (2012). Phronesis, experience and the primacy of praxis. In A. E. Kinsella & A. Pitmas (Eds.), *Phronesis as professional knowledge* (pp. 147–162). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Kemmis, S., & Grotenboer, P. (2008). Situating praxis in practice: Practice architectures and the cultural, social and material conditions for practice. In S. Kemmis & T. Smith (Eds.), *Enabling praxis: Challenges for education* (pp. 37–64). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Knorr Cetina, K. (1999). *Epistemic cultures: How the sciences make knowledge*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Loftus, S. (2010). Exploring communities of practice. In J. Higgs, D. Fish, I. Goulter, S. Loftus, J. Reid, & F. Trede (Eds.), *Education for future practice* (pp. 41–50). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

- Marcuse, H. (1965). Repressive tolerance. In R. P. Wolff, B. Moore, & H. Marcuse (Eds.), *A critique of pure tolerance* (pp. 95–137). Boston: Beacon.
- McEwen, C., & Trede, F. (2014). The academisation of emerging professions: Implications for universities, academics and students. *Power and Education*, 5(6), 145–154.
- McEwen, C., Trede, F., & Sheehan, D. (2012). *What constitutes an effective workplace learning environment?* Paper presented at the CSUEd annual conference, The Education for Practice Institute, Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, Australia.
- Moore, P. (2004). *Longing to belong: Trained actors' attempts to enter the profession* (Unpublished PhD thesis). The University of Sydney, Australia.
- Schatzki, T. R. (2002). *The site of the social: A philosophical account of the constitution of social life and change*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Schatzki, T. R. (2012). A primer on practices: Theory and research. In J. Higgs, R. Barnett, S. Billett, M. Hutchings, & F. Trede (Eds.), *Practice-based education: Perspectives and strategies* (pp. 13–26). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Swartz, D. (1997). *Culture and power: The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- Trede, F., & McEwen, C. (2015). Critical thinking for future practice. In M. Davies & R. Barnett (Eds.), *Palgrave handbook of critical thinking in higher education* (pp. 457–474). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Trede, F., & Smith, M. (2012). Teaching reflective practice in practice settings: Students' perceptions of their clinical educators. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 17(5), 615–628.
- Trede, F., Higgs, J., & Rothwell, R. (2009). Critical transformative dialogues: A research method beyond the fusion of horizons. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 10(1), Art. 6.

Educating the Deliberate Professional

Preparing for future practices

Trede, F.; McEwen, C. (Eds.)

2016, XIII, 234 p. 4 illus., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-32956-7