Chapter 3
Educating for Professional Responsibility: From Critical Thinking to Deliberative Communication, or Why Critical Thinking Is Not Enough

Tone Dyrdal Solbrekke, Tomas Englund, Berit Karseth, and Eevi E. Beck

Introduction

Complexity and challenges characterise twenty-first century western democratic societies, and our everyday lives are highly dependent on well-qualified professionals. Professionals have a considerable responsibility to make wise judgments about how to use their knowledge for the betterment of the individual and society (Solbrekke, 2007). This responsibility is multifaceted, context-sensitive and frequently gives rise to conflicting values and ethical stances at the heart of professional practice. What various groups such as politicians and employers define as good and accountable work might contradict what professionals see as responsible work (Green, 2011; Solbrekke & Englund, 2011; Solbrekke & Sugrue, 2014). While it is relatively easy then to assert that professionals are obliged to act responsibly, it has proven more difficult to articulate what this responsibility entails, how it should be enacted in practice, and what the implications are for professional education (Sugrue & Solbrekke, 2011). Historically, though, the capacity for critical thinking has been considered a significant component of professional judgment across the disciplines (Foundation for Critical Thinking, 2013).

In this chapter, we discuss strengths and limitations of 'critical thinking' in educating for professional responsibility. A capacity for critical thinking has been proposed as one of the most important formative outcomes of higher education for responsible professionals (e.g. Barnett, 1997; Bergan, Harkavy, & van't Land, 2013; Davis, 2011). The capacity to analyse, interpret and evaluate how theory may be

T.D. Solbrekke (✉) • B. Karseth • E.E. Beck
Department of Education, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
e-mail: t.d.solbrekke@iped.uio.no; berit.karseth@iped.uio.no; e.e.beck@iped.uio.no

T. Englund
Department of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences, Örebro University, Örebro, Sweden
e-mail: tomas.englund@oru.se

F. Trede, C. McEwen (eds.), *Educating the Deliberate Professional*,
Professional and Practice-based Learning 17, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-32958-1_3

applied to practice is crucial. However, many newly graduated professionals indicate that they do not feel adequately prepared to cope with the demanding responsibilities they are expected to assume at work (Sugrue & Solbrekke, 2011). At stake, therefore, is how pre-service education may improve their way of qualifying for complex professional responsibility.

As our analytical frame of discussion, we present below different strands of thought on critical thinking in research on higher education. Then we provide examples of different meanings of critical thinking in use in nurse and teacher education research. We find these professions particularly interesting because of their significant positions in society: both educate students for work in what Steven Brint (1994) defines as the 'human services sphere' and for professions that may be characterised by their 'social trustee professionalism' (*Ibid.*, pp. 45–55; cf. Durkheim, 1957/2001; Solbrekke, 2007; Solbrekke & Englund, 2011 for further elaboration). While expected to provide the best care for patients and the teaching of students, they are simultaneously required to externally account for their treatment and teaching in terms of economy and time-efficiency. Moreover, both in pre-service education and at work, these professionals experience an increased pressure to provide 'scientific evidence' of what 'works' (Biesta, 2007; Heggen, Karseth, & Kyvik, 2010) and practices are expected to be transparent and measurable against predefined standards (Green, 2011; Solbrekke & Englund, 2011, 2014).

In the following, we first distinguish and discuss the normative orientations of five strands of thought on critical thinking in recent research literature on higher education. Second, we review the use of 'critical thinking' in selected peer-reviewed journals on teacher and nurse education. Third, based on issues identified in the review, we propose a model of deliberative communication as a way of educating for professional responsibility.

Critical Thinking in Higher Education

Our reading of the research literature on higher education generally confirms that critical thinking is considered 'a fundamental educational ideal' (Siegel, 1997, p. 1) and a most important learning outcome of higher education (Davis, 2011; Englund, 2002). However, researchers and practitioners have no single way of understanding critical thinking (Jones, 2009) and also contest what constitutes critical thinking (James, Hughes, & Cappa, 2010; Moore, 2004, 2011; Pithers & Soden, 2000; Sullivan & Rosin, 2008; Turner, 2005). Consequently, researchers offer a range of interpretations, strongly influenced by the disciplinary culture in which critical thinking is taught. In our reading, the various positions can be categorised as five different strands of thought.

The first strand is critical thinking as citizen competence. This strand relates to issues of citizenship, social responsibility and the ability to think critically about one's cultural frame of reference (e.g. Barnett, 1990; Delanty, 2001; Englund, 2002; James et al., 2010; Mezirow, 1997; Trede & McEwen, 2013). In this strand of

thought, critical thinking is usually associated with *liberal education*, implying that students are encouraged to develop critical self-examination, a sense of world citizenship and a narrative imagination, in a context that fosters dissenting voices and the challenging of ideas (Nussbaum, 1997, 2010).

A second strand of thought is critical thinking as self-cultivation. This relates critical thinking to the Humboldtian tradition of viewing *Bildung* as the essential qualification for self-cultivation through scholarship (Karseth & Solbrekke, 2016).[1] Critical thinking conceptualised within a *Bildung* tradition implies an idea of humanity oriented towards one's own life as independent and self-directed. In this context, higher education institutions, such as universities, should 'devote themselves to the elaboration of the uncontrived substance of intellectual and moral culture, growing from an uncontrived inner necessity' (von Humboldt, 1970, p. 243).

In the third strand of thought, critical thinking as higher-order learning, critical thinking is seen as a cognitive competence associated with higher-order learning that is individually and psychologically oriented. The purpose of critical thinking is to increase the individual's capacity of reasoning. A dominant view conceptualises critical thinking in terms of universal dispositions and skills (Scriven & Paul, 1987, p. 1). A central reference for this approach is Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives where critical thinking skills are seen as essential when it comes to learning objectives related to levels of analysis, synthesis and evaluation (Bloom, Englehart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956).

A fourth strand of thought is critical thinking as employability skill. This strand has intensified over the past 20 years and recently become more prominent, promoting critical thinking as a transferable skill. This view is a consequence of a discussion of employability in terms of utility and increased engagement from external stakeholders, such as politicians and employers, who hold this view (Solbrekke, 2008). In the perspective of lifelong learning, this interest is closely linked to both labour market needs and the perceived need for continual knowledge creation, assessment, and so on (Peters & Humes, 2003).

The fifth strand of thought takes professional education as the main reference: critical thinking as an aspect of professionalism. Here, critical thinking is closely associated with the notion of 'critical being', where a professional takes on the responsibility for acting for and with others and the public good (Barnett, 1997, pp. 133–134). Sullivan and Rosin (2008) emphasise a similar dimension, explicitly stating that critical thinking, as a cognitive skill, is insufficient for professional practice. They suggest that critical thinking must be integrated with both 'being' and 'acting' in practice as a professional. This understanding is closely related to the idea of professional education and implies that students develop an understanding of the moral and societal responsibilities of their particular professional work (Karseth, 2011; Trede & McEwen, 2013).

These five dominant strands of thought reflect different normative orientations. The initial four emphasise critical thinking as an intellectual skill to be developed in

[1] For other perspectives on *Bildung*, including applying it to professional education, see Beck, Solbrekke, Sutphen, and Fremstad (2014).

the individual, and the fifth opens up broader perspectives. While the focus is mainly on developing the individual's capacity to reason and act, the fifth additionally, opens up to collective will-formation. By collective will-formation we mean institutionalised, cooperative decision making for analysing and solving different kinds of problems through deliberative argumentation in a reflexive manner (Habermas, 1992/1996).

Reviewing Uses of 'Critical thinking' in Research on Professional Education

We reviewed research papers on pre-service nursing and teaching programs, published in international peer-reviewed journals. We chose highly ranked journals because they present powerful voices on matters such as how to understand critical thinking. Research literature on professional education presents expressions of epistemic cultures underpinning teaching approaches with regard to educating for professional responsibility. Research at local and national levels might have yielded different findings. We also read papers on in-service and further professional education as a useful reference for comparing our interpretations.

A review was conducted of the use of the term 'critical thinking' in articles published in top-rated peer-reviewed research journals on professional education between January 2005 and early 2011. Four international, peer-reviewed scientific journals were selected, two within nursing (*Journal of Nursing Education* and *Nurse Education Today*) and two in teaching (*Teaching and Teacher Education*, and *Journal of Teacher Education*).

These journals were chosen because they:

- have a focus on pre-service education of the profession
- were considered of high quality within their constituent culture
- provided access to papers online, for practical reasons of conducting the review
- were written in English for an international audience.

Papers were selected by conducting a search for 'critical thinking' in the title, keywords and or full-text within those four journals. Within the nursing journals, the search yielded 35 papers that were read in full by at least one of the authors. Within the education journals, the search returned a total of 77 papers (52 papers in *Teaching and Teacher Education* (TATE) and 25 in *Journal of Teacher Education* (JTE)), which were analysed.

The four authors worked individually and in pairs, and critically discussed each other's interpretations. Our approach may be characterised as an 'abductive' mode of inquiry inspired by what Alvesson and Sköldberg (2000, pp. 247–257) describe as 'reflexive interpretation'. We re-read our findings and critically scrutinised our interpretations from which our analysis of the papers emerged. In reading the papers, we were not looking for one exact and definite understanding of critical

thinking. Rather, our research question in this review was: What different meanings of critical thinking could be identified in the selected journals?

Critical Thinking in Teacher Education: Three Different Meanings

A review of the 77 papers selected from the two teacher education journals revealed a certain embedded, taken for granted, understanding of critical thinking as an important outcome of education. As exemplified below, only four of the papers (El-Dib, 2007; Freese, 2006; Leonard, Brooks, Barnes-Johnson, & Berry, 2010; Warburton & Torff, 2005) provided explicit definitions of the concept. Many of the discussions related to the works of influential US teacher education researchers, such as Darling-Hammond, Shulman, and Cochran-Smith, and their arguments for critical thinking were underpinned by the notion that it was part of effective teaching to increase students' learning outcomes (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Goodman, Arbona, & Dominguez de Rameriz, 2008; Leonard et al., 2010). Collectively, researchers exhibited a general understanding of critical thinking as an intellectual skill, yet there were clear variations with regard to the purpose of critical thinking. These are discussed below through a three-fold categorisation of meanings of critical thinking as higher-order learning, reflective practice, and a means for social change.

In several of the papers reviewed, critical thinking is understood as higher-order learning. This resembled the definition of critical thinking used in the third strand above, emphasising individually and psychologically oriented approaches to critical thinking. They are primarily concerned with how teaching may encourage critical thinking skills in sophisticated academic learning, problem solving, self-direction, self-regulated learning, and inquiry-based learning (e.g. Freese, 2006; Struyven, Dochy, & Janssens, 2008). Warburton and Torff (2005, p. 24) additionally point to 'cognitive skills and strategies that increase the likelihood of a desired outcome (…) thinking that is purposeful, reasoned, and goal-directed'. Freese (2006, p. 103) provides an explicit connection between teaching approaches and critical thinking: 'An inquiry-based approach, designed to promote reflection and critical thinking skills, actively involves the students in their learning and makes them responsible for their learning'.

Critical thinking as reflective practice is an important means to enhance teaching and develop more efficient teaching methods (Darling-Hammond, 2010). The tradition may be traced back to the inspirational works of Dewey and Schön (Rich & Hannafin, 2009). The influence of Schön is predominant, which is problematised by, for example, Rich and Hannafin (2009, p. 52). A core concern in their critique is that the level of reflection tends to remain 'in and on practice', neglecting broader social concerns and not explicitly elaborating the normative stances implicit in good and effective teaching. An illustration of this is the argument that all learners should

have equal access to instructions that encourage them to think critically. For instance, Warburton and Torff (2005) claim that all learners should participate in 'high' critical thinking activities, such as classroom conversations, journals, reaction papers and portfolios. El-Dib (2007, p. 25) argues that critical thinking starts in reflection 'as the process by which teachers engage in aspects of critical thinking such as careful deliberation and analysis, making choices'. This category strongly aligns with the fifth strand above. Though we can envisage a move towards mutual communication, the learning outcome remains the individual's capacity of critical thinking.

While the two categories above mainly see critical thinking as an individual skill, in this third category, we identify a meaning that links critical thinking as higher-order thinking to deliberation and a greater collective purpose, as might be identified in the first strand. Conklin, Hawley, Powell, and Ritter (2010) argue that higher-order thinking skills prepare students for critical, democratic citizenship. In this sense, critical thinking as higher-order thinking is connected to collective interests. Others emphasise the notion of competence over skills in their definition of critical thinking and as a means to achieve democracy, social inclusion and equality. Leonard et al. (2010, p. 262) connect critical thinking to critical consciousness, where critical consciousness is the ability to understand the political nature of a situation, critique the status quo and proactively try to change it. Gay (2005) places the responsibility on teacher educators to emphasise critical thinking in this broader sense. She argues that teacher educators must 'prepare teachers to function more effectively with ethnically, racially, culturally and socially diverse students and issues' (*Ibid*., p. 227). Ersoy (2010) and Lippincott, Peck, and D'Emidio-Caston (2005) argue that public conversation is an important and effective means for the expansion of ideas and the promotion of critical thinking. Further, Leonard et al. (2010, p. 262) clearly relate the capacity for critical thinking to social and political purposes: 'Critical consciousness is the ability to understand the political nature of a situation, critique the status quo, and proactively try to change it'.

Critical Thinking in Nurse Education: A Measurable Cognitive Skill and Affective Disposition

While our examples of critical thinking in teacher education indicate three different meanings, we find a more coherent orientation in nurse education. In the 35 papers selected, critical thinking relates to the third strand of thought: higher-order learning. Critical thinking is widely accepted as a collection of individual cognitive skills and affective dispositions associated with the provision of quality care. The argument for critical thinking is in this context based on patients' needs (e.g. Propil, 2011, p. 204). In addition to this, the majority of the papers reviewed emphasise the fact that critical thinking, as a cognitive skill and affective disposition, should be measured against predefined standards and for the purpose of care. The main reference for this is the definition published by the American Philosophical Association

(APA) (see Facione, 1990). These are repeatedly referred to in these two journals. For example:

> Critical thinking is purposeful, self-regulatory judgement, which results in interpretation, analysis, evaluation, and inference, as well as explanation of evidential, conceptual, methodological, criteriological, or contextual considerations upon which judgement is based. (Mangena & Chabeli, 2005, p. 293)

A substantial number of the papers report results from testing students' level of critical thinking and how the level correlates with teaching methods and students' performance or how they change over time. The most frequently cited instruments are the California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST) and the closely related California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CCTDI). For example, Ozturk, Muslu, and Dicle (2008) use the CCTDI as a data collection tool. Their findings show that the active and self-directed nature of problem-based learning improves the ability of students to think critically, tolerate the ideas of others and evaluate conflicting information before reaching a conclusion.

A small number of papers critique the use of standardised instruments. Walsh and Seldomridge (2006) conclude that the above-mentioned instruments are not particularly useful to measure critical thinking, because they do not target many skills, such as clinical problem solving and decision making, which are essential in clinical practice. They argue that the 'development of critical thinking is a worthy goal for improving the quality of professional nurses in clinical practice, and not simply measured for the sake of meeting accreditation standards' (*Ibid*., pp. 217–218).

While some authors (e.g. Mangena & Chabeli, 2005; Yuan, Williams, & Fan, 2008) reference the complexity of society and hence of nursing practice as a justification for the importance of teaching critical thinking, no paper addressed the broader theme of moral and social responsibility. These papers show that the contemporary discourse on critical thinking in the two prominent journals retains a solid focus on various approaches that render critical thinking definable and measurable. Emphasising the instrumental application of intellectual rigour (i.e. APA's recommendations implemented in standard multiple-choice tests) and bureaucratic imperatives, such as the need for funding, the discourse seems immutable. In this set of papers, any critique of this notion of critical thinking is mostly in the form of recommendations for a single definition with improved measurability. Some authors are concerned about the lack of evidence of improvement in student scores over time.

Our findings are consistent with Simpson and Courtney's (2002) findings of their survey of the nursing literature on critical thinking published between January 1989 and 2000. The authors conclude that critical thinking is an integral component of nurse education and is necessary to promote the development of nurses' critical thinking abilities.

No paper referred to the need for transferable skills and lifelong learning in the global knowledge economy, although some advocate greater accountability. We found that, with a few exceptions (e.g. Twibell, Ryan, & Hermiz, 2005), the papers

reviewed on nurse education overwhelmingly gave 'critical thinking' an instrumental meaning related to the care of the individual patient.

Our examples confirm that researchers see critical thinking as a needed capacity in current professional work. Although some papers on critical thinking in teacher education open up the possibility for relating critical thinking to issues associated with emancipation and democracy, critical thinking remains an individual skill–an instrument to be used in order to provide the best possible care or teaching for other individuals. The literature in general lacks references to how professionals may cope with the multifaceted and complex responsibilities of 'social trustee professionals'. Reminding us of the fact that most graduates feel inadequately prepared for the moral and social quandaries at work, we find reason to look for new ways of integrating critical thinking in the education towards professional responsibility because establishing critical thinking does not itself ensure that deliberation gets taught. While we agree that critical thinking, as a capacity of the individual student, is profound, it is nevertheless insufficient for building a collective will as a foundation for making subjective judgments and decisions.

Professional Responsibility

Before turning our attention to what we see as a better way of helping students develop a base for professional responsibility, we need to briefly discuss implications of our findings for professional responsibility and how they relate to the work of a deliberate professional. We agree with Trede and McEwen (2016) that the 'deliberate professional' is a fruitful conceptualisation of a responsible professional in the twenty-first century. It includes the idea of 'critical' professionalism (Barnett, 1997) that requires professionals to be dedicated to their individual clients, but also to have the courage and will to publicly and critically engage and speak out on matters in which the views of professionals are relevant. The role of professionals cannot be separated from their role as engaged citizens in current societies (Bergan et al., 2013). However, there is no simple answer as to how to realise and live out these obligations in practice. Thus, many argue for the need for a critical investigation and reconceptualisation of core professional values, like moral and social responsibility (Englund, 2008; Strain, Barnett, & Jarvis, 2009; Sugrue & Solbrekke, 2011).

To take this seriously requires an understanding of the implications of the dual responsibility to work for individuals *and* for democratic societies. As these implications are characterised by multiple needs, contesting interests and conflicts, reaching decisions on appropriate action requires deliberation on what we mean by 'public good' and investigation of 'the factors in civic life which contribute to the public good of the citizenry' (Englund, 2006, p. 506). Thus, in order to qualify as deliberate professionals (Trede & McEwen, 2016), students must be supported in building their capacity to imagine and evaluate the potential consequences of their professional practices, as well as critically investigate the interests of clients and

local communities in light of moral and social responsibilities. Deliberate professionals have developed 'discretionary specialization' (Freidson, 2001). As gatekeepers of services for the public, deliberate professionals critically evaluate how they may best serve the needs of others in unpredictable and challenging situations (Molander, Grimen, & Eriksen, 2012).

In our approach, 'deliberation' and 'critical thinking' are seen as related, yet distinct, concepts, connected to each other in a specific manner. While critical thinking is, as indicated above, commonly seen as an individual capacity, the capacity to deliberate is developed through—and rooted in—an ongoing mutual and deliberative communication in which the capacity to think critically is an important, yet not sufficient, element. For students to learn how to reach decisions on how a profession can provide good services for both individuals *and* society requires collective deliberation. Further, developing the ability to deliberate involves communication where participants mutually develop their ability to place themselves in relation to their knowledge and values. It requires professional educators with the capacity, courage and will to create and engage in deliberation with students on the role and tasks of professionals and how to serve the public good. By taking part in collective deliberations and public debates, students may learn how to argue and take a stance, while also critically exploring consequences of their actions, or inactions, in order to develop a professional responsiveness to the wider society (Barnett, 1997; Delanty, 2001).

A Way Forward: Deliberation for Professional Responsibility

In this section, we suggest a way forward that may contribute to such collective will-formation. We propose a process for integrating critical thinking in educating for professional responsibility and the deliberate professional by applying a model of deliberative communication developed by Englund (2006).[2] Working with professional responsibility in a deliberative manner can beneficially be linked to issues and dilemmas arising from authentic cases, such as whether or not a nurse or teacher may wear religious or ideological symbols, or how a teacher might respond to anti-democratic utterances. Issues debated in the public sphere and/or introduced by the teacher or students may provide ample opportunity for deliberation, with no set answer.

Englund's (2006) proposal for guiding such discussion is intended as a guideline for teachers, and can also be applied in retrospect in a mutual evaluation by all involved. It is based on the following characteristics:

[2] The model was originally developed for use in schools and presented in Swedish (Englund, 2000). More elaborated evaluations and uses of the model can be found in Andersson (2012) and Forsberg (2011). The model in this chapter is slightly adjusted to higher education, especially professional programmes (Englund, 2002).

1. Different views are set against each other and arguments for each are articulated.
2. There is tolerance and respect for the 'concrete other'; participants learn to listen to the other person's argument.
3. Elements of collective will-formation are present; participants endeavour to reach consensus, or at least a temporary agreement, while also acknowledging and drawing attention to differences.
4. Authorities and/or traditional views may be questioned, and there are opportunities to challenge one's own beliefs.
5. There is encouragement for students to communicate and deliberate both inside and outside of the formal course; argumentative discussions between students aimed at solving problems, or shedding light on issues, from different viewpoints, are encouraged in a range of contexts.

How may this perspective on deliberation, as operationalised in these guidelines, help teachers and practitioners understand the shortcomings of instrumental approaches to critical thinking and provide an alternative?

As the first characteristic suggests, the precondition for starting a deliberative process, deliberative communication, is the existence of conflicting views. Englund (2006, pp. 513–514) argues:

> The presence of different views is one of the fundamental elements in deliberative communication and in creating, in spite of the differences, a common ground for discussion. This common ground can be called a discursive situation. {…}. The dimension of conflict and confrontation (of different views) is substantially central to, and constitutive of, deliberative communication as a procedural phenomenon. This dimension implies both openly conflicting views of moral and/or political character and an attempt to expose relatively minor differences of how to solve problems of how to act.

While the first characteristic, as in Habermas's (1990) concept of 'communicative action', opens up the crucial value of the better argument, the second characteristic emphasises, in relational terms, the need for respect for the concrete other—the other person(s) actually present and debating—as well as the need for transactional listening. Such listening can be nurtured, developed and realised in and through respectful communication. Transactional listening can also be facilitated and qualified by what is going on in the educational situation, especially in the way the teacher acts, builds relationships and communicates with students, encouraging different forms of communication among the students (Garrison, 1996).

From these two first characteristics, we can see that (a) no-one who can make a relevant contribution may be excluded, (b) all participants are granted an equal opportunity to make contributions, (c) participants must mean what they say, and (d) communication must be freed from external and internal coercion, so that 'yes' or 'no' stances that participants adopt on criticisable validity claims are motivated solely by the rational force of the better reasons (c.f. Englund, 2009, p. 30; c.f. Habermas, 1998, p. 44).

Concerning the third characteristic, researchers such as Mouffe (1999) and Ruitenberg (2008) stress and question the attempt to reach consensus through

rational deliberation. However, conflict and confrontation (of different views) is central to, and constitutive of, deliberation. Further, whether or not consensus is reached is an empirical question. While collective will-formation is the ideal, consensus is not the only acceptable result. Another might be greater clarity on differences. However, it should be noted that the collective will-formation process implies that the 'classroom' can be viewed as a weak public sphere, where different views occurring during a public debate will also be highlighted, even if they challenge the values students bring with them (Fraser, 1992).

The fifth characteristic stresses the public character of deliberative communication in the sense that universities and schools are potential public spaces in which there is a preference for pluralism of views. This implies that 'the principle of pluralism becomes a fundamental and crucial element of deliberative communication' (Englund, 2006, p. 514). The pluralist principle further indicates that an educational institution will not 'be a companion to the values students bring with them, rather it will be pluralistic' and that 'authorities and traditional views may be challenged' into deliberations with peers and teachers while 'teachers' opinions—especially if they leave no space for pluralism—may of course be questioned' (*Ibid*., pp. 514–515).

In summary, the first four characteristics above stress the pivotal role of educators (as deliberate professional educators) in making use of the discursive situation of conflicts and trying to realise the criteria of deliberative communication. The fifth characteristic emphasises educators' responsibility for creating a deliberative culture or preconditions for further deliberative communication among students without the management or presence of the teacher (Dewey, 1916/1980; Hansen, 2000). Central to this is the meaning-creating process that may encourage a collective will-formation among 'equals' (c.f. Englund, 2006, pp. 515–516). Thus, the potential for developing continuous deliberative communication practices requires students, teachers and professional practitioners to accept the idea of democracy and to be willing to adopt a deliberative approach.

To develop such learning communities requires not only the will to deliberate, but also the investment of time and humility of spirit. To build learning communities as well as societies founded on ideas of deliberative democracy is a long-term project, as 'deliberation requires *equal opportunity of access to political influence*' (Knight & Johnson, 1997, p. 280; emphasis in original). Higher education institutions and the professions play a central role in such a project. In this sense, professional education contributes to students understanding professional responsibility as more than 'just getting the work done'; it includes also broader societal concerns. This can lay the foundations for developing deliberative capacities, as Gutmann and Thompson (1996, p. 361) hoped that, 'while acknowledging that we are destined to disagree, deliberative democracy also affirms that we are capable of deciding our common destiny on mutually acceptable terms'.

Conclusion

As we have suggested in this chapter, integrating 'critical thinking' with 'deliberative communication' reconceptualises critical thinking to better support students (and teachers). While critical thinking encourages students to consider both knowledge and skills in a critical manner and also helps them intellectually analyse what is at stake in specific situations, deliberative communication encourages them to listen to others and reach consensus to act for others, while also considering communal concerns in the interest of democracy and the public good. It is not a question of either/or; rather, becoming a deliberate professional and ensuring the best discretionary specialisation, requires integration of the two. Reconceptualising critical thinking in this way may not only strengthen the intellectual capacity of the deliberate professional, but also encourage the formation of certain moral dispositions that develop in relation to other people. A deliberate professional acts responsibly by combining intellectual critical and rational thinking with moral considerations, in order to help concrete others and work for the public good. While these claims may not apply to each individual professional, we view this as a collective responsibility and aim. As such, it is potentially achievable. If students learn to deliberate about the implications of professional responsibility in collaboration with others, we may lay the ground for further professional practice in which practitioners *together* seek to reach nuanced decisions.

References

Alvesson, M., & Sköldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.

Andersson, K. (2012). *Deliberativ undervisning – en empirisk studie* [Deliberative teaching – an empirical study]. Göteborg: Statsvetenskapliga institutionen, Göteborgs universitet. Göteborg Studies in Politics 128.

Barnett, R. (1990). *The idea of higher education*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Barnett, R. (1997). *Higher education: A critical business*. Buckingham, England: SRHE & Open University Press.

Beck, E. E., Solbrekke, T. D., Sutphen, M., & Fremstad, E. (2014). When mere knowledge is not enough: The potential of *Bildung* as self-determination, co-determination and solidarity. *Higher Education Research & Development*. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2014.973373

Bergan, S., Harkavy, I., & van't Land, H. (Eds.). (2013). *Reimagining democratic societies: A new era of personal and social responsibility* (Council of Europe Higher Education Series, No. 18). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Biesta, G. (2007). Why 'what works' won't work: Evidence-based practice and the democratic deficit in educational research. *Educational Theory*, *57*(1). Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2006.00241.x/full

Bloom, B., Englehart, M. D., Furst, E., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives. The classification of educational goals, handbook 1: Cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay Company.

Brint, S. (1994). *In an age of experts*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Conklin, H. G., Hawley, T. D., Powell, S., & Ritter, J. K. (2010). Learning from young adolescents: The use of structured teacher education coursework to help beginning teachers investigate middle school students' intellectual capabilities. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(4), 313–327.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(1–2), 35–47.

Davis, M. (2011). Introduction to the special issue on critical thinking in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development, 30*(3), 255–260.

Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging knowledge: The university in the knowledge society*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Dewey, J. (1980). Democracy and education. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The middle works 1899–1924* (Vol. 9, pp. 1–370). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1916)

Durkheim, E. (1957/2001). *Professional ethics and civic morals.* London: Routledge.

El-Dib, M. A. B. (2007). Levels of reflection in action research: An overview and an assessment goal. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(1), 24–35.

Englund, T. (2000). *Deliberativa samtal som värdegrund – historiska perspektiv och aktuella förutsättningar* [Deliberative communication as a value foundation – Historical perspectives and current preconditions]. Stockholm: Skolverket/The National Agency for Education.

Englund, T. (2002). Higher education, democracy and citizenship: The democratic potential of the university. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 21*(4–5), 281–287.

Englund, T. (2006). Deliberative communication: A pragmatist proposal. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 38*(5), 503–520.

Englund, T. (2008). The university as an encounter for deliberative communication: Creating cultural citizenship and professional responsibility. *Utbildning & Demokrati – tidskrift för didaktik och utbildningspolitik, 17*(2), 97–114.

Englund, T. (2009). Educational implications of the idea of deliberative democracy. In M. Murphy & T. Fleming (Eds.), *Habermas, critical theory and education* (pp. 19–32). New York: Routledge.

Ersoy, A. F. (2010). Social studies teacher candidate's views on the controversial issues incorporated into their courses in Turkey. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(2), 323–334.

Facione, P. A. (1990). *Critical thinking: A statement of expert consensus for purposes of educational assessment and instruction.* Newark, Delaware: American Philosophical Association.

Forsberg, Å. (2011). *'Folk tror ju på en om man kan prata'. Deliberativt arrangerad undervisning på gymnasieskolans yrkesprogram* ['People believe you if you know how to talk'. Deliberatively organized teaching in upper secondary vocational schools]. Karlstad: Karlstad University Studies.

Foundation for Critical Thinking. (2013). *Professional and personal development.* Critical Thinking Community. Retrieved from http://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/professional-and-personal-development/800

Fraser, N. (1992). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Habermas and the public sphere* (pp. 109–142). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Freese, A. (2006). Reframing one's teaching: Discovering our teacher selves through reflection and inquiry. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*, 100–119.

Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism: The third logic*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Garrison, J. (1996). A Deweyan theory of democratic listening. *Educational Theory, 46*(4), 429–442.

Gay, G. (2005). Politics of multicultural teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(3), 221–228.

Goodman, G., Arbona, C., & Dominguez de Rameriz, R. (2008). High-stakes, minimum-competency exams: How competent are they for evaluating teacher competence? *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(1), 24–39.

Green, J. (2011). *Education, professionalism and the quest for accountability: Hitting the target but missing the point*. New York: Routledge.
Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (1996). *Democracy and disagreement*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.
Habermas, J. (1992/1996). *Between facts and norms*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Habermas, J. (1990). *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
Habermas, J. (1998). *The inclusion of the other: Studies in political theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Hansen, D. (2000). Dewey's conception of an environment for teaching and learning. *Curriculum Inquiry, 32*(3), 267–280.
Heggen, K., Karseth, B., & Kyvik, S. (2010). The relevance of research for the improvement of education and professional practice. In S. Kyvik & B. Lepori (Eds.), *The research mission of higher education institutions outside the university sector* (pp. 45–60). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
James, N., Hughes, C., & Cappa, C. (2010). Conceptualising, developing and assessing critical thinking in law. *Teaching in Higher Education, 15*(3), 285–297.
Jones, A. (2009). Generic attributes as espoused theory: The importance of context. *Higher Education, 58*, 175–191.
Karseth, B. (2011). Teacher education for professional responsibility: What should it look like? In T. D. Solbrekke & C. Sugrue (Eds.), *Professional responsibility: New horizons of praxis?* (pp. 159–174). London: Routledge.
Karseth, B., & Solbrekke, T. D. (2016). Curriculum trends in European higher education: The pursuit of the Humboldtian university ideas. In S. Slaughter & J. T. Barrett (Eds.), *Higher education, stratification, and workforce development: Competitive advantage in Europe, the US, and Canada* (pp. 215–233). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
Knight, J., & Johnson, J. (1997). What sort of political equality does deliberative democracy require? In J. Bohman & W. Rehg (Eds.), *Deliberative democracy. Essays on reason and politics* (pp. 279–319). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Leonard, J., Brooks, W., Barnes-Johnson, J., & Berry, R. Q. (2010). The nuances and complexities of teaching mathematics for cultural relevance and social justice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*(3), 261–270.
Lippincott, A. C., Peck, A., & D'Emidio-Caston, M. (2005). Staging the work of teacher education through public conversation. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(5), 482–497.
Mangena, A., & Chabeli, M. M. (2005). Strategies to overcome obstacles in the facilitation of critical thinking in nurse education. *Nurse Education Today, 25*, 291–298.
Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 74*, 5–12.
Molander, A., Grimen, H., & Eriksen, E. O. (2012). Professional discretion and accountability in the welfare state. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, *29*(3), 214–230. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5930.2012.00564.x
Moore, T. (2004). The critical thinking debate: How general are general thinking skills? *Higher Education Research and Development, 23*(1), 3–18.
Moore, T. (2011). Critical thinking: Seven definitions in search of a concept. *Studies in Higher Education*. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.586995.
Mouffe, C. (1999). Deliberative democracy or agonistic pluralism? *Social Research, 66*(3), 745–758.
Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity. A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Ozturk, C., Muslu, G. K., & Dicle, A. (2008). A comparison of problem-based and traditional education on nursing students' critical thinking dispositions. *Nurse Education Today, 28*, 627–632.

Peters, M. A., & Humes, W. (2003). Education in the knowledge economy. *Policy Futures in Education, 1*(1), 1–19.
Pithers, R. T., & Soden, R. (2000). Critical thinking in education: A review. *Educational Research, 42*(3), 237–249.
Propil, I. (2011). Promotion of critical thinking by using case studies as teaching method. *Nurse Education Today, 31*, 2004–2007.
Rich, P. J., & Hannafin, M. (2009). Video annotation tools: Technologies to scaffold, structure, and transform teacher reflection. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*, 52–67.
Ruitenberg, C. W. (2008). Educating political adversaries: Chantal Mouffe and radical democratic citizenship education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*. doi:10.1007/s11217-008-9122-2.
Scriven, M., & Paul, R. (1987). The Eigth Annual Conference on Critical Thinking and Educational Reform. Foundation for Critical Thinking. Retrieved from http://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/defining-critical-thinking/766
Siegel, H. (1997). *Rationality redeemed? Further dialogues on an educational ideal*. New York: Routledge.
Simpson, E., & Courtney, M. (2002). Critical thinking in nursing education: Literature review. *International Journal of Nursing Practice, 8*, 89–98.
Solbrekke, T. D. (2007). *Understanding conceptions of professional responsibility* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Oslo, Norway: University of Oslo.
Solbrekke, T. D. (2008). Educating for professional responsibility. A normative dimension of higher education. Theme issue: Educating towards civic and professional responsibility – The future of higher education? *Utbildning och Demokrati [Education and Democracy], 17*(2), 73–96.
Solbrekke, T. D., & Englund, T. (2011). Bringing professional responsibility back in. *Studies in Higher Education, 36*(7), 847–861.
Solbrekke, T. D., & Sugrue, C. (2014). Professional accreditation of initial teacher education programmes: Teacher educators' strategies – Between 'accountability' and 'professional responsibility'. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 37*, 11–20.
Solbrekke, T. D., & Englund, T. (2014). Certification of teachers: Tensions in a new signature reform. *Professions and Professionalism*, *4*(2). Retrieved from http://dx.doj.org/10.7577/pp.668
Strain, J., Barnett, R., & Jarvis, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Universities, ethics and professions. Debate and scrutiny*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.
Struyven, K., Dochy, F., & Janssens, S. (2008). The effects of hands-on experience on students' preferences for assessment methods. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(1), 69–88.
Sugrue, C., & Solbrekke, T. D. (Eds.). (2011). *Professional responsibility: New horizons of praxis*. London/New York: Routledge.
Sullivan, W. M., & Rosin, M. S. (2008). *A new agenda for higher education. Shaping a life of the mind for practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Trede, F., & McEwen, C. (2016). Carving out the territory for educating the deliberate professional. In F. Trede & C. McEwen (Eds.), *Educating the deliberate professional: Preparing for future practices*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.
Trede, F., & McEwen, C. (2013). *Educating the deliberate professional* (Occasional Paper 9). Sydney, Australia: The Education For Practice Institute, Charles Sturt University.
Turner, P. (2005). Critical thinking in nursing education and practice as defined in the literature. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 26*(5), 272–277.
Twibell, R., Ryan, M., & Hermiz, M. (2005). Faculty perceptions of critical thinking in student clinical experiences. *Journal of Nursing Education, 44*(2), 71.
von Humboldt, W. (1970). On the spirit and the organisational framework of intellectual institutions in Berlin. *Minerva*, *8*, 242–250. (Original work published 1809)
Walsh, C. M., & Seldomridge, L. A. (2006). Critical thinking: Back to square two. *Journal of Nursing Education, 45*(6), 212.

Warburton, W., & Torff, B. (2005). The effect of perceived learner advantages on teachers' beliefs about critical-thinking activities. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(1), 24–33.

Yuan, H., Williams, B. A., & Fan, L. (2008). A systematic review of selected evidence on developing nursing students' critical thinking through problem-based learning. *Nurse Education Today, 28*, 657–663.