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INTRODUCTION
Educational Research is the new kid on the European research block. ‘Kid’ is an appropriate label because as a field – or, perhaps more accurately, sub-field – European educational research is still very much in its infancy. Indeed, it wasn’t until 1994, as Kenk (2003) reminds us, that education was included in the 4th EU framework programme.

Yet a field in its infancy is, by definition, under-developed, and whilst the development of European educational research has increasingly been the subject of debate over the last few years amongst those within, or with an interest in, the field (Agalianos, 2003; Brown, 2004; Lawn, 2002; Sirota, Zay, Lawn and Keiner, 2002) the discussion has tended to focus mainly on a European educational research ‘space’ or ‘area’. Whilst they have received less attention, issues related to the identification of a distinct European educational research community or profession have certainly been addressed, but examination of how such a professional community ought to develop has, for the most part, been confined to consideration of principles or practicalities associated with unification, coherence and identity (Brown, 2004; Sirota, in Sirota, Zay, Lawn and Keiner, 2002). The qualitative development of this profession – professional development in its traditional sense of the enhancement and improvement of work-related knowledge, skills and understanding – has been considered (in some cases, fleetingly and without specificity) by what appears to be a minority of European educational research analysts (e.g. Gogolin, 2002; Keiner, in Sirota, Zay, Lawn and Keiner, 2002) and remains generally under-examined. This is understandable, since it may be considered rather pointless – or, at least, precipitate – to be attending to the development of what may justifiably be described as a potential, rather than an existing or clearly identifiable, professional community. Indeed, Lawn (in Sirota, Zay, Lawn and Keiner, 2002) makes the point that the European Educational Research Association (EERA) ‘needs the active participation and friendly effectiveness of its members before it can become the major force in policy and science it aspires to be in Europe’ (p. 576; my emphasis). But there is also a case for arguing that a professional development agenda may, in fact, expedite the realisation of a European educational research community.

This article presents such an argument. Drawing on a necessarily sketchy picture of the current European educational research community it presents the case for researcher professional development, and proposes a framework for enhancing the professionalism and professionality of European educational researchers.

THE CASE FOR DEVELOPMENT
My proposed professional development model for European educational researchers, presented in a later section, incorporates consideration of areas of developmental need that have been identified from examination of the current state of European educational research. The case for development is built up from a combination of this analysis with clarification of my understanding and interpretation of professional development, presented below.
Professionalism, professionality and professional development: examining the concepts

As part of his discussion of whether educational research ought to be categorised as a profession, Donald McIntyre (1997) presents an outline examination of professionalism, as applied to educational researchers. Within this context he identifies the criterion for it as ‘expertise’ (p. 130). Yet leaving aside its specificity of application, this is by no means a consensually accepted interpretation. Whilst the study of professions and professionalism has evolved over the years, shifting its focus from examination of the constituents of a profession and, by extension, of professionalism, to other issues within the field, there remains considerable lack of clarity and disagreement over how professionalism should be conceived. As Freidson (1994, p.15) writes: ‘we seem to be no nearer consensus than we were in 1915, and … usage [of the term, ‘professionalism’] varies substantively, logically, and conceptually.’

The concept of professionalism

Many interpretations1 of professionalism – perhaps representing a broad consensus - seem to focus on its being an externally imposed, articulated perception of what lies within the parameters of a profession’s collective remit and responsibilities (e.g. Ozga, 1995; Troman, 1996). In setting the positions of these parameters – and, hence, in defining the boundaries of the profession’s actual and potential authority, power and influence – external agencies appear to have the capacity for designing and delineating professions. In one sense, then, professionalism may be interpreted as what is effectively a representation of a service level agreement, imposed from above.

Yet some interpretations lie outside this broad consensual one. With Boyt, Lusch and Naylor’s (2001, p. 322) emphasis on the influential capacity of the professional her/himself - ‘Professionalism consists of the attitudes and behavior one possesses toward one’s profession. It is an attitudinal and behavioral orientation that individuals possess toward their occupations’ - we see a degree of consistency with the key foci of McIntyre’s interpretation, referred to above.

A common feature of many conceptions of new professionalism in an education context is a focus on practitioner control and proactivity; (these fall into the category of analysts’ own prescriptions, e.g. Hargreaves and Goodson, 1996; Sachs, 1999). This, in part, is consistent with Freidson’s (1994, p. 10) interpretation of professionalism:

I use the word ‘profession’ to refer to an occupation that controls its own work, organized by a special set of institutions sustained in part by a particular ideology of expertise and service. I use the word ‘professionalism’ to refer to that ideology and special set of institutions.

It is also consistent with McIntyre’s (1997) idealised notion of the British educational research community’s controlling and maintaining the quality of its own work through the British Educational Research Association (BERA), which had originally been intended as a professional association.

But whether this interpretation of professionalism is still valid, or whether it is now outdated, is highly debateable, for there is a wave of opinion that distinguishes ‘new’

---

1 In the interests of conciseness I do not present here a full examination of different interpretations and definitions of professionalism; this may be found elsewhere (Evans, 2007).
professionalisms from the professionalisms that preceded them by a key feature: a shift in power. Whoever used to call the shots, it is argued, no longer does so (or, at least, does so to a lesser extent). The advent of new professionalisms is often seen as a governmentally-imposed professional development initiative which has, to all intents and purposes, swept away such conceptions as that of Freidson (1994, p. 10), above, of professionalism as a structure and system of professionals’ autonomy and control over their work-related remits and roles. In order to move towards application of a conception of professionalism to consideration of the current state of the European educational research profession, I first examine what I refer to as the ‘substance’ of professionalism.

The substance of professionalism

Freidson’s interpretation of professionalism incorporates references to features that might generally be equated with elements of professional culture. Implicit in the interpretation – with its focus on ideology and a special set of institutions – is homogeneity of values and viewpoints. It is this homogeneity amongst its membership that Johnson (1972) suggests as one of the features of a profession.

The relationship - and the distinction – between professional culture and professionalism are relevant to examination of the substance of professionalism. Although, based on examination of many interpretations (Freidson, 1994; Hargreaves and Goodson, 1996; Johnson, 1972; Sachs, 1999), it may be argued that professionalism is constituted largely of professional culture, it is evidently also something more. The consensus of interpretation suggests that professionalism goes beyond professional culture by delineating the content of the work carried out by the profession, as reflected in accepted roles and responsibilities, key functions and remits, range of requisite skills and knowledge, and the general nature of work-related tasks. Whilst professional culture may be interpreted as shared ideologies, values and general ways of and attitudes to working – ‘a configuration of beliefs, practices, relationships, language and symbols distinctive to a particular social unit’ (Hoyle and Wallace, 2005, p. 103) - professionalism seems generally to be seen as the identification and expression of what is required and expected of members of a profession. Day (1999, p.13) implies an interpretation of professionalism as a ‘consensus of the “norms” which may apply to being and behaving as a professional within personal, organizational and broader political conditions’.

If professional culture is incorporated within, and constitutes a large element of, professionalism it is likely to have evolved as such as an inevitable by-product of it, although, as I discuss below, I do not believe this is likely to be a unidirectional relationship. The distinction between professional culture and professionalism is, arguably, that the former is more attitudinal than behavioural in its focus and the latter more functional than attitudinal. The relationship between the two, I suggest, is that professional culture may be interpreted as the collective, predominantly attitudinal, response of people towards the professionalism that predominantly defines how they function.

In the context in which it is examined in this paper, a key element of professionalism appears to be commonality. Though I accept that in everyday parlance it is acceptable to talk of an individual’s professionalism, the majority of definitions presented above suggest a general conception of professionalism, like professional culture, as a collective notion: a plurality, shared by many. Yet the basic components and
The constituent elements of professionalism are essentially singular since they reflect the individuality representing the individuals who are the constituency of the profession delineated. The ‘singular’ unit of professionalism – and one of its key constituent elements – is, I suggest, professionality, as I interpret the term.

‘Professionality’ is a term introduced by Hoyle (1975), who identifies two distinct aspects of teachers’ professional lives: professionalism and professionality. In 1975 Hoyle explained the distinction as being between status-related elements of teachers’ work, which he categorised as professionalism, and those elements of the job that constitute the knowledge, skills and procedures that teachers use in their work, and which he categorised as professionality. After extensive consideration and analysis, I have defined professionality as: an ideologically-, attitudinally-, intellectually-, and epistemologically-based stance on the part of an individual, in relation to the practice of the profession to which s/he belongs, and which influences her/his professional practice (Evans, 2002b).

In the 1970s Hoyle formulated two models of teacher professionality: ‘For the sake of discussion we can hypothesize two models of professionality: restricted and extended’ (Hoyle, 1975, p. 318). The characteristics used to illustrate these two hypothetical models created what may effectively be seen as a continuum with, at one end, a model of the ‘restricted’ professional, who is essentially reliant upon experience and intuition and is guided by a narrow, classroom-based perspective which values that which is related to the day-to-day practicalities of teaching. The characteristics of the model of ‘extended’ professionality, at the other end of the continuum, reflect: a much wider vision of what education involves, valuing of the theory underpinning pedagogy, and the adoption of a generally intellectual and rationally-based approach to the job. I use the term, professionality orientation to refer to individuals’ location on an ‘extended-restricted’ professionality continuum. Empirical evidence supports the existence of such a continuum within teacher culture (Evans, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2002b; Nias, 1985, 1989), giving credence to Hoyle’s heuristic models. Allowing for specific contextual differences it is a continuum that, I suggest, is applicable to all professions.

I perceive professionalism to be what may perhaps best be described as, in one sense, the ‘plural’ of individuals’ professionality orientation: the amalgam of multiple ‘professionalities’ – professionality writ large. In this respect my interpretation of professionalism is consistent with that of Boyt, Lusch and Naylor (2001), presented above. One implication of this interpretation is that the delineation and shape of professionalism are evolved within the profession, rather than formulated and imposed on it by external agencies. However, this implication, in turn, is predicated upon acceptance that professionality orientation is determined independently of professionalism and suggests a unidirectional, consequential relationship between professionality and professionalism. In fact, it is more plausible that an iterative developmental process operates: the amalgamation of individuals’ professionalities influences and shapes the collective professionalism, which, in turn, stimulates or provokes responses in individuals that determine their professionality orientations. Professionalism thus has as much chance of influencing professionality as professionality has of influencing professionalism, in the same way that a critical realist interpretation explains the interaction between structure and agency in defining culture (Archer, 1988; 1995; 2000). There can be little doubt that professional culture also enters into the equation, contributing to the iterative
developmental process, for my current thinking leads me to perceive individual professionality as the singular unit not only of professionalism but also as one of the singular units of professional culture. Professional culture represents – at least in part - the sum of individuals’ professionality and, since professionality is potentially influenced by professionalism, so too, therefore, is its sum. As I have already suggested, professional culture represents an attitudinal response towards professionalism.

Yet professional culture, in turn, determines the nature of professionalism. This may be disputed by those who interpret professionalism as an externally formulated and applied design of the nature and scope of a profession - an interpretation which safeguards professionalism from being tampered with from within the profession and secures its function as an occupational control mechanism (Ozga, 1995, p.35). My contention, though, is that professionalism should not be a hypothetical or idealised concept, it should be perceived as a reality – a real entity. Yet it is only a real entity if it is operational. Professionalism’s ‘entiativity’, to use Campbell’s term (1958, cited in Castano, Yzerbyt and Bourguignon, 2003), is crucial because if it is not enacted – if it is not functional – professionalism is reduced to being meaningless; an unfulfilled vision; an ideal that fails to be realised. To be real, it has to be something that people – professionals - actually ‘do’, not simply something that the government or any other agency wants them to do, or mistakenly imagines they are doing. Above, I liken professionalism to a service level agreement, but it is only such when it is accepted and adopted by the professionals at whom it is directed. Until that happens it is merely a service level requirement. In enacting or reifying professionalism professionals inevitably shape it by allowing their professional culture to influence it, yet their professional culture is also shaped by the enactment of professionalism. If it is to achieve any measure of success, any attempt to impose a professionalism on an occupational group or community must, therefore, incorporate both consideration of the influence, and understanding of the nature, of that group’s professional culture(s), as represented by the professionality range represented within the profession.

A second implication of my interpretation that professionalism is the amalgam of multiple ‘professionalities’ is that, if we accept that a range of professionality orientations within any profession underpins an evident diversity of outlook, attitudes, values, ideologies and approaches to the job, then the homogeneity, commonality or consensus which are generally identified as essential to professionalism necessarily become elusive. This, in turn, calls into question the very notion of professionalism as it has generally come to be understood. If professionalism is essentially accepted as a collective commonality of approach to and execution of the key roles, responsibilities and activities that constitute the work undertaken by the profession then its existence is undermined by a diversity that negates its essential features. Whilst such commonality – indeed, uniformity – may feature within a conception of professionalism that is required, or even demanded, of an occupational group, it is bound to dissipate into impracticable rhetoric at some stage during the translation from what is required to what is enacted because a wide, diverse range of individuals’ professionalities is entered into the equation.

---

2 The term entiativity was first introduced by Campbell (1958) to refer to ‘the degree of having the nature of an entity, of having real existence’ (Campbell, 1958, p. 17, cited in Castano, Yzerbyt and Bourguignon, 2003, p. 735).
**Professionalism redefined**

Having examined its substance, how, then, should we conceive of professionalism? Does the term relate to what is officially set down as the accepted shared norms and behaviour code of the profession in relation to how it delivers its service and/or performs its designated function(s), or does it refer to the real, enacted version of this? The two will never completely match, as anyone who has ever complained of poor customer service will testify. Hoyle and Wallace (2007, p. 19) refer to one form of such mismatch as ‘the irony of presentation’, which ‘manifests itself in the manner in which members of an organization present an image of the organization to the outside world that is not wholly congruent with the reality of its daily practices.’ Mismatch is inevitable since ‘official’ versions of professionalism are predicated upon a commonality of professional-related behaviour that a study of professionality reveals to be unviable, and hence such notions of professionalism, in representing something that is unviable, begins to veer towards nonsense, and one questions the existentialist status of a professionalism conceived as such.

One solution may be to distinguish between different reified states – or states of entitiativity - of professionalism (incorporating consideration of the question: real, according to whose perspective?) Thus one may, for example, distinguish between: professionalism that is demanded or requested (such as that reflecting specific professional service level demands or requests made of an occupational group or individual workforce), professionalism that is prescribed (such as that reflecting envisaged or recommended professional service levels perceived by analysts, trade unions, or, indeed, any interested observers from outside or within the profession), and professionalism that is enacted; that is, professional practice as observed, perceived and interpreted (by any observer – from outside or within the relevant professional group, and including those doing the ‘enacting’; such is the form of professionalism identified by McIntyre (1997) in relation to educational researchers). Yet since only the third of these conceptions of professionalism may be considered to reflect reality – albeit a phenomenologically defined reality – it remains the only meaningful conception; any others represent insubstantiality ranging from articulated ideology to wishful thinking. Drawing once again on Hoyle and Wallace’s (2007, p. 19) words, quoted above, a meaningful conception of professionalism must reflect the reality of daily practices.

From this reasoning, and incorporating my interpretation of professionalism as, in a sense, the ‘plural’ of professionality, my current thinking leads me to define professionalism as: professionality-influenced practice that is consistent with commonly-held consensual delineations of a specific profession and that both reflects, and contributes to the formulation of, commonly-held perceptions of: the profession’s purpose and status; the specific nature, range and levels of service provided by, and expertise prevalent within, the profession; and, the general ethical code underpinning this practice.

Both professionalism and professionality, as I define them, are incorporated within my conceptualisation and definition of professional development, outlined below.
Professional development
Elsewhere (Evans, 2002a) I present a conceptual and ontological analysis of a specific contextual application of professional development - teacher development - which explains the reasoning underpinning my identification of its constituent elements, dimensions and range of applicability. Removing it from this narrow contextual application, I apply this analysis to professional development in general, which, modified to reflect this wider applicability, I define as: *the process whereby individuals’ professionalism and/or professionality may be considered to be enhanced*, and which incorporates what I have identified as two constituent elements: functional development and attitudinal development. These relate, respectively, to the process whereby professional performance may be improved, and the process whereby people’s attitudes to their work may be modified. I currently perceive attitudinal development as incorporating two constituent change features, or foci of change: *intellectual* and *motivational*, referring respectively to individuals’ development in relation to their intellect and their motivation. I currently perceive functional development as incorporating two constituent change features, or foci of change: *procedural* and *productive*, referring respectively to development in relation to procedures utilised, and to what and/or how much people ‘produce’ or ‘do’, at work.

My proposed model of professional development for the European educational researcher incorporates this definition and analysis. With its focus on the perceived enhancement of professionalism and/or professionality, the model is clearly dependent for its justification and credibility on consideration, as a starting point, of the current state of European educational researchers’ professionalism and professionality.

The current state of European educational research: professionalism and professionality
Adapting my definition to the specific context, I define European educational research professionalism as: *professionality-influenced European-specific educational research practice that is consistent with commonly-held consensual delineations of the educational research profession and that both reflects, and contributes to the formulation of, commonly-held perceptions of: the purpose and status of the European educational research profession; the specific nature, range and levels of service provided by, and expertise prevalent amongst, educational researchers working in the European context; and, the general ethical code underpinning educational research.*

By *European(-specific)* educational research I do not simply mean educational research carried out by European educational researchers but: *research directed at extending knowledge and understanding related to all areas of educational activity and issues, and from all perspectives, including those of learners, educators, policymakers, analysts and the public, in the context of: Europe as a geographical location, pan-Europeanism, Europeanisation or Europe as a cultural identity referent.*

---

3 In this context I employ the term ‘educational research’ in the sense of researching, using the present participle of the verb, rather than in the sense of research as a noun.

4 This definition adapts and extends the British Educational Research Association’s (BERA, 2004) definition of educational research.
But to what extent does this definition of its professionalism reflect the current state of European educational research? In other words, is this an accurate definition of current, enacted European educational research professionalism?

Current enacted European educational research professionalism: building up a picture from the available evidence

It is, as McIntyre (1997, p. 129) suggests, impossible to construct an accurate picture of British educational researchers at work: ‘Much of our debate about what educational research in Britain is like, and what is or is not wrong with it, is conducted on the basis of very limited and inadequate information… . We have…little information about educational researchers’. Constructing such a picture of the European educational researcher is clearly no less difficult. Indeed, the difficulties associated with it are compounded by confusion, uncertainty and inconsistency arising from the lack of conceptual, interpretative and definitional clarity that generally surrounds any new, abstract, organisational and/or structural entity. The European Union itself is continually re-forming and re-presenting itself both quantitatively and qualitatively in its progress towards stability and effectiveness. Many of its member states are still preoccupied with carving out for themselves a niche within it and clarifying their power- and identity-related positions and functions. Their inhabitants, for the most part, seem none the less ambivalent or unclear in relation to their own lives as Europeans, and what being European means and involves. Even amongst citizens of established, and even founder, member states there appears to be no consensual, shared European identity. In relation to European research the same sources of confusion, uncertainty and inconsistency are evidently mirrored, if not magnified. The newly-established European Research Council (ERC) is still defining itself and its purpose and mission – if not on paper then certainly in practice. Add to this the novelty of educational research on a European scale, plus the consideration that European research and what is often referred to as a European research space – educational or otherwise – is not necessarily confined to the context of the EU, and any picture of the European educational researcher at work seems destined to be at worst unobtainable, and at best sketchy and imprecise. As Lawn (2002, p. 576, in Sirota, Zay, Lawn and Keiner, 2002) points out, ‘The role of educational researchers in Europe is not clear’; indeed, despite his editorship of the European Educational Research Journal, and his extensive involvement in the European Educational Research Association (EERA), he admits to having ‘struggled to understand what the EERA is’ (p. 576). Nevertheless, set against this backdrop of impedimentary circumstances and influences, I draw upon what little evidence is available in order to outline a rudimentary and incomplete image that I believe bears some vague resemblance to what might be labelled ‘European’ educational research as an activity or form of professional practice.

First, European educational research has a low profile. Kenk’s assessment is that ‘the EU regards educational research as subordinated to the social sciences’ (Kenk, 2003, p. 615). This perception is borne out by the exclusion of any real consideration of educational research within the structure and organisation of the ERC. Of the twenty-two members of its scientific council only one is a social scientist and one is from the field of arts and humanities; the remaining twenty represent subjects that are most likely to facilitate the ERC’s mission ‘to bring about new and unpredictable scientific and technological discoveries - the kind that can form the basis of new industries, markets,
and broader social innovations of the future’ (ERC website, accessed September 2007).
This may not necessarily demonstrate that educational research is held in low esteem
within the wider academic and research community – though that is quite likely - it may
simply be that the ERC’s focus on the physical sciences, engineering and technology
(European Commission Directorate General for Research, 2005) leaves little room for
any other disciplines. What does seem fairly certain, though, is that if educational
research manages to put in any sort of appearance on this particular European stage it is
unlikely to involve anything more than a chorus part.

Second, a key contributor to European educational research’s low profile is
almost certainly its very wide-ranging quality. Indeed, referring to non-education-specific
research the European Commission Directorate General for Research (2005, p.2)
emphasises the need for ‘reinforcing excellence’: ‘Europe does not perform particularly
well in terms of truly outstanding research.’ Furthermore, based on what limited evidence
is available, an outline comparison between a small number of national educational
research profiles suggests diversity of quality and, arguably related to this, differing
emphases and preoccupations with methodological rigour, not only between, but, in some
cases, within, countries (e.g. Bassey, 2007; Evans, 2002b; Gorard, 2007; Hammersley,
1998; 2007; Hillage et al., 1998; Pollard, 2007; Pratt and Swann, 1999; Ransom, 1998;
Rey, 2006; Scott, 2000; Tooley with Darby, 1998; OECD/CERI, 2002; OECD/CERI,

Third, European educational research is generally fragmented and
compartmentalised (Agalianos, 2003, Brown, 2004; European Commission Directorate
General for Research, 2005, p.4) and lacks the coherence of a clear, consensually
accepted direction for development: ‘Research is most often pursued by small research
teams or individuals who work in isolation within their own national contexts and who
are, in many cases, unaware of similar research being carried out elsewhere in Europe’
(Agalanos, 2003, pp. 184-5). This is hardly surprising since much – if not all –
educational research carried out in national (including non-European) contexts is
considered deficient in this manner. Indeed, the fourth point that I wish to make about
European educational research follows directly from this issue.

‘European’ educational research, I suggest, does not yet exist in any significant
way in its own right; it is, at this stage in its evolution, little more than an association of
separate national European research sub-communities – or, in some cases, research sub-
communities that are drawn from and transcend national contexts but which remain,
nevertheless, separate from an identifiable European research community - each with
their own traditions, foci, and, above all, weaknesses. In this respect educational research
is no different, it appears, from other European research:

At the present time … it cannot be claimed that there is a
European research policy. The research policies of the
Member States and that of the Union are conducted in
parallel but do not constitute a coherent whole … National
research programmes are highly independent of one
another … European researchers lack familiarity with the
research cultures which exist in other countries’ (Europa,
accessed 2007).
Currently, the case for developing the European educational research profession rests upon the premise that the truly European educational researcher has not yet emerged – at least, not in any recognisable quantity – because there is not yet a clear European educational research space, nor a European educational research culture, nor a European educational research professionalism. Educational researchers working in a European context, on European issues, are still, for the most part, a long way from manifesting the requisite homogeneity for reflecting or contributing to commonly-held perceptions of the purpose and status of the European educational research profession and the specific nature, range and levels of service provided by, and expertise prevalent amongst, educational researchers working in the European context, all of which are requisite features of European educational research professionalism, as I define it above. Indeed, the diversity of attitudes and perceptions that evidently reflect different European national cultures precludes their being commonly-held.

In this respect, European educational research professionalism is, I believe, no different from any other professionalism; homogeneity is, as I have suggested elsewhere (Evans, 2007), unachievable. Yet, ironically, it is important to question the degree to which, in the context of European research, homogenization is desirable; indeed, I share Kwick’s (2004) concern that it endangers the traditional role of European universities. Moreover, his highlighting of the increased diversity of European academic culture brought about by the most recent expansion of the EU and the incorporation of new, Eastern European member states which, to varying degrees, are still confronting old challenges as well as having to take on new ones, begs the question of whether any meaningful progress made towards Europeanisation has now had to take a backward step, or at least remain stationary whilst our new neighbours catch up with us. In the light of these issues and concerns, the key question is how the European educational research profession may best be developed. What is the nature and image of the professionalism that we should be pursuing?

TOWARDS A PROFESSION OF ‘EXTENDED’ PROFESSIONALITY: A MODEL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Development of European educational research should, I believe, be aimed at combating the profession’s evident disadvantages and weaknesses – a low profile stemming from low status; wide-ranging quality of research; differing substantive and methodological emphases and foci; and, lack of singular identity – whilst simultaneously accommodating different cultures and traditions. On the one hand it should transcend diversity by offering universal applicability and appeal in order to promote much-needed coherence, yet on the other hand it should also incorporate provision for differentiated rates of development and ease of transition. This is certainly a tall order, but it is, I suggest, achievable if the developmental focus is shifted from professionalism to professionality. Instead of setting our sights on a homogeneous professionalism we ought, I believe, to work on developing what I consider to be the singular unit of professionalism: professionality. By this means the professionalism that emerges will do so as a natural extension - an amalgamation – of the individual professionalities manifest by European educational researchers. But these individual professionalities need developing.
A ‘restricted’-‘extended’ educational researcher professionality continuum

I have argued elsewhere (Evans, 2002b) that a wide range of professionality orientation (on a ‘restricted’-‘extended’ continuum adapted from Hoyle’s (1975) heuristic models of schoolteacher professionality) is evident within the educational research profession in the UK. Referring to the ‘extended’ educational researcher as an ‘analytical’ researcher who constantly strives to practise reflective educational research, I have suggested too that many educational researchers are located nearer to the ‘restricted’ than to the ‘extended’ end of such a continuum, and I have called for a more concerted effort to develop the profession towards one constructed from more prevalent ‘extended’ professionality, for whom I have outlined typical indicative characteristics. I now expand upon this argument, first by applying it to the European educational researcher, and second, following Hoyle’s (1975) portrayal of schoolteacher professionalities, by identifying more precisely and completely the typical characteristics that may be associated with educational researchers located at the two extremes of a ‘restricted’-‘extended’ professionality continuum. These are presented in Figure 1, below.

Figure 1: Characteristics illustrating the extremes of the ‘restricted’-‘extended’ professionality continuum in relation to educational research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The educational researcher located at the ‘restricted’ extreme of the professionality continuum typically:</th>
<th>The educational researcher located at the ‘extended’ extreme of the professionality continuum typically:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conducts research that lacks rigour;</td>
<td>conducts highly rigorous research;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draws upon basic research skills;</td>
<td>draws upon basic and advanced research skills;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fails to develop or extend her/his methodological competence;</td>
<td>strives constantly to develop and extend her/his methodological competence;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utilises only established research methods;</td>
<td>adapts established research methods and develops methodology;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fails to develop basic research findings;</td>
<td>generates and develops theory from research findings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceives research methods as tools and methodology as a task-directed, utilitarian process;</td>
<td>perceives research methodology as a field of study in itself;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies low level analysis to research data;</td>
<td>strives constantly to apply deep levels of analysis to research data;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceives individual research studies as independent and free-standing;</td>
<td>recognises the value of, and utilises, comparative analysis, meta-analysis, synthesis, replication, etc.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceives individual research studies as finite and complete;</td>
<td>constantly reflects upon, and frequently revisits and refines, his/her own studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struggles to criticise literature and others’ research effectively;</td>
<td>has developed the skill of effective criticism and applies this to the formulation of his/her own arguments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publishes mainly in ‘lower grade’ academic</td>
<td>publishes frequently in ‘high ranking’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journals and in professional journals/magazines; is associated mainly with research findings that fall into the ‘tips for practitioners’ category of output.</td>
<td>academic journals; disseminates ground-breaking theoretical issues and contributes to, and takes a lead in developing, discourse on theory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quite simply, what I propose as a model of European educational researcher development is a commitment to progress steadily along the professionality continuum towards the ‘extended’ end, by developing and manifesting the attitudes, skills, knowledge and understanding reflected by the characteristics that I present (Fig. 1) as illustrative of the ‘extended’ professional: the ‘analytical’ researcher. This model would allow individual researchers and research communities to progress from whatever point marks their current location on the continuum, yet its common focus and direction would also provide coherence and a degree of singularity of identity. The analyticism and reflectivity that the model promotes are directed towards improving quality and raising standards, which would have a positive effect on the status and, in turn, profile of European educational researchers, yet the generic nature of the skills and competences that it is aimed at developing transcends specific epistemological and methodological traditions, stances and allegiances; ‘extended’ professionality is primarily quality-related, rather than substantively-determined.

It is important at this point to examine my proposed development model in relation to its capacity for achieving the elements incorporated into my definition of European educational research professionalism: *professionality-influenced European-specific educational research practice that is consistent with commonly-held consensual delineations of the educational research profession and that both reflects, and contributes to the formulation of, commonly-held perceptions of: the purpose and status of the European educational research profession; the specific nature, range and levels of service provided by, and expertise prevalent amongst, educational researchers working in the European context; and, the general ethical code underpinning educational research.* The provision of a central focus and direction would generate commonly-held consensual delineations of the educational research profession and promote research practice that reflects and contributes to the formulation of commonly-held perceptions of the purpose and status of the educational research profession and of the specific nature, range and levels of service provided by, and expertise prevalent amongst, educational researchers. The aim of the model – albeit somewhat idealistic – is that researchers would all pursue ‘extended’ professionality, but at their own pace and within the contexts of their own backgrounds and traditions.

As it has been presented so far, however, the model fails to incorporate consideration of a European-specific dimension. To address this omission I suggest typical indicative characteristics of researchers who may be considered to lie at either extreme of what I refer to as a ‘Euro-sceptic’-‘European’ continuum, presented in Figure 2. Clearly, development as a European educational researcher, rather than simply as an educational researcher, would need to incorporate progression along a continuum such as this.

---

5 I adopt the term ‘Euro-sceptic’ from the UK political arena, where it is employed as both a noun and an adjective to denote lack of commitment to, and reservations about, European hegemony.
Merging these two continua would this create a ‘restricted’-‘extended’ professionality continuum in relation to European educational research, presented in Figure 3, which would serve as the framework for a professional development model for the European educational researcher.

**Figure 2:** Characteristics illustrating the extremes of the Euro-sceptic-European professionality continuum in relation to educational research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The educational researcher located at the Euro-sceptic extreme of the ‘Euro-sceptic’-‘European’ educational researcher professionality continuum typically:</th>
<th>The educational researcher located at the European extreme of the ‘Euro-sceptic’-‘European’ educational researcher professionality continuum typically:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lacks a sense of European identity;</td>
<td>perceives her/himself primarily as a European;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resists Europeanisation and pan-Europeanism;</td>
<td>embraces Europeanisation &amp; pan-Europeanism;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manifests a research contextual referent that is restricted to local or national perspectives and issues.</td>
<td>conducts research that addresses and/or has relevance to European-specific issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3:** Characteristics illustrating the extremes of the ‘restricted’-‘extended’ professionality continuum in relation to European educational research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The researcher located at the ‘restricted’ extreme of the European educational researcher professionality continuum typically:</th>
<th>The researcher located at the ‘extended’ extreme of the European educational researcher professionality continuum typically:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conducts research that lacks rigour;</td>
<td>conducts highly rigorous research;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draws upon basic research skills;</td>
<td>draws upon basic and advanced research skills;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fails to develop or extend her/his methodological competence;</td>
<td>strives constantly to develop and extend her/his methodological competence;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utilises only established research methods;</td>
<td>adapts established research methods and develops methodology;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fails to develop basic research findings;</td>
<td>generates and develops theory from research findings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceives research methods as tools and methodology as a task-directed, utilitarian process;</td>
<td>perceives research methodology as a field of study in itself;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applies low level analysis to research data;</td>
<td>strives constantly to apply deep levels of analysis to research data;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceives individual research studies as independent and free-standing;</td>
<td>recognises the value of, and utilises, comparative analysis, meta-analysis, synthesis, replication, etc.;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceives individual research studies as finite and complete;</td>
<td>constantly reflects upon, and frequently revisits and refines, his/her own studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>struggles to criticise literature and others’ research effectively;</td>
<td>has developed the skill of effective criticism and applies this to the formulation of his/her own arguments;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publishes mainly in ‘lower grade’ academic journals and in professional journals/magazines;</td>
<td>publishes frequently in ‘high ranking’ academic journals;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is associated mainly with research findings that fall into the ‘tips for practitioners’ category of output;</td>
<td>disseminates ground-breaking theoretical issues and contributes to, and takes a lead in developing, discourse on theory;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacks a sense of European identity;</td>
<td>perceives her/himself primarily as a European;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resists Europeanisation and pan-Europeanism;</td>
<td>embraces Europeanisation &amp; pan-Europeanism;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manifests a research contextual referent that is restricted to local or national perspectives and issues.</td>
<td>conducts research that addresses and/or has relevance to European-specific issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**From continuum to development model: implications for policy and practice**

A continuum for which typical indicative characteristics are presented, reflecting professionalism located at either of its extremes, does not constitute a professional development model; it is merely the framework for such a model. But, as a framework, it exemplifies professional attitudinal and behavioural descriptors that reflect standards of practice ranging from low to high. In the context of European educational research, building a professional development model around this framework requires its incorporation and adaptation into research leadership and development policy and practice as well as all areas and strata of European research activity. This may be achieved by adapting and incorporating the indicative typical ‘extended’ professionalism characteristics into measurable standards and criteria used by, *inter alia*, journal editorial boards; conference, symposia and seminar organising committees; research funding bodies, including, in particular, the ERC; job appointments and promotion panels and committees; and organisations awarding academic prizes. The ‘restricted’-’extended’ continuum may be used diagnostically to formulate professional development programmes and research mentoring schemes, and, above all, if publicised within the European educational research community, it may serve as a motivational yardstick against which individuals and communities may measure themselves and direct their self-development. It is by no means unproblematic. In particular, it is susceptible to wide-ranging subjective opinions about precisely what measurable activity or output may be considered a manifestation of each specific typical indicative characteristic: what one individual, for example, may consider ‘highly rigorous’ research may be considered by another to be nothing of the sort. Indeed, it is possible that such diverse interpretation may prevail between different research communities, rendering standardisation of quality difficult to apply. Yet it is surely a step in the right direction, since it is likely to inject into the developing European educational research community greater coherence, commonality of focus and standardisation of quality of practice than has hitherto been evident.
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