



Values, virtues and professional development in education and teaching

David Carr

University of Edinburgh, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Values
Virtues
Professional development
Teaching
Education

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses conceptual issues concerning values in teaching and the professional education of teachers. Proceeding from rejection of a common (empiricist) account of values as subjective tastes, the paper distinguishes three common (more and less restrictive) concepts or senses of value, here referred to under the labels 'principled preference', 'principled commitment' and 'principled disposition'. The paper proceeds to argue that, in light of certain distinctive features of teaching as a profession, the key values of teaching should be regarded as 'principled dispositions' (or, in another term, virtues). It is further argued that such professional teacher values are best appreciated under the three aspects of 'intellectual virtues', 'procedural virtues' and 'moral virtues' and the paper concludes with a brief exploration of the implications of this analysis for professional teacher education.

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

What generally bedevils attempts to comprehend such complex expressions as (for example) 'professional values' is the presence in common usage of different concepts or senses of 'value' – and perhaps also of 'profession' and 'professional' (see Carr, 1999, 2000) – that do not always sit happily together or with other terms that they may be employed to qualify. Past philosophers have also often fretted over the definition of such terms to the point of madness and death, hopelessly struggling to reconcile what may seem irreconcilable. However, other modern philosophers have taught us – perhaps none better than Wittgenstein (1953) – to keep a cool head and try to map clearly the labyrinthine twists of usage until we find conceptual connections that make sense.

Certainly, the term 'value' seems to be one that cries out for such treatment. Indeed, perhaps the biggest headache that the term 'value' has caused for ordinary reflection hails from the sharp – but popularly influential – contrast drawn by latter day empiricist philosophers between values and 'facts'. Although this contrast is to some extent prefigured in earlier philosophy (in, for example, the thought of ancient Greek sophists), it arguably received its clearest statement in the work of the eighteenth century Scottish philosopher, Hume (1969). In his work on the theory of knowledge, Hume famously reduces knowledge to two narrow sentential categories to which he gives the terms 'matters of fact' and 'relations of ideas'. Whereas 'matters of fact' are potentially verifiable reports (true if they correspond to ordinary common experience, false if they do not) on the deliverances of sense experience (e.g. 'the cat is sitting on the mat'), 'relations of ideas' are simply rules for the uses of words or dictionary definitions (e.g. 'a veterinarian is an animal doctor'). For Hume, all other statements – of metaphysics, morals or theology – simply fail to qualify as genuine knowledge because they are neither true by definition nor subject to the test of sense experience.

On this rather strict view, judgements of value – such as 'that's a good book', 'Helen is a beautiful girl' or 'you should not speak to your mother like that' – fall quite beyond the pale of objective knowledge: thus, while Hume recognises that such

E-mail address: DavidC@education.ed.ac.uk.

judgements have an important place in human life and that we may often be justified in making or accepting them, they have no objective rational basis and should be regarded more as expressions only of subjective taste or opinion. To be sure, other philosophers have criticized this view of value and value judgement in various ways: some moral 'objectivists' (Geach, 1956; Foot, 1958a, 1958b, 2001) have pointed out that 'genuine' value judgements are invariably grounded in 'factual' considerations about fitness for purpose (thus, what counts as a 'good' knife cannot be just a matter of subjective opinion); other modern idealists, pragmatists and 'post-modernists' have more recklessly argued that since the idea of objective knowledge is itself philosophically questionable, the empiricist contrast between values and objective facts is also unsustainable: in this light, any and all human knowledge claims are provisional – if not subjective – so that so-called 'facts' are on no firmer ground than so-called 'values'.

2. The objectivity of values

For now, we may admit that while expressions of taste are commonly regarded as weak statements of value, the term 'value' may be used in more robust senses – and it is much to the present point to explore some of these. As already seen, it is certainly one key objection to any weak sense of value as 'taste', that values are not – as insisted by Hume's modern positivist successors (Ayer, 1967) – simply objects of mere liking. Whereas I might express my taste for chewing gum by saying that 'I like chewing gum', it sounds odd to say 'I value chewing gum'. Indeed, it is not even clear that valuing and liking always coincide: thus, I may say that although I do not like X (e.g. going to the dentist) I regard it as of value; or that though I like Y (e.g. smoking) I do not value it. So while my tastes may sometimes be in line with my values, they are not always so. **Values would generally appear to invite reasoned justification in a way that tastes do not (or not necessarily)**; so that while I do not have to give a reason why I like smoking or chewing gum, I might well have some (perfectly intelligible health-related) reason for valuing dentistry or disvaluing smoking. From this viewpoint, **once distinguished value from the preference of taste as a matter of 'principled preference' (Carr, 1991).**

However, it no longer seems to me that any general notion of value as 'principled preference' is the only sense of value in common currency – or that this sense is sufficient to do justice to what is required of 'professional value'. Indeed, one trouble with the idea of value as a 'principled preference' seems to follow from what has already been said. **For while it is true that I may value dentistry – on objective rational grounds – it also seems that I might admit to such a value despite going out of my way to avoid going to the dentist. In short, the values that people often profess may be notional positions to which they may also pay little more than lip service.** There might also be different reasons for this. Thus, while such weak commitment may sometimes amount to outright hypocrisy, it may as often be a matter of what philosophers of antiquity called *akrasia* or **weakness of will**. In such cases, it is not at all that agents do not (sincerely) value dentistry, or do not really want to go to the dentist; it is rather that they are too afraid to do so because of the anticipated pain or discomfort.

Evidently, then, such **weak notional assent to the principle** that regular dental attention is a good thing **does not require that robust commitment that we might or should expect of practitioners of this or that profession**. On the contrary, **what is required for this are agents who are able by virtue of integrity, will and nerve to adhere to professional principles, rules and imperatives in the teeth of opposition, difficulty and setback: in short, agents who are capable not just of principled preferences but of principled commitments.** Good professional practitioners are not those who merely pay lip service to principles of professional responsibility and accountability but who in fact act for personal advantage or profit when this seems more convenient. **They are rather those whose strict loyalty to such principles may be relied upon 'through thick and thin'.**

However, it is arguable that even values of principled commitment are still not enough – at least for some kinds of occupation or profession. One significant issue here is that the idea of a commitment may be prone to a narrower (deontological) construal as a kind of rule. Certainly, some commitments may be little more than a matter of rule observance. I may set myself the rule of running five miles before breakfast – which may also be part of my overall regime of keeping fit and healthy. Such commitment may also be an unswerving matter of iron self-control. Moreover, it may often be that the person of self-control – or what Aristotle (1925) called 'continence' – is a quite reluctant observer of internally or externally imposed rules or principles. For Aristotle, however, self-control or continence – though certainly a moral quality of sorts – was not the best or highest state of moral agency. Indeed, even in terms of the trivial example lately given, we can see that although I may run daily out of a sense of reluctant, self-regarding obligation to my own health, I might also do it out of more wholehearted love of health, fitness and running for their own sake. It is conduct of this kind that Aristotle held to be virtuous rather than merely continent.

Of course, one might not exactly regard daily running for health and fitness as a virtue – since it does not especially seem to be a matter of moral commitment (though the ancient Greek sense of 'virtue' was rather broader than many modern senses of 'moral'). Indeed, for Aristotle, the distinction between self-control and virtue applied primarily to such moral dispositions as honesty, temperance, courage, justice, liberality and so on. In this regard, even temperance or self-control itself could be practiced either as a matter of continence or virtue. In so far as Aristotle considered virtue to lie in a mean between extremes of excessive and deficient appetite or passion, while the merely continent would moderate their appetites as a matter of regular but perhaps reluctant observance of the rule, the virtuous would be more wholeheartedly inclined to moderation. In a nutshell, the moral motivation of the virtuous differs from that of the continent in virtue of a greater degree of unity between what Aristotle characterised as the 'intellectual' and 'appetitive' parts of the soul. **While people may be morally continent in the face of some resistance or opposition from their natural desires, passions or appetites, the virtuous have 'educated' their passions and appetites to a point where they (should) no longer even desire what is not virtuous.**

Aristotle's distinction between continence and virtue has clear implications for ascription of values to agents. On a more modest sense of values as principled commitments, values are rules to which agents may professionally or otherwise subscribe even though they are not wholeheartedly committed to these as a matter of (first or) second nature. On a stronger sense of values as virtues, agents will exhibit or embody these as at least a matter of second nature. Briefly, on Aristotle's definition of virtues as "dispositions concerned with choice, lying in a mean between extremes" (Aristotle, 1925, book 2), the values of the virtuous are not just a matter of principled commitment, but of 'principled disposition'. Indeed, though (professional and other) commitments have often been regarded as a matter of adherence to rule or principle, it would seem that the principled dispositions of virtue are both more and less than commitments. They are more so in the sense that they are not merely matters of cognitive or intellectual assent, since virtue also involves education of the affective side of human nature. At the same time, they may also be less so in that even where virtues are informed by rules or principles, it is not always (perhaps even seldom) possible to reduce virtuous conduct to strict observance of such rules. Indeed, there may even be occasions on which the virtuous will need to act contrary to established moral imperatives in order to perform a virtuous act. This is why so-called virtue-ethics is often referred to (a little inaccurately) as an ethics of judgement rather than principle.

3. The status of professional values

A key present question is that of how best – in terms of these stronger and weaker senses of value – to conceive so-called professional values. To be sure, since it would not seem appropriate to view professional values as simply tastes or even as mere principled (but uncommitted) preferences, perhaps the main issue is that of whether they should be conceived as principled commitments, or in the rather stronger sense of principled dispositions or virtues. In the event, there are weighty arguments for and against either of these interpretations, turning largely on whether one thinks that professional values could or should be continuous with personal values. On the stronger (Aristotelian) conception of moral values as virtues, virtues are not merely technical skills or commitments to local conventions, rules or practices, but properties or qualities of persons: in fact, in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle clearly thinks of moral virtues as defining features of personhood. Thus, he suggests, one cannot pick or choose whether to exercise a particular virtue that one has – such as honesty or courage – in a way that one might pick or choose to exercise some acquired technical skill. To have acquired or cultivated a moral virtue is to have become a particular kind of person: thus, since virtues are an integral part of us, they are in an important sense inalienable and it is inconceivable that those who possess or exercise a virtue in this context should not act on it.

Still, while this view of values as virtues might seem all to the good, there is a case for regarding it as a far too strong requirement for many professional contexts. For it might be said that all we need for acceptable professional conduct is that practitioners should be honest, fair or respectful doctors, lawyers and teachers, rather than honest, fair or respectful persons as such. Thus, for example, while one might appropriately require lawyers to treat their clients fairly or doctors to be respectful of patients, it is not obvious that we are justified in requiring such professionals to be fair or respectful in all areas of their lives (e.g. to their wives, children and friends). Indeed, there may be a 'liberal' case for not requiring agents to exhibit professionally mandated conduct in other more personal areas of their lives – since, precisely, it may seem an unwarranted intrusion into personal privacy to demand this. To be sure, principled commitment to honesty and justice is properly required in such professions as law and medicine – which may distinguish them from such enterprises as auto-sales or estate agency (in which any inclination to honesty or fairness may be little more than good business policy) – but it may be a 'bridge too far' to require such professional commitment to be that of virtuously honest or just people.

That said, there may be a case for saying that what successful practitioners of some occupations or professions need is principled dispositions, or virtues, rather than mere principled commitments. That is, there seem to be occupations in which possession of certain morally significant personal qualities is a *sine qua non* of effective professional practice. Thus, for example, one of the qualities that we might require of a good nurse is that he or she is a caring person. While effective caring may require certain professional skills or the observance of certain moral principles, it would appear nonetheless to be far from reducible to such skills or principles. Another field in which we might expect the professional commitment of practitioners to extend to principled disposition or virtue is religious ministry. To be sure, one obvious criticism of ministers who (literally) do not practise what they preach is hypocrisy. Whereas it is not obvious that we could appropriately accuse a doctor who is trustworthy to patients, but not to his wife, of being hypocritical, it would seem right so to accuse priests or ministers who preach marital fidelity of chastity to their flocks while themselves engaging in sexual liaisons with parishioners.

4. The virtues of education and teaching

Thus, in so far as occupations or professions such as nursing, and perhaps ministry and social work, have an evident pastoral, caring and/or educational dimension that explicitly involves the personal expression or exemplification of certain values and virtues, it would appear that actual possession of such qualities is tantamount to a professional desideratum. However, this would seem no less so of the profession or vocation of education or teaching – with regard to which, to be sure, we might consider qualities of caring and moral modelling to be desirable if not necessary personal virtues. Indeed, I have previously argued (Carr, 2000, 2005, 2006) that one possible way of marking the fine line between such traditional professions as law and medicine, and those occupations such as nursing, ministry and teaching that have more often been

regarded as 'vocations', is to see the latter as more deeply implicated in those personal and interpersonal associations that call for such qualities as sympathy, compassion, caring, empathy and personal example. That said, we should not aim to overdraw this distinction: just as we should desire nurses, teachers or social workers to be warm, supportive and approachable persons, so we might also hope for sympathetic lawyers, and general practitioners of good 'bedside manner'. Still, there is clearly also a point at which this becomes a distinction of significant professional principle. Thus, for example, while one might personally criticise a doctor or lawyer for failing to show qualities of human warmth or empathy to clients or patients, it is less obvious that this should count as a professional criticism of such practitioners – if they cure or legally advise well – whereas it could well so count in the case of the teacher who failed to give personal support or encouragement to pupils. Again, whereas it could not be considered a professional fault of a medical professional that he or she was a serial adulterer, one can certainly think of some educational contexts (of, say, religious schooling) in which this might well be considered a professional fault.

So, regardless of whether continuity between professional and personal qualities is desirable in all human occupations, one might still claim that such vocations as nursing, ministry – and teaching – should exhibit such continuity. Yet might this not be precisely denied in the case of education and teaching? Could it not be said that good teaching is compatible with a range of personal moral defects and shortcomings – if not with downright vice and immorality? Might not teachers be habitual wife-beaters, serial adulterers, drug-addicts, card-cheats, tax-dodgers and so on, and yet be effective professionals? Any such claim, however, seems problematic in various ways. To begin with, it rests on significant ambiguity regarding the term 'teaching' – which may refer either to an activity ('I have just been teaching mathematics to 4B'), or to a professional role ('I have been teaching for thirty years'). To some extent, success in an activity sense of teaching is measurable by simple results: if A learns that p as a direct result of my instruction, then I have successfully taught p to A – whatever kind of person I may happen to be. On the other hand, one could hardly be a teacher in any substantial professional role sense without observing the standards and values of a time-honoured human practice that is generally agreed to have significant moral aims regarding (amongst other things) the pursuit of truth and justice – and, more particularly, the promotion of such attitudes, values and virtues to others. Moreover, however much we may have been taught useful things by bad or vicious teachers – and perhaps many of us have – we could hardly consider this to be professionally desirable, and might therefore reasonably entertain the cultivation of virtuous moral dispositions as valid professional aspiration or ideal.

Of course, the point of the sceptic is not to deny that virtuous teachers and moral standards in education are desirable, but to question whether they are in any significant sense required or necessary. We may still ask what is wrong or incoherent about the idea of professionally successful teachers who observe appropriate moral and other standards in the professional context but who are nevertheless less than personally virtuous agents. Is there much to support the case that (morally or otherwise) good teaching requires principled dispositions (virtues) rather than mere principled (professional) commitments?

At this point, it seems clear that much of the case for the opposition rests on common and persistent construal of both the activities of teaching and the role responsibilities to which these activities (partly) contribute as something like value-neutral – person-independent – skills and techniques. This is the chief legacy of a century-old theoretical attempt to construe teaching – as activity or role – as a pedagogical technology grounded in a science of (predominantly behavioural) learning. Over a long modern period, Western educational research has been mainly focused on the empirical discovery of causally effective methods of learning, instruction or behaviour management, and British, American and other colleges of education have promoted a conception of teacher training as a matter of the acquisition of repertoires of such skills or 'competences' (on competence, see Carr, 1993; Hyland, 1993, 1994). This conception encourages the view that all there is to becoming a good, effective or successful teacher is the acquisition of a set of 'off-the-peg' educationally all-purpose skills in much the same way that acquisition of auto-repair skills might equip someone (anyone) to be a good car mechanic. Such a view also clearly reinforces the 'liberal' distinction between the professional and the personal: on this view, since all it takes to be a good teacher is to have mastered relevant pedagogical or managerial skills, any rogue or rascal might become a good teacher.

Several points, however, tell forcibly against this conception. To begin with, it has been widely noticed (Elliott, 1989; McLaughlin, 1999; Smith, 1999) that the kind of expertise possessed by good teachers (and effective schools) is not readily (if at all) reducible to the general all-purpose rules which (natural and social) science has often sought. Thus, while much so-called 'school effectiveness' research has tried to discover 'evidence-based' principles and procedures for effective pedagogy or school management, it is far from clear that such principles are available in the real world of educational practice. Indeed, teachers often find that what works in this school or educational context does not work in that quite different one. From this viewpoint, what teachers need in order to be effective are not all-purpose off-the-peg rules, but capacities for contextually sensitive reflection, deliberation and judgement in the actual various and varying professional and pedagogical contexts in which they daily find themselves. Moreover, in so far as much, if not most, professional educational deliberation and judgement is directed to moral ends, it would seem to follow that what is here needed is an ethics of judgement more than an ethics of rule or principle. Thus, for example, although all good teachers will need to aim at just distribution of educational goods, it is far from clear that this means mathematically equal distribution – since, as Aristotle observed in his *Politics*, it is no less unjust to treat unequals equally than it is to treat equals unequally.

It has been less widely noticed that such ethics of contextually sensitive judgement is more or less tantamount to an 'ethics of virtue'. Thus, on the view of the father of virtue ethics, Aristotle, whereas one needs the judgement of what he calls 'practical wisdom' in order to have the qualities of moral character that he calls 'virtues', one cannot (in any full measure) have such judgement without the qualities of moral character: in short, practical wisdom and the virtues presuppose one another. On this view, to acquire and possess the capacities for judgement that one might call 'pedagogical phronesis'

(McLaughlin, 1999) is to have acquired qualities of character that also merit description as 'professional virtues'. In short, any truly satisfactory professional development would need to extend beyond principled commitments to the cultivation of principled dispositions. Moreover, if we attend more closely to particular instances of such pedagogical *phronesis*, we soon see that there is much to be said for this view.

Let us, for example, consider what is involved in the very necessary occupational task for teachers of the discipline, management and control of classes of pupils. Such discipline and control often features as a so-called 'competence' in the professional training programmes of contemporary British and other teacher education and there can be little doubt that it has been widely conceived in the theoretical and policy documentation of professional expertise as a kind of skill or technique (see, for example, DES, 1989). On this view, the principles that govern the ability to exercise authority or command the respect of pupils are expressible in the form of practical procedures that can be learned rather as one learns how to drive a car. However, this seems dubious from a variety of perspectives. First, as previously noted, it is not at all clear that there are universally applicable procedures that teachers might use in this 'off-the-peg' way. As I have argued before (e.g. Carr, 2000), what may work for discipline in one context may be quite inappropriate or unworkable in another situation, and strategies for achieving classroom order need much tailoring to the needs, motives and personalities of different classes. Indeed, good teachers need first to be familiar with the individual psychologies of pupils as well as the social psychologies of classes in order to know what will or will not work with them in terms of discipline.

That said, such knowledge is evidently not merely a matter of theoretical or practical psychology, but of personal relations – which means, above all, of moral association. Authority, as argued by Winch (1967), is a matter of 'internal' rather than external relation. Hence, good (which also means effective) teachers are not those who have found ways of psychologically manipulating pupils or of managing them via externally imposed rules, but those who have succeeded in gaining the trust and respect of pupils in a climate of positive 'other-regarding' moral association. Again, however, this should not be regarded as some mere deployment of general moral (rather than technical) rules or imperatives: rather, it needs to be understood more in terms of the cultivation of those capacities for wise judgement that Aristotle identified with virtuous agency. In short, what a good teacher needs for the kind of authority that commands the respect and obedience of pupils is 'character'. Moreover, such character may be exhibited in a range of particular virtues. Good teachers will need courage or nerve to get them through often difficult and trying circumstances; they will need temperance in order to act in a calm, patient and controlled way under stress or provocation; they will need wisdom and honesty to act with required integrity; and, above all, they will need justice to be and to be perceived by pupils as fair.

5. Towards a taxonomy of pedagogical virtues

At bottom, the foregoing emphasis on the professional cultivation of virtues or principled dispositions may be taken as a general plea for a rather richer psychology of professional life than seems to have prevailed in many latter day contexts of theorising about teacher education and training. There can be no doubt that the strong recent emphasis on 'competence', skill and technique in professional teacher training has served to obscure the extent to which wider non-technical qualities of character and personality are required for good teaching (see Carr, 2007). Indeed, there can be little doubt that much good teaching is often dependent on such personal qualities as charisma, charm, wit, likeableness and good looks, as well as upon courageous, temperate, honest and fair character – though, of course, the professional relevance of the latter more than the former traits is clearly dependent on their moral status. While we may professionally criticize teachers for their laziness, dishonesty or injustice, we can hardly fault them for their lack of humour or good looks, even where we can see that such qualities put some teachers at a professional advantage. In any case, we can see that virtuous character occupies a central place in the economy of good teaching that personality and technique do not. There can be good or excellent teachers who lack wit or good looks, but it is less likely that there are many (if any) who can get by without some measure of honesty, justice or courage; and though good teachers may well need to develop various pedagogical or managerial skills or techniques, it is doubtful whether these are sufficient for effective authority or communication in the absence of character.

In the light of important recent work in mainstream ethics and epistemology, however, it seems possible to put an even sharper point on the educational centrality of virtuous character than the present author has hitherto done in previous work. For, although we have so far emphasised the pedagogical significance of such moral virtues as courage, temperance, honesty and justice, Aristotle distinguished in his *Nicomachean Ethics* between moral and intellectual virtues. To be sure, this is a distinction of a different logical order from any that may be drawn between particular moral virtues – and it is also not clear cut from any practical viewpoint: in fact, the governing or ordering principle of moral virtues is the intellectual virtue that Aristotle named as *phronesis* or practical wisdom. However, Aristotle also distinguishes *phronesis* as an intellectual virtue from such other 'theoretical' virtues as *sophia* (wisdom), *episteme* (science) and *nous* (intuition), on the one hand, and from the 'practical' intellectual virtue of *techné* or productive reasoning (skill, technique, craft knowledge), on the other. That said, some epistemologists (e.g. Zagzebski, 1996) have more recently argued that received concepts of knowledge (both knowing that and knowing how), explanation and understanding – of a kind that past epistemology seems to have failed to explain at all well – may also be best understood in something like 'virtue theoretical' terms.

In this connection, if we first ask what qualities (aside from the fortuitous contingencies of charm, wit or good looks) are required to make a good teacher, it might be generally suggested that such teachers need three main forms of expertise, namely: (i) subject knowledge; (ii) qualities of authoritative presence; and, (iii) procedural skills. In short, in addition to the lately discussed qualities of moral character required for effective moral and other authority and healthy interpersonal

classroom climate, we should also expect good teachers to have extensive subject knowledge, and also to possess some of the craft skills or 'know how' of effective teaching. But what is it to possess educationally relevant knowledge (either knowing how or knowing that)? On a time-honoured view, to have knowledge of a given topic, subject or activity is to have acquired a set of 'justified true beliefs' that may be identified quite independently of any epistemic capacities of the knowing agent. According to advocates of so-called virtue epistemology, however, it is quite impossible to give any adequate account of knowledge in such terms, since any genuine knowledge that human agents might be held to possess requires a range of capacities for intellectual honesty, integrity, scrupulousness, persistence, open-mindedness, fair-mindedness, accuracy, and so on, that need to be understood in virtue ethical terms. For virtue epistemologists, if it is true that what is morally right is what a virtuous agent would do in the circumstances, it is no less true that what it is right for an agent to believe or know is in a significant sense what an epistemically virtuous person would claim to know or believe – or, at least, that one cannot speak of knowledge in any robust sense in the absence of epistemic or intellectual virtues.

If this is true of theoretical knowledge, it would seem to be no less true of the procedural knowledge of pedagogical skill or technique. Thus, although Aristotle drew a significant distinction between the practical 'productive' knowledge of *techné* and the practical moral wisdom of *phronesis* and disparaged attenuated notions of the former as mere 'cleverness' (Aristotle, 1925), it would also seem that the practical knowledge of complex crafts is no less conceivable in non-virtuous terms than forms of theoretical knowledge and understanding. Precisely, in the terms of virtue epistemology, master craftsmen could hardly lack the qualities of care, patience, attention to detail, application, industry, diligence and so on in terms of which any respectable human craft would have to be defined.

6. Conclusion

In this spirit, just as we have argued that any professional capacities that teachers may need for effective classroom authority and discipline are not reducible to management techniques, and require moral virtues of courage, honesty and justice, so we can also argue that the academic and procedural knowledge that they require is no less a matter of personal virtue. The knowledgeable teacher needs intellectual virtues no less than the authoritative teacher needs moral virtues and no such virtues may be regarded as merely external or contingent accessories of good teachers, since they serve to define the kinds of persons that good teachers need to be. The good teachers of moral, epistemic and craft virtue, then, are those to whom positive moral association, knowledge and its skilful presentation are no less significant for individual personal development than they are for the development of others. To be sure, this is a tall order for professional development and a high ideal for any teaching profession to live up to; but perhaps – at least prescriptively speaking – it would be wrong to settle for less.

References

- Aristotle. (1925). *The Nicomachean ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ayer, A. J. (1967). *Language, truth and logic*. London: Gollancz Press.
- Carr, D. (1991). Education and values. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 39, 244–260.
- Carr, D. (1993). Guidelines for teacher training: The competency model. *Scottish Educational Review*, 25, 17–25.
- Carr, D. (1999). Professional education and professional ethics. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 16, 33–46.
- Carr, D. (2000). *Professionalism and ethics in teaching*. Routledge professional ethics series, London: Routledge.
- Carr, D. (2005). Personal and interpersonal relationships in education and teaching: A virtue ethical perspective. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53, 255–271.
- Carr, D. (2006). Professional and personal values and virtues in education and teaching. *Oxford Review of Education*, 32, 171–183.
- Carr, D. (2007). Character in teaching. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 55, 369–389.
- Department of Education and Science and the Welsh Office. (1989). *Discipline in schools*. London: HMSO. [The Elton Report].
- Elliott, J. (1989). Educational theory and the professional learning of teachers: An overview. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 19, 81–101.
- Foot, P. (1958a). Moral beliefs. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 59, 83–104.
- Foot, P. (1958b). Goodness and choice. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 35(Suppl.).
- Foot, P. (2001). *Natural goodness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Geach, P. T. (1956). Good and evil. *Analysis*, 17, 33–42.
- Hume, D. (1969). *A treatise of human nature*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics.
- Hyland, T. (1993). Professional development and competence based education. *Educational Studies*, 19, 123–132.
- Hyland, T. (1994). *Competence, education and NVQ's: Dissenting perspectives*. London: Cassell.
- McLaughlin, T. H. (1999). Beyond the reflective teacher. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 31, 9–25.
- Smith, R. (1999). Paths of wisdom: The revival of practical judgement. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 31, 327–340.
- Winch, P. (1967). Authority. In A. Quinton (Ed.), *Political philosophy* (pp. 97–101). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zagzebski, L. (1996). *Virtues of the mind: An enquiry into the nature of virtue and the ethical foundations of knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.