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Abstract

This paper critically examines what a 21st Century university should be by actively employing the 19th Century educationalist John Henry Newman’s ‘Idea of a university’. The idea of a university in England and elsewhere is undergoing significant change as funding structures seemingly force greater marketisation and associated technical rationalism of education at all levels. With the new funding arrangements of 2012 upon us in England it would seem an appropriate time to reflect on what a modern university could be and what perhaps it should be in terms of curriculum content and student experience. Although Newman was writing in the mid/late 1800s, he was an original thinker and writer on these subjects and this paper will demonstrate how his ‘idea of a university’ still has relevance today. This paper considers some of his ideas on the formation of student identity and how these have been employed at Liverpool Hope University to develop a new Education Studies programme. The paper’s conclusion suggests that in the current context of educational economic change there is a need to move on from the mere formation of students to the transformation of students.
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Introduction

John Henry Newman had a special interest in student formation and what it meant to be an educated person. He explored these notions within his writings conducted in the educational context of a 19th century university. Although writing in the 19th Century, this paper seeks to articulate how Newman’s experiences as a student, a practising Christian, a university tutor and ordained cleric are as influential today to discussion of university education as they were in the 1850s (Carpenter & McMullen, 2011). This is particularly so for a ‘modern university’ which has a strong commitment to student formation and voice, and to transformative education in line with that espoused within Newman’s seminal text ‘The Idea of a University’. Newman wrote extensively about Theology and university education, both Christian and secular, and his lectures and essays on these subjects were frequently entwined. In recent times, though, scholars have critiqued Newman’s views on the nature of knowledge, different academic disciplines and the relevance of these to modern university education (MacIntyre, 2009 & Dunne, 2006). Less attention has though
been given to his view of the student and to student formation. This paper explores the more contemporary concept of student voice in relation to Newman’s philosophy.

Newman was a Christian theologian who wrote prolifically in the second half of the nineteenth century. He is most well known, perhaps, for his theological writings on themes such as the complexity of personal belief, Christian doctrine and authority in the Church. His personal journey of faith from Anglicanism to Evangelicalism to Catholicism has made him a much studied theologian across different denominations. He is a much respected Victorian writer on higher education, theorising about the nature of a university and the place of the student, or scholar (Loughlin, 2009). In this field he is most well known for his seminal text, published in 1873 ‘The Idea of a University’. In this he remodels his earlier thoughts and writings on universities and the disciplines studied within them. This nineteenth century text has gone on to influence thinking about higher education in the twentieth and twenty first centuries, although it is interesting to note that at the time of its publication it did not receive much interest (James & Heft, 2007). For some of us teaching and researching in universities today his ideas of what a university education should consist of are still deeply significant, perhaps even more so with the increase in marketisation and commoditisation of institutions and courses. It is appropriate then that in this time of significant change in higher education policy and provision we should pause and reflect on the deeper questions which affect us, not ‘How much should this course cost?’ or ‘Which institution is at the top of the league tables?’ but ‘What is a university?’, ‘How might a university contribute to the formation of individuals and society?’ and with reference to Newman ‘Are the thoughts of Newman little more than historic reflections of an era long passed?’

Newman’s own educational experiences

Newman’s family were London bankers and as such he had a relatively privileged early education, attending Great Ealing School, in London. He was a pupil there in its heyday when it was considered one of the best schools in England. This gave him a classical education and initiated him into the educational environment of the elite establishment where he developed a strong interest in classical philosophy and literature. He then became a student of Trinity College Oxford, where he studied widely and had something of what could be described as a liberal education. He particularly enjoyed the tutorial system which gave him close contact with academic scholars, both students and tutors (Gilley, 2009). This emphasis on relationships as a vehicle for exploring one’s own thoughts and those of others can be traced through his writings and much of his philosophy on education is built around this Oxford model. He graduated from Trinity but only with a third class honours and was determined to do better. He funded further studies for himself by tutoring school pupils and then won a fellowship at Oriel College in 1822. Oriel was renowned for its intellectualism and had already produced several significant churchmen (Gilley, 2009). It provided Newman with an environment and community in which he was able to develop academically studying philosophy and theology, professionally with his aspirations for ordination and personally with his own relationship with God. This
academic, professional and personal learning could be considered to be important to his ideas of student formation.

Newman drew on his experience at Oxford when he established the Oratory in Birmingham. He was seeking to establish a Catholic version of an Oxford college, as Catholics were not permitted to enrol at Oxford. (He had not yet converted to Catholicism when a student and tutor there himself.) Newman was requested by the Irish Catholic bishops, to go to Dublin in 1854 as rector of the newly established National University of Ireland. It was during this time that he really developed his ideas about the university. He retired after four years, frustrated with his general lack of progress on this venture, preferring to pursue his own scholarship and writing and he published various texts and collections of lectures on the university and its disciplines.

Newman and the Student

Newman had been influenced by the classical Greek culture promoted in the mid/late 1800s, a time which did not have contemporary aspirations for mass education and empowerment of women (Dunne, 2006). The prevailing culture of universities in the nineteenth century in England was that knowledge was largely the preserve of the wealthy and that the masses were to give their attention to commerce, business, industry and production as opposed to study. When Newman was a University fellow and rector, the student body was therefore made up of the male elite, such as the sons of upper-class merchants and noblemen. Contrastingly, universities today are places of social change, measured in relation to their widening participation achievements in part. It might be said that modern universities have become focussed on ‘outputs’ rather than knowledge with students viewed as clients and outcomes measured by degree classifications rather than personal academic development. Newman though was interested in the student’s participation in the process of study and of learning, rather than focussing on the student’s examination success or failure. It was the engagement in study and the process of learning supported by strong relationships which Newman thought were key to a university education. He articulated this in his description of what he understood a university to be;

I protest to you, Gentlemen, that if I had to choose between a so-called University, which dispensed with residence and tutorial superintendence, and gave its degrees to any person who passed an examination in a wide range of subjects, and a University which had no professors or examinations at all, but merely brought a number of young men together for three or four years... if I must determine which of the two courses was the most successful in training, moulding, enlarging the mind... which produced better public men, men of the world... I have no hesitation in giving the preference to the university which did nothing, over that which exacted of its members an acquaintance with every science under the sun. (Newman, 1996, p.105)
In Newman’s comparison of the two universities, the first is about knowledge transfer; the second has focus on relationships as a facilitator of learning and on dialogue as a process of learning. It is in this latter area in which Newman opened the debate about university education being more than just knowledge. He was able to articulate a deeper and more sustained debate about the formation of the student as opposed to education as a knowledge-based enterprise. This gave an emphasis to student formation as opposed to academic information. This commitment to student formation can be traced through Newman’s own higher education experiences of the tutorial system at Oxford, as mentioned earlier, where he developed close relationships with tutors and peers and through which he was able to explore his own academic and personal development as a process of learning. For Newman, the university was “not a foundry, or a mint, or a treadmill”; that is to say it was not a place of production of students in a mechanical or industrial sense, but rather was a place of student development. For Newman a university education was about the process of learning. He articulates this process as the movement onward, as ‘locomotion’. This implies that a student cannot be passive in the process of learning and disengage from it but rather has to be actively engaged in his or her own learning, that it is a process which demands the giving of one’s self. For him there was a difference between inquiring of knowledge and the commanding of it, of understanding it rather than memorisation of facts. Disciplines here were important but not in isolation from the learning process or from each other. Interestingly, Loughlin (2009) regards his thinking on student formation as being influenced more by his experiences as rector at Dublin than by those as a student at Oxford. For Loughlin, writing about Newman’s idea of a university, the Oxford model reproduces culture through association whereas the Dublin model reproduced a culture which is also about questioning, and learning to see things as they are and of discriminating between truth and falsehood, (Loughlin, 2009).

To Newman then a university education was not just about knowledge acquisition, but was also grounded in intellectual growth. He also emphasised though the moral and religious formation of students (Mulcahy, 2008). Thus, he believed a university should give careful consideration to how it cares for the student as well as how it educates them. He believed consideration should be given to emotional moral and intellectual formation. Newman actually likens a college, a smaller unit within a university based on the Oxford model, as a home, in that it should be a place where values are learnt and the student is cared for. Indeed, Newman is regularly quoted as saying that the University is the students ‘alma mater,’ the mother who should know her children one by one (Lee, 2003). For Newman this notion of student formation as education could not take place in a vacuum.

Although it may not have been articulated as student formation in his time Newman was undoubtedly of the view that education is about formation rather than mere memorising of information. These views are articulated in of his description of a university as a place to take students and to” turn them into something or other”, to mould their characters, form their habits, educate their hearts though educating their minds” (Loughlin, 2009, p.236). Newman also described certain characteristics he thought students should develop through their university experience. These included
being resourceful, having versatility and being able to make informed judgements (Mulcahy, 2008). Newman’s broad idea of a university was that it was about social, moral and spiritual formation (Mulcahy, 2008). To Newman then it was the process of learning and the self-discipline required for scholarship which forms the student and not solely the memorisation of knowledge.

From formation to transformation

The nature of a university and Newman’s view of it has some modern parallels. For example, Newman did have a view of a university where the relationship between the tutor and the student was very much at the heart of it and where that relationship was observed to be critically important. Newman might even have taken the view that it was a triangular relationship, the tutor, the student and God, that were the three elements of that triangle and that knowledge was created within that triangular structure and triangular relationship. He also recognised this did not imply an equal relationship, since God was at the centre of everything. This, of course, has parallels to the holy trinity of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, a triangular relationship which was at the heart of Newman’s own life. He was very concerned to make sure that the student was someone who was single minded in his thinking. He himself led a fairly ascetic life devoting his entire attention to the disciplines of philosophy and theology that he was teaching and the student being formed as part of this. Newman then observes the idea of formation in a focussed way and would see education as being formation, formation in the discipline, in terms of a traditional set of relations.

To this extent Newman still held to the idea that education was about formation in a particular kind of way. The formation he had in mind was related to a cognitive and spiritual life devoted to God and developed for the service of others. So education was not about some liberal and explorative set of relationships, but rather about how we should form people in the image and likeness of God.

In the modern view maybe one would want to raise questions about this model, and move beyond formation to transformation and observe change being the constant rather than the discipline being the constant as in Newman’s time. Newman was well aware that “to live is to change”. In that regard he saw education as an enterprise in which knowledge itself changes. Knowledge nowadays is not the rather static entity that it might have been as a feature of the nineteenth and early twenty century universities. Nowadays, knowledge is a much more dynamic and shifting set of ideas, thoughts and processes which moves us somewhat into the area of transformation and not formation. It might be said that education is no longer about information. How can it be as information changes so rapidly into today’s modern world with its rapid technological and scientific advances. If it is no longer about information and formation I want to argue that modern education should be about transformation and a shift in thinking. This shift should see lecturers supporting individuals as lifelong learners who have a role to play in their own transformation and that of society.

This transformation of students, indeed transformative learning, should then seek to bring about changes in the self. Illeris (2005:) describes such changes as being
‘characterised by a simultaneous restructuring in the cognitive, the emotional and the socio-societal dimensions’. That is to say, there are three dimensions to student transformation: psychological (changes in understanding of the self), convictional (revision of belief systems), and behavioral (changes in lifestyle). According to this model planning a university experience where student transformation might take place requires consideration being given to three types of knowledge which should be integrated in the planned experiences of students. These three kinds of knowledge are:

- **Academic Knowledge** - This is about scholarship and research. The role of discipline orientated knowledge is critical to this.
- **Professional Knowledge** - This allows theory to be explored through practical situations and may be related to professional study but is not specific to vocational degrees.
- **Personal Knowledge** – This is where the values, aspirations and emotional (and spiritual) aspects of learning and educating are formed and fostered.

With the current emphasis on research, modern universities plan for and can facilitate the development of academic knowledge with confidence, or at least an interaction with it. In addition some universities, particularly those offering professional courses and qualifications, do indeed pay close attention to professional knowledge. It is the third knowledge, personal knowledge, which it seems is often overlooked by universities, in that it is not explicitly planned for in the curriculum or the experiences offered to students. It is the intensity of a situation, the challenge within the learning environment which develops personal knowledge as students grow in their own understanding of themselves and of what is important to them.

### A Model for Learning

In the McGettrick model for learning it is not only the content or curriculum which is significant, the what, but also the how, the why and the where. This model emphasises the inter-relatedness of the curriculum with meaningful relationships, a love of learning and and the creation of an emotional and spiritual space for learning and transformation. For transformative learning and student transformation, to occur all four of these areas need to be present in the student experience.

The Faculty of Education at Liverpool Hope University is driven by the McGettrick model for learning as it supports the University’s commitment to student transformation. It is interesting to note that the University’s founding colleges have existed since 1844 when Newman was seeking to influence higher education in England. At this time the Sisters of Notre Dame were establishing educational opportunities for women in Liverpool, and in particular working class women, two groups marginalised by Newman’s idea of a university. The Notre Dame philosophy of education was to teach people what they needed for life, not what they needed for an exam. This early commitment to student formation has remained very strong at
Liverpool Hope University and a more contemporary commitment to student transformation underpins the mission and values of the University today. While the Sisters were not originally seeking to establish a university, which was Newman’s goal, they shared his vision of education as a process of learning and formation. Indeed the Sisters of Notre Dame were successfully developing opportunities beyond school for women in Liverpool, at a time when Newman was failing to make any significant impact on higher education in Birmingham. Perhaps the Sisters’ success was due to the fact that they had a shared philosophy of education and they worked as a community to promote this, whereas Newman was initially something of a lone voice at Birmingham and Dublin. Like Newman the Sisters were concerned not only with the disciplines, but also with the student experience and the process of learning underpinned by strong relationships between students and their tutors – in this case the Sisters themselves. It was the community of learners which the Sisters established which was of importance here. This community of learners, of students and tutors, a collegium, which the Sisters established continues to underpin Liverpool Hope University in its modern form. It is interesting to note that the University is the only ecumenical university in Europe and describes itself as being fully Catholic and fully Anglican. Being a Christian university it has a particular and direct relationship with Newman and his idea of a university as a place informed by a living faith.

In this collegiate environment which shares strong values with Newman the man and the tutor, it is important that the learning process does indeed provide opportunities for student transformation, for the development of academic, professional and personal learning. This is why the McGettrick model for learning is of significance here. It is our philosophy that in order for learning to take place effectively there needs to be a number of planned aspects of what can best be described as the environment. These are the curriculum or content, relationships, a disposition to learning and emotional and spiritual space. These four elements do not constitute a model of learning, but rather a model for learning, that is to say they are necessary for learning to occur and in particular for transformational learning to occur. What is crucial to this model is that there is a dynamic and integral relationship between;

- The content of the curriculum, and “success” within this
- The disposition to learning – a love for learning
- The relationships created in the educational setting or learning environment
- The emotional and spiritual space in which learning takes place.

Central to a university education, or indeed any education, are the relationships which are created in any appropriate context. Through a positive set of relationships the student or learner forms the scaffolding for her/his thinking and development. This becomes the mental framework that allows the student to make sense of the world. It forms the intellectual and emotional structures which provide the capacity and ability to see the world in different ways. It is suggested that attention being given to the four aspects in the model above and the interaction among them will be significant for the engagement of students in more effective learning.
I turn now to consider how the four aspects of this university model of education, an education which seeks to transform students, relates to Newman’s philosophy of learning.

Curriculum

In the above model for learning the curriculum is the content, the principles, knowledge, ideas, concepts and skills. Newman shared his views on what today would be called the curriculum in his discussion of disciplines and what he understood to be a liberal education. He was of the view that the subject matter or curriculum content should come from a number of academic disciplines. Interestingly for those of us in faith-based universities he identified theology as the central focus for any Catholic university (Oakes, 2011), but he was strongly of the view that it should be studied alongside other disciplines. He regarded it as one field of knowledge with what he termed ‘secular sciences’, as other fields of knowledge.

It was important to him that the curriculum should promote a breadth of knowledge, with the study of several disciplines, and the development of intellectual skills. Thus, students would grow in their thinking as well as their acquisition of knowledge. This was his commitment to a liberal education. Newman’s curriculum therefore, was about formation as well as knowledge transfer. The purpose of a university education for Newman was the formation of the mind;

The result is a formation of the mind, that is, a habit of order and system, a habit of referring every accession of knowledge to what we already know, and of adjusting the one with the other; and moreover, as such a habit implies, the actual acceptance and use of certain principles as centres of thought around which our knowledge grows and is located.

(Newman, 1976, p.404)

Newman thought that every student should have a liberal university education before studying a profession and becoming too focused on a body of professional knowledge. This would enable the student to be single-minded in his academic study and then subsequently his professional learning rather than for one to be distracted by the other. It is interesting to note here that Liverpool Hope University has its foundation in the professional learning of teachers. In the Faculty of Education undergraduate teacher education continues but the Faculty’s growing strength is in Education studies and its related subjects, such as Early Childhood Studies. Here the focus is on academic study, with explicit professional courses being provided at postgraduate level. Having the opportunity to study education without being distracted by professional requirements is regarded as important by the Faculty. Furthermore, our new curriculum is formulated upon Newman’s liberal perspectives and so provides students with an opportunity to study the sociology, philosophy, history and psychology of education. This curriculum whilst providing a strong foundation for student transformation was designed to be purposefully different in
emphasis to the more popular curriculum approaches which study education through issues and policy.

**Relationships**

Relationships are at the heart of learning and of our learning culture; this was true for Newman. However, these relationships Newman argues must be strong as weak relationships cannot convey values and respect or support the dialogue and exchange of ideas which are so crucial for learning in which understanding is to take place. Carpenter and McMullen (2011), highlight Newman’s view of a university as “a place for communication of thought by means of personal intercourse” (p.72). As in our Faculty, it was the exchange of ideas, the dialogue, the interaction amongst students and tutors which was at the heart of Newman’s university. Like Newman we believe that the personal presence of the tutor is essential to the student experience and the development of learning relationships (Mulcahy, 2008). The teacher, as Newman dictates, has to become an intermediary between the student and the discipline and a guide to help the student understand the body of knowledge being studied.

Newman writes that the teacher is “the living voice, the breathing form... which catechises” (Newman, 1961, p.14). While catechising here makes particular reference to teaching a faith, it also stresses a relationship between the teacher and the student which references the use of questions and answers as a teaching strategy. The basis then of this learning relationship then is dialogue and interaction between student and teacher. This formulation of relationship is at the heart of philosophy of learning which underpins Liverpool Hope’s Faculty of Education. To facilitate such personal learning relationships in our new education studies degree all first year students are in seminar groups of 10. This enables tutors to know their students well; something Newman advocated strongly. Of course in the current economic climate of higher education this requires very careful resource planning elsewhere in the course but we believe strongly that these personal learning relationships are fundamental to the transformation of our students.

Unlike Newman, who was aware of the value of relationships but continued to place significant emphasis on knowledge, we believe that in the modern world, where knowledge changes at such speed, the emphasis on relationships offers a powerful model of education and of what it means to be an educated person. Whilst we do not deny the place of knowledge we chose to give precedence to relationships in the educational process.

**Disposition to learning**

The contemporary university should be a place which is exciting, vibrant, enjoyable and engaging and one that is underpinned by challenging academic disciplines. Such a university can develop a passion for learning amongst students, and tutors
for that matter, in relation to the formal curriculum. The facilitation of meaningful relationships across the university community can further promote a positive attitude and approach to learning. In a process of transformation students should come to recognise and use their and their peers’ assets, the gifts and talents that each student brings to the community, encouraged and guided by their tutor. This process is about recognising themselves as learners and becoming passionate about learning, confident in and with their own learning styles.

Perhaps it is here, under dispositions to learning that we should come back to Newman’s idea of a university being an ‘alma mater’. For Newman universities should know their children - their students one by one- and know them as individuals rather than as numbers on a set of statistical returns. It is by knowing students as individuals that tutors will know how to develop in them a love of learning, will know what will excites, motivates and challenges them in their studies. It therefore challenges the modern university to develop a pedagogy which engages students in very directly. This implies having a variety of ways of working, but essentially ways which create, sustain and develop relationships. The student experience is always paramount and the pedagogy should address the varying needs of students. While this can be seen to be Newmanesque, the contemporary application of electronic platforms for learning is very different from the intimacy of the Oxford tutor’s study. This is why we believe seminar groups of 10 are so key to the learning process in Liverpool Hope’s Faculty of Education. Elsewhere the new course seeks to engage students in their learning and excite them by the use of enquiry-based learning, honours level reading mentors and weekly keynotes from influential thinkers and policy makers from within Hope’s community and outside. This varied programme of activities aims to develop a love of learning which is crucial to future educators of why type or another.

It is here, in this love of learning that the student’s voice should emerge. In particular, we believe that those students who will be future educators, either formally as teachers or youth workers for example, or informally as community volunteers and advocates, should feel passionate about their own learning and the learning of others. They should be able to articulate this passion clearly and to advocate for opportunities and environments which promote and facilitate such learning in others. Student voice should therefore not just be about the voicing of their views about the university experience but also should be about them sharing with others their views on society and their place in it. As such student transformation here is about developing the student’s voice so it can be heard loudly and clearly in the service of education.

**Emotional and Spiritual space**

It is important that effective learning for all teachers, those in higher education and elsewhere, gives attention to creating ‘space’ for the flourishing of students, in terms of emotional and spiritual well-being. In the culture of control in which we find
ourselves today we believe educational institutions should support an environment in which there is freedom to be an autonomous learner. Therefore, it is my contention that the effective, active student should not be characterised by compliance but rather by their enterprise and creativity.

It is difficult to find explicit reference to space in Newman's ideas; it was not a particularly recognised concept of the time in the way it is today. Newman though does write about the process of learning on numerous occasions, some of which have been discussed already. In the Idea of a University he strongly supports the notion of a university as a “residence without examinations, rather than examinations without residence” (Newman, xxvi). He did not like examinations as he thought that they encouraged cramming and created ‘pigs’. I take this to mean that universities should promote an environment or education which provides space for the student to think and reflect. As stated earlier in this paper, for Newman a university should not be a foundry, or treadmill or mint. In other words it should not be a space of the factory where knowledge is memorised, where the end product is counted even, but instead be formulated upon the process of learning. Any effective process of learning must provide space for reflection, not just academic reflection but also professional and personal reflection, an emotional and spiritual space for students. This is important if the psychological, convictional and behavioural transformation is to take place as described earlier. Liverpool Hope University recruits students and staff of all faiths and no faith. In doing so it does provide spaces and opportunities, both physical and otherwise, for students to develop emotionally and spiritually. These may be formal, in that they are planned activities in dedicated spaces, in its ecumenical chapel or prayer rooms for other faiths for example. Or in our weekly Foundation Hour when staff and students come together as a community to reflect on some aspect of the University’s values, such as volunteering projects that students are involved in or a religious celebration. This may also be informal and unplanned learning within planned spaces which facilitate spiritual and emotional reflection. An example of this is the new Education building where open spaces have been created for students, and staff, to gather socially or to work together outside of the classroom; these spaces have been described as indoor atriums for the dark winter months. In the summer the University’s numerous gardens become meeting spaces for friendship and reflection, spaces where Newman’s idea of a university as a community can flourish.

Conclusion

Reflection on Newman’s philosophy from a higher education perspective is particularly interesting when it is localised within the only ecumenical university in Europe. However, this paper has sought to suggest how his views of higher education might be of wider interest for the University of the 21st Century. At Oxford he was part of the establishment of the tutor system there. This really formed his thinking about education and his reflection on the idea of a university. Indeed his idea of a university was clearly based on his experience at Oxford with its intimate engagement of students, a focus on the disciplines and a focus on the rather elite
form of education that was provided. To a large extent this is a far cry from the type of university education we see today with an emphasis on democracy and wider access and participation. These considerations were not part of the thinking of Oxford or of Newman’s idea of a university, nor was research a particularly significant part of the university in Newman’s view. These then are much more elements of the model of the industrial university developed during the twentieth century. Some may question, then, why Newman’s ideas remain of such interest, and indeed relevance today.

This paper has sought to discuss some of Newman’s key thinking in relation to the student and the student experience, this is a very contemporary theme in higher education. Athie (2003) writes of what Newman’s idea of what knowledge is. He uses Newman’s definition of knowledge was. This being;

> When I speak of Knowledge, I mean something intellectual. Something which grasps what it perceives through the senses; something which takes a view of things; which sees more than the senses convey; which reasons upon what it sees, and while it sees; which invests it with an idea. (Newman, 1987 in Athie, 2003, p.289)

Newman’s education then has the potential to transform students because it is a liberal education in the way that a solely academic education cannot be. As Athie accounts;

> Thus a liberal education breaks with the dynamics of an instruction that doesn’t educate, that offers knowledge with no sense of direction, a power without a service that leads us to believe that knowledge can only be translated into a power in itself, into a right to control others. (Athie, 2003, p.301)

For Athie, Newman’s idea of education is about “inward self-command and outward service. Education here grants power over oneself and power for others” (p.301). This development of self-empowerment is what student transformation is about and this has tremendous relevance for modern universities. Many forms of contemporary education lack depth and do not give space to meaningful relationships or spirituality. I believe that a university education which challenges students, not just academically but personally too, which offers them a space to grow academically and spiritually, which is values driven as well as curriculum focussed, has the potential to transform. This is what Newman was promoting when he wrote about a university;

> A University training is the great ordinary means to a great but ordinary end; it aims at raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the national taste...at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age. It is the education which gives a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgements, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them. (Newman, 1852 in Ker, 1976, p.154)
Newman was writing in the nineteenth century and articulated his ideas according to the rhetoric and terminology of the time. He did not write about student formation as such, but the importance of formation can clearly be observed in many of his ideas as. If he was writing today he may well have moved his thoughts from formation to transformation. This is because a transformative education is one which seeks to develop in students a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgements, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them, to give them a voice. Nonetheless there would have been that constant struggle between the knowledge base of education and the processes which lead to that knowledge. The modern university may well have a different emphasis, highlighting ideas which were still a little in the shadow of Newman’s writing. Today we acknowledge the absolute need for change and the place of the transformed student as a lifelong learner. Newman set us on an interesting journey of thought, and characteristically a journey without a destination. That is not always comfortable, but that just may be the nature of transformation.
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