Modelling Transformative Education

REBECCA WEBB & PERPETUA KIRBY

ABSTRACT This article is a call to rebalance and broaden contemporary education to include a focus on both conformity *and* transformation. It includes an overview of three different models of education, relating to different educational purposes. Two emphasise conformity in knowledge acquisition – 'mastering knowledge' and 'discovering knowledge' – as well as a third, 'not-knowing', that emphasises transformation in terms of what it is possible to know, to do and to be. The article explores the complementarity of these different models, and the need for further conversations to ensure a greater balance between conformity and transformation within educational institutions.

Introduction

This article is part of a journey of two ethnographic education researchers. It is a call to rebalance and broaden contemporary education to include a focus on both conformity *and* transformation. There is an imperative to examine these two ideas together; we are in an age that promises technological and educational solutions to global challenges that mask the inevitable uncertainty of twenty-first-century futures. In the article, we give an overview of three different models of education that relate to different educational purposes. Two emphasise conformity in knowledge acquisition – what we call 'mastering knowledge' and 'discovering knowledge' – while a third, 'not-knowing', emphasises transformation in terms of what it is possible to know, to do and to be. We explore what gets lost and what becomes possible within the presumptions of each of the three models. This includes the forms of agency this gives to pupils. We begin by outlining how we came to our interest in this area deeply connected to practices in schools, before discussing the different purposes of education and outlining the three models, and demonstrating their complementarity. The article concludes with some reflections on our deliberately 'ignorant' research endeavours, which rely on our passion for challenging some existing assumptions about the purposes of education. We

make a call for conversations that catalyse a rethinking of ways we think about education that might lead to actions about the balance of conformity and transformation within educational institutions currently and in the near future. This includes conversations with teaching staff, researchers, pupils, parents, policy makers and other interested stakeholders.

How Did We Get Here?

Our shared research and pedagogic interests in education models emerge from our experience of working and researching in schools, where we are interested in the everyday lives of pupils and staff. This included our recent doctoral ethnographic research studies of English primary schools with mixed intakes of pupils, although predominantly white. Rebecca's research (undertaken between 2011 and 2015) was conducted in one large town school. It championed children's rights and participation in line with UNICEF's Rights Respecting Schools programme.[1] Rebecca was interested in asking about the way children's rights and participation actually worked in the day-to-day: who benefited most/least? Who became most visible or even most silenced? Who struggled, and why? She found that the alleviation of some rules and regulations (e.g. requirements for school uniform, insistence on lining up, regulating with whistles and bells) enabled many pupils to experience the school as joyful, carefree and relaxed. The participatory value of children's rights did not, however, enable some groups of parents, pupils, staff and other stakeholders to feel more included and able to have a voice in shaping what happened and how (Webb, 2014).

Perpetua's study in two Year 1 classrooms was conducted a few years later (2014 to 2018). She focused on understanding where children achieve agency in the classroom, and the classroom conditions that support or limit agency. By agency, we mean acting purposefully to achieve change (Moran-Ellis, 2013). Perpetua spent time over the course of a year in one classroom in a school rated 'good' by Ofsted, plus a week in a classroom of a teaching school rated 'outstanding'. The research was conducted following curriculum changes introduced by Michael Gove emphasising measurability in maths and literacy (Bew, 2011), and a renewed concern with discipline to achieve attainment. Citing Lyndon B. Johnson, Gove emphasised the importance of pupils' silence for knowledge acquisition: 'you aren't learning anything when you're talking' (Gove, 2013, n.p.). These words were echoed by teachers in the research schools, where the emphasis is on children always being 'on-task': 'Remember good sitting and listening means good learning.' Perpetua demonstrates that while children are learning a lot of curriculum knowledge, they achieve a limited agency in navigating conformity (Kirby, 2018). Pupils put in effort to be 'good', sitting silent and still for long periods, and into being 'clever', working hard to find the correct answer: yet they avoid engaging in new and unexpected challenges where there is no clue to the answer. Children achieve agency in brief moments in the day when 'off-task', pursuing movement,

humour, storytelling, art and collaboration. At these times, they have a go at things where there are no clear answers, without having to worry about being 'good' or 'clever', transforming what it is possible to know, to do and to be.

Both studies identified limited space for all school communities, pupils and teaching staff in particular, to engage with different purposes of education for the twenty-first century, especially how these relate to everyday school life. During our research we were struck by the hard work and commitment of staff, and the pressures on them as they did their best for the pupils in their care. They operate under a monumental schooling expectation for discipline (even when this was seemingly more light touch in Rebecca's experience) as well as with the relentless demand to demonstrate pupil attainment (particularly within Perpetua's research). Moving beyond the doctoral research, Rebecca and Perpetua are interested to learn more about how school staff, especially teachers, balance these demands with showing their care and doing what they feel is right every day. In our concluding commentary, we return to this concern.

Purposes of Education

Gert Biesta (2006, 2010, 2015a) has written extensively in recent times on the purposes of education as assumed within wider democratic systems of citizenship and engagement not only to consider the merit of particular ways of organising systems, but to query who education is actually for. He questions presenting or representing a real or pre-existing world to students, one already past, arguing instead for allowing 'undecidability to exist in the classroom' (Osberg & Biesta, 2007, p. 48). This includes choices about curricular content, ensuring its sensitivity to the contingency of the present: 'Who is to say what the curricular content should be, particularly in today's climate of multiculturalism?' (p. 48). Biesta suggests, broadly speaking, that we might conceive of purposes in three different but interrelated ways – namely, as to do with qualification, socialisation and subjectification (Biesta, 2009). Qualification concerns itself with a 'common-sense' view of education, and is about acquiring necessary skills and knowledge and aptitudes 'to do something' (Biesta, 2009, p. 39) that might be very practical in nature or geared towards entering a certain profession or trade following from gaining certification. Socialisation sits comfortably with qualification and is do with ways of being schooled to fit in with what has gone before, whether over centuries in terms of traditions, or aspiring to certain social and cultural values or 'orders' (Biesta, 2009, p. 40), any of which may or may not be desirable for the individual or wider group. Subjectification is a more challenging purpose. Biesta contends that education systems find it problematic to embrace teaching staff and pupils who do not easily fit into the assumptions of the conforming classroom. This is, in part, because subjectification lays down something of a gauntlet to qualification and socialisation. It challenges the idea of being part of what is already there, to make demands for the possibility for something unique and not yet known. It is about querying the more established and accepted to see what might emerge.

Significantly, Biesta suggests that forms of subjectification within education are integral to democratic systems in order to enable them to regenerate and flourish but also to allow for agency and autonomy 'in thinking and acting' (Biesta, 2009, p. 41).

Models of Education

What we offer below relies heavily upon Biesta's tripartite conceptualisation of the purposes of education. In line with many theorists of education, it also aims to go beyond what Gibbons (2015, referencing Wells, 2000) calls 'two competing ideologies about the goals of education and the means by which it is to be achieved' (p. 11). These two ideologies are often referred to as the 'traditional' model of education, where the teacher is presumed to 'pour' knowledge into the deep and empty vacuum that is the pupil; and the 'progressive' model. In the progressive model the pupil is presumed to be 'at the centre' of the educative process and the teacher on the periphery ready to pounce in response to an enquiry or thought posed by the pupil, steering them towards a goal with an appropriate intervention. Both models position the pupil as what Gibbons (2015, p. 12) calls 'the lone learner', albeit engaged in the varied socio-cultural and emotional world of school. In our models, we depart from simple 'either/or' binaries of the traditional/progressive. We have struggled to find the language to explain our emerging models as each is hijacked by a whole set of technical languages that tend to all too quickly 'fix' them rigidly. We have opted, therefore, for a travelling metaphor, borrowed and adapted from the work of the anthropologist Tim Ingold (2016). The travelling metaphor helps us think through what is distinct about these three models. It invites us to consider what might unify or connect practices treated as silos, within the shifting and competing paradigms of the purposes of education.

Model One: mastering knowledge

The first model relates clearly to a transmission idea associated with the 'traditional' view of education. It focuses on the acquisition of knowledge, where the destination is clearly defined, with everyone travelling along the fastest, most direct route possible, with an emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness. This educational model assumes certain pedagogies with the teacher as the Master Explicator (Rancière, 1991). There is a correct way of doing things, with pupils expected to sit facing forward listening to the teacher to identify answers. We find it helpful to think of this as similar to flying to a holiday destination. Passengers are moved from A to B, and must follow instructions, sit in rows looking ahead, and tolerate any discomfort or anxiety, with a view to enjoying the promised destination when they eventually arrive.

Knowledge acquisition acquired through this 'shut up, belt up' approach is an important educational goal globally, and the popularity of TED Talks demonstrates the continuing relevance of pedagogies where pupils sit and listen

(Biesta, 2015b). Within current schooling, this mastery approach is the legacy of historical models of teacher as transmitter of knowledge and a current dominant model of education reflecting the convergence of two influences. This includes some collectivist pedagogies of parts of Southeast Asia and former Soviet bloc countries in which pupils learn/march together, where everyone is required to be the same and the knowledge thus received is deemed incontrovertible and the route to certain designated power positions assumed (Alexander, 2000).

This model also borrows from old European authoritarian public/ grammar ideas of schooling, with their military demand that everyone should be kept in line. It is built on maintaining a tight ship and avoids engaging with difference or with challenge to the ways things have been done. It is about futurity in which the end justifies the means. The model does not emphasise the idea of the voice of the democratic citizen in the here and now; pupil opinions are awkward where an idea of reality is fixed and known by the master/teacher. Pupils' questions must relate to the goals of the pre-prescribed learning; anything else is viewed as irrelevant or potentially disruptive. Equality and liberty come with completing the plane journey, having demonstrated the acquired knowledge and the gaining of qualifications. These are the 'entry conditions' (Honig, cited in Biesta, 2011a, p. 143) for participating within adult democratic spaces; the alternative is possible failure and exclusion.

The model is founded on assumptions of particular ideas of equality. Everyone starts at the same place, on the clearly mapped-out flight path, supported along each step of the route to maximise qualification success. In a complex world, this does not demand too much independence from pupils at any one point in time, with the route segmented into discrete key stages and objectives, allowing focus to be maintained on the learning task. Perpetua's research identified concerns with children becoming independent. She found that they were expected to learn skills to more competently work out answers (e.g. using phonics sheets before asking a teacher how to spell a word); the primary aim is encouraging children's conformity as independent *learners*, rather than teaching them to become independent *thinkers*.

The paradox of emphasising controlling pedagogies for democratic means remains insufficiently interrogated within this model, for it relies heavily on tightly orchestrated 'behaviour management' regimes (see MacLure et al, 2012 for the way this can be inscribed within a UK reception classroom). This means that what can be difficult for pupils is the emotional demand to keep on working towards future goals: the continuing mastery of knowledge into the future as well as demonstrating knowledge through qualifications to succeed. A key tool for addressing motivation involves a behaviourist emphasis using numerous rewards and punishments, with competition becoming an integral educational feature. Certain behaviours are often emphasised as necessary for this type of learning, including bodily comportment, as well as being smart, on time and resilient, and overcoming feelings. It is about mastering the body and emotions, and emphasising rationality.

It is, of course, important that everyone remains on the plane, given some groups currently remain more at risk of being 'jettisoned, often without the parachute of suitable alternative provision', as discussed by Bailey and Taylor in a recent issue of *FORUM* (2018, p. 65). There are also multiple ways of reaching the same destination, which we explore in the next model.

Model Two: discovering knowledge

There are different ways of pursuing the knowledge curriculum of Model One. This means, therefore, that the second education model has knowledge acquisition as its goal *but* utilises other pedagogical practices. These are attached to democratic principles of valuing the individual with human warmth and generosity. The same assumptions remain as in the first model – namely, that there is a knowledge truth to be pursued and mastered, with the teacher as Master Explicator. However, she is more heavily disguised as fun wizard or circus ringmaster or even party magician. There are, nonetheless, numerous routes for pupils to arrive at the goal of knowledge mastery, for this model utilises pedagogies that encourage pupils to discuss and discover meanings. The emphasis is less on speed than on the process of comprehending knowledge that encourages greater pupil inquiry, curiosity and agency. This includes, for example, using group work, dialogue and experimentation. We think of this model as similar to taking the train. There is scope to consider pursuing different (more scenic) routes to reach the same destination. It generally feels safe and comfortable, with scope to move about and look around. There are possibilities to discuss with fellow passengers in seats grouped together, and even to stop off at a series of sites to examine in detail and extract more meaning and to be inspired by wonder. This remains a representation in which knowledge is assembled by joining up a series of dotted lines (Ingold, 2016).

This model is informed by ideas of progressive pedagogies, articulated especially clearly within the Plowden Report (Central Advisory Council for Education, 1967) in England, for example. It champions the integration of ideas of 'child voice', participation, human rights and agency and the acknowledgement of feelings and emotions. It operationalises a vision of liberal democracy; assuming 'the ability of an identifiable being to knowingly and deliberately use its willpower to achieve predetermined aims' (Gallacher & Gallacher, 2008, p. 502). It also celebrates the idea of the individual as autonomous and universal, focused on assimilating pupils rather than adapting to difference (Kirby & Webb, forthcoming). It champions ideals of pupil empowerment through 'pupil voice' and the involvement and participation of pupils in their learning as part of their rights (Covell & Howe, 2009; Sebba & Robinson, 2010). In its foundational and progressive ideals, it assumes unproblematic symbiotic relationships between the democratic citizen of the school and the functions and the purposes of education. In her ethnographic study of one 'Rights Respecting School' in England, for example, Rebecca found its ethos to be highly regulative of some pupils and staff, focusing upon

seeking 'consensus', and producing a 'common sense' idea of schooling that became difficult to contest for some (Webb & Crossouard, 2015, p. 171). However, it was also described by some school stakeholders as very positive and uplifting. The emotionality of challenge is central to this model of education, where '[r]eal learning and discovery can only take place when a state of not knowing can be borne long enough to enable all the data gathered by the senses to be taken in and explored until some meaningful pattern emerges' (Salzberger-Wittenberg, 1983, p. 58). In the work of Marcello Staricoff (n.d.), for example, there is a focus on enjoyment, on feelings, and on addressing the idea that not knowing the correct answer can be anxiety provoking, even for currently highly achieving children. His in-school initiative, 'The Joy of Not Knowing' (JONK), integrates an emphasis that in learning anything new we must at first not know.

This second model, similar to the first, is about the pursuit of conformity through learning existing knowledge, understood as 'an "act" of comprehension' (Biesta, 2015c, p. 239). Both models are founded on an understanding of certainty of what can be known. While this second model allows for greater pupil agency in how they arrive at this knowledge, there is a shift of power towards the pupil and teacher as co-constructors in the scaffolding of knowledge. Nonetheless, there remains an accepted dependency on the solidity of the scaffold towards a trusted goal. In the third transformative model, there is the possibility for pupils (and indeed teachers) to countenance the possibilities of what might happen if the scaffold is less solid than previously thought.

Model Three: not-knowing

This third model is about inviting pupils to explore something where no one knows where it might lead. The focus is not just on the future but on having the opportunity to engage in the here and now. This means responding in ways informed by, but not restricted to, what has gone before and what is known already. We liken this to the seafarer, who may have the stars or a sketch map to hand, but takes a winding route with no fixed destination in sight. Ingold (2016) describes the creative entanglements of place-making 'seafaring' or 'wayfaring' lines (p. 78) that potentially afford growth and movement: they are, he says, 'neither placeless nor place-bound, but place making' (p. 104). They can be described 'as a flowing line proceeding through a succession of places' (Ingold, 2016, p. 104).

Seafaring allows the possibility for extraordinary things to happen, including finding new lands, large or small, where the 'knowledge we have of our surroundings is forged in the very process of moving through them' (Ingold, 2016, p. 91). Rather than seeking and claiming certainty, by grasping at an externally existing world, the emphasis in this model is on maintaining an ethical integrity and humility of not-knowing within an emergent world, exploring it creatively and experimentally to see what transpires. In *Moby-Dick*, we learn of Queequeg, the seafarer driven to explore the world in order to

'make his people still happier than they were; and more than that, still better than they were', and who comes from an unmapped island that 'is not down on any map; true places never are' (Melville, 2002, pp. 54-55). Melville touches on the wisdom of the possibility of being open to uncertainty, within a world concerned with fixing everything as already knowable.

This model is about not accepting a status quo, but instead being open to divergent thinking and new ways of being (Rinaldi, 2006). Ingold's seafaring lines invoke Malaguzzi's metaphor of learning as an 'entanglement of spaghetti' (Malaguzzi, n.d., cited in Dahlberg, 2003, p. 279), which underpins Reggio Emilia's educational emphasis on knowledge as 'created through relationships, theory building, listening and making connections' (Fielding & Moss, 2011, p. 26). This is where 'not-knowing' is a way of acting in relation to forging something new: being able to remain curious and to 'suspend knowledge' (Johnson, 1988, p. 68), keeping the future open. Not-knowing is saturated with feelings (e.g. excitement, fear), what Derrida (1991) called '[t]he passion of non-knowing' (p. 75). In this model, there is not a reliance on a binary between the head and the heart. Rather, feelings are bound up with what is being done and are part of what 'can change you, expand you' unpredictably (Massumi, 2015, pp.10-11). Similarly, this model acknowledges that we are entwined with our school environments that generate or curtail what can be felt, thought and done (Murris, 2016).

For us, this model is underpinned by a Rancièrian (1991) principle of the equality of intelligence of all beings and a concern with 'what an intelligence can do when it considers itself equal to any other and considers any other equal to it' (p. 39). In contrast to Model Two, it goes beyond a presumed depoliticised pupil 'voice' in decisions affecting the child. Rather, it challenges the ways things are always done or understood, by opening up the possibility for something *different* to be seen and heard. The model is not utopian; it does not ask that pupils change enormous educational systems. It is forgiving; it does not ask pupils to be resilient. It is generous; it allows us to live in the world as it is, but requires that we act and think. It allows for the possibility of adopting and negotiating different ways of knowing, doing and being in school:

- *Knowing*: sharing opinions and raising questions, rather than asserting answers; not-knowing too quickly or narrowly when making decisions; making explicit and reconsidering assumptions about what is considered 'sensible'; showing where one stands in the world.
- *Doing*: acting without being all-knowing makes it possible to connect in different ways with other people and things in the here and now; asking how one can respond thoughtfully now; acting beyond established norms.
- *Being*: 'coming into presence' (Biesta, 2010, p. 547); showing who we are and how we place ourselves in relation to others and things; knowing who we are and how to be, when we are not all-knowing; responding in ways that are unique to each of us in the here and now; being otherwise in the world.

Transformation happens in unforeseen ways; it is unpredictable and beyond attempts to control events, and does not necessitate particular pedagogies. Transformation is not in the control of teachers, but 'seized' when children act with 'the assumption of equality' (Biesta, 2013, p.140). There are still things educators can do to enhance the possibilities for transformation. It is where teachers confront pupils with difference and challenge them to respond; transformation is relational and beyond self-expression or doing simply what one likes. When done with integrity, this requires a demanding pedagogy, rather than leaving the pupil to explore alone. The teacher might, for instance, ask: 'Okay, you've thought what way you would like to go, so what does that demand of you, what role can I play in supporting you in your pursuit?' Perpetua's doctoral research demonstrates that children in Year 1 pursue paths where the destination is unknown, but only in brief moments, in time carved out by themselves, when they are off-task, spinning 'around in their own universe' (Biesta, 2017a, p. 79), without a teacher to ask: 'What do you see? What do you think about it?' (Rancière, 1991, p. 23). Under such conditions, advantaged children (i.e. those who are male and middle class) have greater scope to pursue transformation (see also Kulz, 2017, Reay, 2017).

Significantly, the educator's' role is important for children's transformation to ensure 'judgement about what and who comes into the world' (Biesta, 2011b, p. 313). Without this role:

> The freedom of signification thus appears as a kind of neo-liberal freedom, where everyone is free to articulate their own 'story', rather than a political let alone a democratic freedom where there would always be a question about how the different 'poems' would impact on the ways in which we live our lives together-in-equality, rather than each of us being enclosed in our own story. (Biesta, 2017b, p. 69)

Exemplifying the Complementarity of the Three Models

In this section, we compare and contrast the three models using two examples, acknowledging the complementarity of all three. First, we consider 'knowing' and, second, we consider 'doing' and 'being'. The first example is teaching a difficult text, such as a poem or technical academic paper. In Model One, a mastery approach, the focus is upon the necessary explanation of the given meaning of the text and testing pupils' understanding of this. In Model Two, a 'discovery' approach, pupils are encouraged to make sense of the text through dialogue, discussion and sharing of ideas, supporting pupils to manage their anxiety at not understanding in order to reach the given meaning. On the other hand, the third model, a 'not-knowing' approach, does not aim to grasp the author's meaning with certainty. Instead, the aim is to think how the text speaks to the pupil so that she may respond in ways that are not about being right or clever. The teacher may ask, 'What does the text (or an aspect of it) make you think about in relation to other things you are interested in/working on? What

does this text mean to you? What might you bring to the text, to engage the author with another way of seeing?' In this way, a diffraction is created between the author of the text and the reader, to see what ripples are created, without foreknowing what might follow from the event of engaging with the text (Murris, 2016).

The second example shows how we might come 'to do' or 'to be' differently. We take the example of homelessness: although not an explicitly 'educational' context, we use it here to emphasise the ethical and political imperative of transformative possibilities of the third model always being connected to contexts beyond the immediate environ of the space of schooling. A 'mastery' discourse of responding to homelessness might be to respond to the latest publicly accepted advice: 'do not give money ... it will be spent on alcohol/drugs'. A 'discovery' approach may explore other less definitive solutions, such as the offering of a sandwich or a hot-water bottle, that remain mindful of the need not to fund substance misuse associated with homelessness – solutions that still leave us uncomfortable in the moment of giving. A 'not-knowing' approach acknowledges existing ideas of homelessness but equally looks beyond them, demanding that we see what does not easily come into view, asking what it means to be in the here and now of relational encounters with a homeless person. This might be experienced in the moment 'of hesitation, not knowing what to do in these situations', and having been felt, it demands the labour of having 'to respond to a situation that others are protected from' (Ahmed, 2012, p. 176). We might ask ourselves: 'How should we be with one to another, where giving money or a hug can potentially risk or change something? How should I act to establish human connections? When do I challenge? When do I hug?' These are decisions only we can each make. This is the ethical decision made in the moment, and in the doing and being of the here and now, where one intelligent being talks with another with assumed equal intelligence. This allows for the person on the street to be seen as a poet or a mother/father, rather than as homeless: within this model, the structural inequality of homelessness is changed in this moment. It is not-known whether or how this might shift something to come, but there may be ripples that diffract with and reconfigure future events so that something different happens.

If we take the latter example back to the educational space, it reminds us how the third model offers the possibility of a politics of the here and now in the everyday of schooling. The first and second models are primarily orientated towards children's future advancement and equality through forms of socialisation and the gaining of qualifications.

Conclusion: balancing conformity and transformation

There is an interdependence between the models we have set out, where knowing and not-knowing are bi-directional, and where what is already known can catapult us into the exciting terrain of not-knowing. Our twenty-first-century education system requires ballast, particularly in this post-truth era.

Holding on to some of what we know enables us to embrace the uncertainties we face where there are no clear solutions in our personal, social and globally interconnected lives (e.g. climate change, mass migrations, re-emergence of ideas of nationalism and challenges to democracy). Massumi (2015) reminds us: 'You move forward by playing with the constraints, not avoiding them' (p. 12). In Rancièrian terms, Models One and Two offer different 'police' orders. There is always a 'police' that dictates the division between what is allowable (seen and heard); Model Two represents, in our view, a more democratic order in many pedagogic situations (the 'good police' for Rancière, 1991). This means we are not arguing for the abandonment of the 'mastery' voice, nor for an exclusive focus on a 'discovery' model. We believe the two explicative models have something to offer each other. First, where 'mastery' dominates there is a danger that it becomes authoritarian, with evidence to suggest this is happening in contemporary schooling (e.g. Kulz, 2017). Second, the presence of the mastery model can help to ensure 'discovery' does not become flaccid, so that the pace of learning is maintained and lessons remain stimulating; the progressivism of the 1960s and 1970s, for example, offered many positive experiences but also a knowledge-light curriculum for many working-class children in particular (Young, 2007). The first two models are about differences in pedagogy; dominant arguments have focused on the merits of the different balance of 'traditional' and 'progressive' approaches. However, just focusing on these models limits conversations about the purposes of education. The integration of the third model is, we believe, an imperative. If we do not allow purpose to interrogate pedagogy it remains deluded in terms of educational ambition. So that, for example, mental health becomes discussed in relation to how it prevents pupils achieving qualifications, rather than in terms of who and how someone can 'be' in the world. The 'not-knowing' third model allows a space for 'dissensus', for the emergence of a challenge to the consensus of the existing 'police' order (Rancière, 1991). It requires agonism and uncertainty to open up different ways of seeing things. Out of the spaces of uncertainty can blossom possibilities of thinking, doing and being differently. This process is inherently bound up with not only what we think but also how we feel.

While transformation has been identified as core to the purposes of education, too little is understood about what fosters the educational environmental conditions to support children to grapple with the not-known to achieve transformation. Can we imagine a way in which the different models of education can co-exist (without having to wait to achieve a grand scheme for revising the education system)? Currently, those with money for private education have the possibility of choosing schools emphasising alternative approaches to education. We are interested in asking how different models might co-exist within the state education system, and how the 'common school' (Fielding & Moss, 2011) can achieve this balance through even very small changes. We want to explore how the conceptual space of the 'not-knowing' third model might configure as part of the everyday state schooling system, and how it might support, supplement, challenge and align with Models One and

Two, which are currently more dominant within our schooling system. What possibilities might there be for transformation: within the in-between spaces of the school day (e.g. how children are welcomed when they arrive); within demarked subjects that allow possibilities for discussion (e.g. Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE), religious education, English, history); integrated with other models across all curriculum subjects (e.g. when interrogating a difficult text); or even more systemically through a whole school shift?

We pursue these questions from a 'position of ignorance', through our teaching and research, adopting a process described by Gallacher and Gallacher (2008) as '*muddling through*, sometimes feeling lost and out of place, asking stupid questions, being corrected and having our preconceptions destroyed', with the aim of 'attending to the transformative potential of events' (p. 512, original emphasis). We recently established TRANSFORM-*i*N EDUCATION [2] to foster conversations with teachers, researchers, parents, pupils, governors and others on how to balance conformity *and* transformation. We would value engaging with *FORUM* readers on how to foster the conditions where pupils and school staff alike transform themselves in some ways, as well as the social order of their school worlds, and, by implication, the order of things beyond the school gates.

Note

[1] https://www.unicef.org.uk/rights-respecting-schools/the-rrsa/what-is-a-rights-respecting-school/

[2] www.transformineducation.org

References

Ahmed, S. (2012) *On Being Included: racism and diversity in institutional life.* London: Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822395324

Alexander, R.J. (2000) *Culture and Pedagogy: international comparisons in primary education.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Bailey, A. & Taylor, D. (2018) Keeping All of Your Passengers on the Plane: creating truly inclusive, human-scale secondary education for all, including those with special educational needs, *FORUM*, 60(1), 65-70. https://doi.org/10.15730/forum.2018.60.1.65

Bew, P. (2011) Independent Review of Key Stage 2 Testing, Assessment and Accountability. Final report. London: Department of Education.

Biesta, G.J.J. (2006) *Beyond Learning: democratic education for a human future.* London: Paradigm.

Biesta, G.J.J. (2009) Good Education in an Age of Measurement: on the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education, *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability* [formerly *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*], 21(1), 33-46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9064-9

Biesta, G.J.J. (2010) Learner, Student, Speaker: why it matters how we call those we teach, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42(5-6), 540-552.

Biesta, G.J.J. (2011a) The Ignorant Citizen: Mouffe, Rancière, and the subject of democratic education, *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 30(2), 141-153. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-011-9220-4

Biesta, G.J.J. (2011b) Philosophy, Exposure, and Children, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 45(2), 305-319. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.2011.00792.x

Biesta, G.J.J. (2013) Interrupting the Politics of Learning, *Power and Education*, 5(1), 4-15. https://doi.org/10.2304/power.2013.5.1.4

Biesta, G.J.J. (2015a) *Beautiful Risk of Education*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315635866

Biesta, G.J.J. (2015b) Can Education Do Without Teaching? Reflections on the Rediscovery of Teaching. Paper presented at the University of Brighton, Monday 27 April. https://www.brighton.ac.uk/research-and-enterprise/groups/education/events/can-education-do-without-teaching.aspx

Biesta, G.J.J. (2015c) Freeing Teaching from Learning: opening up existential possibilities in educational relationships, *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 34(3), 229-243. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-014-9454-z

Biesta, G.J.J. (2017a) Don't Be Fooled By Ignorant Schoolmasters: on the role of the teacher in emancipatory education, *Policy Futures in Education*, 15(1), 52-73. https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210316681202

Biesta, G.J.J. (2017b) *The Rediscovery of Teaching*. Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315617497

Central Advisory Council for Education (England) (1967) *Children and their Primary Schools*. London: HMSO.

Covell, K. & Howe, R.B. (2007) *Report on the Hampshire County Initiative*. Cape Breton: Children's Rights Centre, Cape Breton University.

Dahlberg, G. (2003) Pedagogy as a Loci of an Ethics of an Encounter, in M. Bloch (Ed.) *Education: restructuring the welfare state*, pp. 261-286. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Derrida, J. (1991) *Cinders*, trans. Ned Lukacher. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Fielding, M. & Moss, P. (2011) *Radical Education and the Common School: a democratic alternative*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Gallacher, L.-A. & Gallacher, M. (2008) Methodological Immaturity in Childhood Research? Thinking through 'Participatory Methods', *Childhood*, 15(4), 499-516. https://doi.org/10.1177/0907568208091672

Gibbons, P. (2015) *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning*, 2nd edn. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gove, M. (2013) Michael Gove Speaks about the Importance of Teaching. Speech given at Policy Exchange, London, 5 September. https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/michael-gove-speaks-about-the-importance-of-teaching (accessed 7 November 2018).

Ingold, T. (2016) *Lines*. London: Routledge.

Johnson, B. (1988) *A World of Difference*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kirby, P. (2018) How the Light Gets In: an exploration of children's agency in the primary school classroom. PhD thesis, University of Sussex.

Kirby, P. & Webb, R. (forthcoming) Taking Part, Joining In and Being Heard? Ethnographic Explorations of Children's Participation in Three UK Primary Schools, in J. Todres & S. King (Eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Children Rights Law.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kulz, C. (2017) *Factories for Learning: making race, class and inequality in the neoliberal academy.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

MacLure, M., Jones, L., Holmes, R. & MacRae, C. (2012) Becoming a Problem: behaviour and reputation in the early years classroom, *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 447-471. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2011.552709

Massumi, B. (2015) *Politics of Affect.* Cambridge: Policy Press.

Melville, H. (2002) *Moby-Dick.* London: W.W. Norton (first published 1851).

Moran-Ellis, J. (2013) Children as Social Actors, Agency, and Social Competence: sociological reflections for early childhood, *Neue Praxis*, 43(4), 303-338.

Murris, K. (2016) *The Posthuman Child: educational transformation through philosophy with picturebooks.* Abingdon: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2011.552709

Osberg, D. & Biesta, G.J.J. (2007) Beyond Presence: epistemological and pedagogical implications of 'strong' emergence, *Interchange*, 38(1), 31-51. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2011.552709

Rancière, J. (1991) *The Ignorant Schoolmaster: five lessons in intellectual emancipation.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Reay, D. (2017) *Miseducation: inequality, education and the working classes.* Bristol: Policy Press. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2011.552709

Rinaldi, C. (2006) *In Dialogue with Reggio Emilia: listening, researching and learning.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Salzberger-Wittenberg, I. (1983) Emotional Aspects of Learning, in I. Salzberger-Wittenberg, G. Williams & E. Osborne (Eds) *The Emotional Experience of Learning and Teaching.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Sebba, J. & Robinson, C. (2010) *Evaluation of UNICEF UK's Rights Respecting Schools Award.* London: UNICEF UK.

Staricoff, M. (n.d.) The Joy of Not Knowing, *Creative Teaching and Learning*, vol. 42. https://viscountnelson.net/wp/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/The-joy-of-not-Knowing-compressed.pdf (accessed 24 October 2018).

Webb, R. (2014) Doing the Rights Thing: an ethnography of a dominant discourse of rights in a primary school in England. Doctoral thesis (PhD), University of Sussex. http://www.sussex.ac.uk/profiles/74949/publications

Webb, R. & Crossouard, B. (2015) Learners, Politics and Education, in D. Scott & E. Hargreaves (Eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Learning,* pp.169-178. London: SAGE.

Young, M. (2007) *Bringing Knowledge Back In: from social constructivism to social realism in the sociology of education.* London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2011.552709

REBECCA WEBB is a lecturer in education at the University of Sussex. She currently co-leads a master's degree and professional qualification in early years education. She has been a teacher and local authority education adviser. She is an ethnographer and qualitative researcher with research interests in ideas of citizenship, democratic schooling, and researching pedagogy and practice. *Correspondence*: r.c.webb@sussex.ac.uk

PERPETUA KIRBY is a research associate and school tutor at the University of Sussex and co-convenes a European Perspectives module on the BA in Childhood and Youth Studies. For 20 years she researched children's participation across different sectors, including education, before doing her doctorate. Her research now focuses on children's agency and democratic schooling. She is an ethnographer and qualitative researcher. *Correspondence*: p.kirby@sussex.ac.uk