

Master or Steward Degree Designations: Implications for Cultures of Peace

Sue McGregor PhD, Professor
Faculty of Education, Mount Saint Vincent University
166 Bedford Highway, Halifax Nova Scotia Canada B3M 2J6
sue.mcgregor@msvu.ca
[Http://www.consultmcgregor.com](http://www.consultmcgregor.com)

Master or Steward Degree Designations: Implications for Cultures of Peace

Abstract

Universities are creating graduate education programs that prepare people in peace education, peaceful schools, social justice, and conflict management, resolution and transformation. The conventional approach is to obtain a Master's degree. After discussing the history of why university degrees are called bachelors, masters and doctorates, the paper narrows its focus to the Master's degree. It critically analyzes the import of the *labels* master and steward. A principle-based case is then made for the merit of creating a Steward of Education degree designation. Stewardship is offered as an alternative to mastery, assuming that a culture of peace could be advanced further with this new graduate designation.

INTRODUCTION

This journal is about creating a culture of peace, with one theme being education for a culture of peace. Universities are creating graduate programs in education that prepare people in such fields as peace education, peaceful schools, social justice, and conflict management, resolution and transformation. This paper is about the possibility of a stewardship paradigm being adopted into these mainstream degree programs.

It was prompted by personal reflections about what paradigm is behind the label *Master's* degree? What does the word master connote? What would a steward's degree look like, and how would one go about convincing mainstream graduate education of its merit? How would people react when they saw that someone in Education did not have an MED or MAED, but had an SED or SAED, with the 'A' referring to a degree with a thesis? Also, why do people call the product of graduate school a thesis, instead of a synthesis? These are some of the questions shaping this discussion. Critically analyzing the import of the labels master and steward is a way to unhook people from their tacit assumptions about control, compliance and dominance, notions that are embedded in the current graduate school infrastructure.

HISTORY OF THREE LEVELS OF ACADEMIC DEGREES

There is an interesting history behind why degrees obtained from universities are called bachelors, masters and doctorates. Although this paper is concerned with the masters' label, it is interesting to place it in the context of the other two labels. One usually obtains these degrees in a certain order: bachelor, masters, and then doctorate (Knowles, 1977; Spurr, 1970). There are reasons for this sequence, stemming from the time of the Middle Ages, when trade guilds emerged. People moved through being an apprentice onto journeyman, and then a master. The whole history of regulated professions is entwined with the history of the guilds in Europe (James, 2002; Wikipedia, 2006e).

Bachelor's Degree

Traditionally, bachelor was the name given to a younger, inferior member of a trade guild, a yeoman, or to the lowest, poorest grade of knighthood. The term bachelor also referred to someone who is inferior which means belonging to a lower rank or class. Junior also means inferior. The word "junior" is still used to refer to first year students enrolled at university in a bachelor degree. *Baccalaureus* is Latin for Bachelor's Degree, first appearing in the 13th century at the University of Paris. It referred to the preliminary degree needed to proceed to a masters level so people could be teachers, masters.

Chilton (1998) explains that someone with a Bachelor's degree has an interest in a particular field and some understanding of, and facility with, its methods (and the author would add principles, theories, and content). The student starts out as an apprentice, and is willing to forgo wages for the opportunity to study with the masters of the field. Apprentice stems from the Latin root *apprendensus*, meaning to seize or apprehend. To apprentice someone is to bind them into the care of a master for the purpose of instruction. They are in training for a future time when they may become a master. The system of apprenticeship dates at least to the medieval days of guilds. It is a traditional way to train a new generation of skilled practitioners.

When someone actually graduates with a baccalaureate degree, this person becomes more of a journeyman (the question about the gender neutrality of this term is acknowledged). The person is able to do routine work in the field, and is interested enough in the field to find this work. The word "journeyman" comes from the French word *journée*, meaning a period of one day. The journeyman was expected to train in the master's workshop without pay, and was allowed to charge others for any work done on Sundays, or in the evenings. So, this term refers to the right to charge a fee for each day's work (Wikipedia, 2006g). Also, once a term of apprenticeship was completed, former apprentices traveled from employer to employer earning wages as journeymen (*journeying* from one employer to another). When, or if, they accumulated enough capital, journeymen set up shop as independent masters, and became members of craft guilds (Jacoby, 2001).

Also of interest to this discussion is the link between the terms *degree* and *graduate*. In the 12th and 13th centuries in Europe, anyone who completed three to four years of university received a Bachelors *degree*, a practice still continued today. Degree stems from the Latin *gradus*, for step. A degree is only a step on the way to becoming a fully-qualified master. Hence, we now have the English word *graduate*, for higher learning. Universities still echo the apprenticeship/journeyman/master schema in their production of scholars. Bachelors can choose to move onto a masters degree, and a doctorate (Wikipedia, 2006a,b).

Master's Degree

The term masters stems from *magister*, Latin for teacher or license to teach. It was first applied to the field of education as a noun in the Middle Ages. Magister was a title given to someone with a license from a university to teach philosophy and the liberal arts. Originally, there were two basic types of Masters degrees: *Magister Artium* (Masters of Arts), and *Magister Scientiae* (Master of Science). Later, it became popular for masters degrees to be named for a particular discipline. There now exists Masters of education, law, family and consumer sciences, fine arts, engineering, divinity, business, public administration, et cetera (Wikipedia, 2006h).

In principle, people with a masters degree learn all they can about what has been written in a field to date. With this knowledge, they are supposed to be able to do *original* work. The term original comes from the time of the guilds, and does not mean an original work as it is understood today. Rather, it means the application of existing techniques in new ways. From the guild perspective, being able to replicate the *same thing*, using the same technique, with each one being a little bit different because there is no mold, is not being original. These works would not be masterpieces. Being *original* means being able to take what one has learned and use it in different settings, with no supervision. Then, one would have *mastered* the ability to create new pieces of work. Masters are always improving their mastery of the foundations and principles of the field, continuing to learn from their experiences, but not necessarily from additional study. Someone with a masters is continually trying to find new ways to use the principles of the field - someone with a PhD is continually trying to *find new principles* (Chilton, 1998).

Doctoral Degree

Less than one percent of the population attains a doctorate degree (Comer, n.d.). Only half of those who enter a doctoral program actually complete their studies (Elgar, 2003). While someone with a masters degree learns all they can about what has been written in a field, the doctorate extends the knowledge in the field by conducting research; that is, explore, investigate, contemplate, interpret, and gain deep understanding. The search is to uncover principles that can be applied in new ways. The research is intended to further human understanding, and further the body of knowledge already compiled in the profession.

Indeed, the key difference between a masters and a doctorate is that a masters is learning the field while a doctorate is learning the profession, with intentions to continually learn the profession. Chilton (1998) explains that the PhD - doctorate of philosophy - can be taken quite literally to mean that the person with this qualification can *doctor* (minister to, repair and foster) the *philosophy*, the underlying tenets, of the discipline, and profession. The person both knows, and stands apart from, the philosophical underpinnings of the field. The PhD cuts deeper than a masters because it examines the very tenets of the discipline with the *intention* of improving or redesigning them.

Also, awarding (note the competitive paradigm term) someone an ‘earned’ doctorate implies that the person is seen as an equal by the university faculty under whom the person studied. In order to qualify for the title, the person has to complete a thesis or dissertation of publishable standard, or has to publish a coherent body of literature, usually in the form of two to three separate, but sequential, papers. The older style doctorates (now called honorary doctorates) are rare. They are usually given to people who have shown themselves to be leaders in their field, and have contributed considerably to society, not necessarily through academic study but more through their lived experiences (Wikipedia, 2006 d,f).

THE PARADIGM BEHIND THE LABEL OF *MASTERS* DEGREE

The previous section teased out three degrees, and the meanings of their labels. This discussion continues on the assumption that the master’s label is the most problematic of the three. While it may have been appropriate for the Middle Ages, using the label Masters for graduate work is not in tune with the leading edge trends in educational reform. What is assumed when people leave graduate school with a *masters*? What have they mastered? What assumptions does this term connote? What images are created in peoples’ minds? How does the mental perception that one is a master of education translate into daily practice? How does it affect one’s pedagogy?

The word *master* has many meanings. Outside the field of education, as an adjective, it can mean:

- something that is principle or paramount (a master plot),
- something that controls all other parts of a mechanism (a master switch),
- being highly skilled or proficient (a master thief), and
- being an original from which copies are made (a master recording).

As a verb it can mean:

- being an expert of something, proficient in something (mastering a language);
- overcoming or defeating something (master an addiction);
- reducing to subjugation (master an animal); and,
- being seasoned or aged (dyed goods or alcohol).

As a noun, it can refer to:

- the captain of a ship (master mariner);
- a man who serves as head of a household;
- someone who defeats another (masters them in tennis);
- an employer (of a slave); and,
- a title for young boys, male officers in the Royal households, the male head of service clubs, or titles for military ranks and male court officers (Dictionary.com, 2006).

Just stop for a moment, and examine the words being used in association with being a *master*: control, domination, ownership, defeat, binding, copying, victory, lower rank, inferior, subject (subjugation or subordination), competition, expert, proficiency, skill, head up, or have charge over. These are all words stemming from the mechanistic, scientific, Social Darwinism, neoliberal, positivistic, and competitive paradigms and ideologies (McGregor, 2006).

In a nut shell, these paradigms hold that humans have dominion over the earth, and others. People who cannot compete and succeed deserve what they get when they fail and lose - survival of the fittest. Everything in a neoliberal, capitalistic, consumer-oriented world can be commodified and put up for sale - even intellectual property - knowledge. There are experts, and there are those who are dependent on them for their well-being. People running schools see students as empty vessels waiting to be filled up with information from the master - the teacher. Then, students are expected to master the material and pass the tests, or they have failed. Any other type of learning is not valued because it cannot be measured. People do not have free will. There is no such thing as chance or fate. Things and property are more important than relationships. Things and people are seen as separate, disconnected and fragmented, so they are easily manipulated and controlled. Only knowledge gained from the scientific method is true. There is no room for narrative, stories, myth, spirituality, or the mystery of life. These cannot be proven true or valid. There is no room, in these paradigms, for sharing, caring, compassion or stewardship because these get in the way of the competition, survival-of-the-fittest, winner take all mind set.

If the label *masters* is used for the middle layer of graduate school, universities implicitly, sometimes explicitly, perpetuate this world view, this set of assumptions about the world, and our place in it. The following text teases out several deeper issues attendant to this situation, setting up the discussion of how graduate school could be labeled and done differently, under a stewardship paradigm.

Association with Control and Manipulation

The meaning of *masters* that has most significance to this part of the discussion is that of a master being someone who has control over, or ownership of, someone or something. Indeed, the Latin root of masters is the prefix *dominus*, meaning lord or master, domineer. Dominion means control - it means the power (authority) or right (ownership) to use or dispose of property. In an information society, knowledge is seen as property. People can hold *intellectual* property rights via patents, trademarks, and copyrights. If there is even the slightest chance of graduate

students perceiving that they are in control of the knowledge and the learning process, then there is no room for the voices of the children, adults, or co-learners in the classroom. People are familiar with the metaphor of the student being the empty vessel waiting to be filled up with information from the teacher - the master who is the expert. This phenomenal teacher-control can lead to unintended, or intentional, manipulation of the learning process, to cooption of students into the control paradigm.

Association with Expert Mode

If educators leave graduate school with the label *Masters of Education*, there is the possibility they may see themselves as the experts with all of the answers. An expert has a high degree of knowledge and expertise or skill in a field of study. If educators approach teaching thinking that they are the experts holding all of the knowledge and information that matters, then the knowledge students have gained from their lived experiences is not valid because it has not come from an expert. The students may have no say in the creation of knowledge, or of the learning environment. They become the receptor of information, expected to memorize it (master it), and spit it back on normative tests. This socialization to be experts can cripple them as learners because they learn it is alright not to critically analyze power relationships in society. They can become complacent and complicit in oppression and marginalization. They can become apathetic citizens who feel powerless, and may not even know it. Things are just supposed to be this way - an expert told them.

Association with Competition and Failure

If educators think they are a *master* of education, it is natural for them to expect others to master what they know, too. The concept of normative testing stems from the competitive paradigm. Normative testing refers to students all learning the same thing, and then taking the same test. Their results are then compared against the other students. They are compared against the norm. Any deviation from this is interpreted as either a failure, or a great success. Being in the middle is not enough because it is too close to failing, and too far away from succeeding. The atmosphere in the classroom becomes very competitive. There is no room for celebrating independent student advancement when their learning is gauged against other students. Instead, students are expected to overcome their failures by defeating others who have beaten them (obtained a higher score). Some teachers go so far as to post grades on classroom doors. Awards are given for the highest grade in topics, best improvement in marks, et cetera. Competition is deeply entrenched if teachers think that they have mastered the field of education, and feel a responsibility to teach others how to master things, too. Students can easily become alienated from other students, and become dependent on the teacher for more knowledge so that their individual success is assured. The competitive paradigm is perpetuated.

Association with Maleness

One of the other issues with the use of the word *Master's* to identify a graduate degree is the common association of the word *master* with *man* (versus *woman*). These automatic

masculine connotations, in an educational setting, are counterproductive to the trend toward gender neutral writing and gender inclusiveness in education. Not to make too big an issue of this, but it is a component of the larger ideology of patriarchy, and its entrenchment in society and world views. Although most educators are women (71% in the United States and 65% in Canada), if they go on to graduate studies, they leave school with a label with masculine connotations. This unbidden mental link with patriarchy can perpetuate the notion of men being superior to women. Furthermore, since most university educators are men (close to three quarters), the use of the label *masters* compounds this problem. A recent study found that only 14.5% of academics in Canada are women, far lower than the Commonwealth university average of 24% (Singh, 2002).

Roadblock to Further Studies

Another recent Canadian study found that 79% of master's students finish their degree (Canadian Association for Graduate Studies [CAGS], 2003). But, once students finish their masters degrees, most stop there, and do not move onto doctoral studies. Comer (n.d.) reported that less than one percent of the population holds a PhD. Rather, graduates tend to do another master's degree, if they continue with professional development. This last statement is anecdotal in nature. There is a paucity of information on this issue, partly because only 32% of the deans and faculty offices of graduate studies in Canada compile completion rate information on a comprehensive basis, or compare rates across time (Elgar, 2003).

This paper offers another interpretation of these statistics. *Maybe* students get multiple masters degrees, instead of a doctorate, because they feel they want to master something else, instead of discovering new principles and advancing a whole field of knowledge, or a profession. Maybe they get a sense of power from the control implied from having a *Master's* degree. Remember, to master something is to be able to control it, to bind something to you, to be highly proficient, or to be an expert. Maybe- albeit stretching the idea a bit - graduates do not complete doctoral studies because they felt they have mastered the field already. They do not see themselves as finding new principles, just using existing ones. This is all speculation, of course. But, it does raise the same interesting point. How would approaching graduate education from another paradigm change this scenario?

Thesis as Proof of Mastery

Historically, one became a master within a guild by producing a "masterpiece" - a set of assigned tasks demonstrating one's mastery of the techniques in the field. One would be an apprentice, working for an expert to learn a trade, an art or an occupation. In graduate education today, one is expected to complete a thesis - a masterpiece if you will - to show that one has mastered the arts of the field, one understands the major approaches, or at least those used in one's specialty (Chilton, 1998). From the master's paradigm, educational institutions have relied upon Hegel's (1812) thesis, antithesis, synthesis triad (dialectic system of inquiry). This approach works in contradictions. An idea is presented, countered by its opposite, and then followed by the creation of a new hybrid of the two ideas - a new entity that did not exist before

the conflict was resolved. The conflict is resolved when the two opposing ideas can be appreciated for their interdependency. This approach to building a field of knowledge inherently involves a never ending sequence of contradiction, conflict, and a temporary resolution.

One problem with using the thesis as an indicator of *mastering* the foundations and principles of a field of study is that it perpetuates a never-ending sequence of contradictions and conflict, assuming that the answer - the ultimate truth - is out there somewhere. The person who finds it, wins. Also, a thesis involves a search for information from other experts. Although a good academic thesis will entail the student providing a critique of the underlying assumptions that shape existing literature in the field, many students simply criticize or find fault with what has already been written. Finding fault sets the student up for more conflict and contradictions. This is not a healthy way to see oneself - master of a flawed field of study. Again, this idea may be stretching things a bit. But, it also raises that interesting question again, namely, 'How could graduate school be done differently, outside the masters paradigm?'

STEWARDSHIP - A DIFFERENT PARADIGM

The answer might be found in the stewardship paradigm. Recent work by the Carnegie Foundation explores the role of stewards at the doctoral level (Golde & Walker, 2006). This paper brings the stewardship paradigm to bear on the step or level of learning before the doctorate, historically known as the master's level. Stewardship can apply to both (a) stewardship of the earth and each other, *and* (b) the world of ideas (Ford, 2004). Stewardship stems from the medieval times, Guilds again, when a "steward" was assigned to hone the skills and development of a young prince - to prepare him for his reign. The steward held the prince in trust so that he could be a successful ruler. Today, the term steward has taken a different turn, less about preparing a man to be a ruler, and more about preparing people for their destiny, usually for the betterment of society. Making a positive difference in the future is the mark of a steward, and the mentality of stewardship (Greenleaf, 2002).

Stewardship means holding a vision for oneself, community and the world, and being committed to the actualization of that vision (MG Taylor Corporation, 1997). This task should be easy enough in principle, if humans perceived themselves as stewards, responsible to themselves, other human beings, the earth, and the world (Pelcovitz, 2003). Stewardship is a balance between recognizing that people: (a) are created with special powers and the potential for their personal mastery; and, (b) have the responsibility and humility to live in ways such that their mastery is not their undoing, or the undoing of nature (Redfield, 2003). It encompasses caring for what one values, for one's creativity, personal growth, the growth of others, the health of communities, and the natural environment. Stewardship arises from the philosophy that all life is sacred, rather than everything is for sale (MG Taylor).

Some argue that a stewardship approach to graduate school is too idealistic, too principled, and not enough about results. Ford (2004) and Block (2003) suggest that the primary function of a steward is to balance the pragmatic results in the system with a principled dedication to ideals. Stewards must constantly encourage the broader, more conservative,

masterful elements of society towards the higher ground. And, they must take up the tasks with which others will not bother. This principled stance is very different from the perception that one has mastered a body of knowledge. It sets educators up to instill in pupils (co-learners) a principled approach. Then, there is a chance that they will be less vulnerable to the competitive nature of the market, economy and state policy, and will speak up as citizens against less principled approaches. They will speak up for compassion, caring, peace, justice, and ethics.

The challenge is that these principles are beyond what the world is ready to accept, so the world continues to suffer, more so under a *masters* mind set. The following discussion assumes a principled approach, sharing upwards of 10 guiding principles of stewardship.

Sharing and Gifting Principles

Stewardship is about being a caretaker or keeper of gifts. From this perspective, graduate students would be socialized to be caretakers of the educational knowledge base - the gift to society. They would be taught to nurture it, to hold it in wonder and awe, and to spread it widely. This approach is so different from mastering, controlling, binding and exploiting knowledge in order to dominate classrooms, and society. From the stewardship perspective, knowledge in one person's possession does not have a separate existence from the profession of education. It is emergent. It requires dialogue, community, and time to develop and evolve. To make this happen, the knowledge has to be shared, rather than hoarded and protected as intellectual property (Grey, 1999). That way, it can be preserved, nurtured and stewarded. Graduates from educational programs would be caretakers of the intellectual assets of the profession of education, of its professional knowledge base, even peaceful cultures.

When educators commit to stewarding the knowledge base of education, they commit to: discussing novel ideas, working together on problems (rather than sharing best practices), and keeping up with developments inside and outside the field. They do not assume they have mastered anything. They recognize their kinship with others, and choose to teach in such a way that they foster the strength of future generations. This is a form of conscious stewardship over their own life in order to support and nurture life. The result is stewardship of life instead of mastery over life, or mastery of life.

Personal Mastery Principle

Some even suggest that people must have personal mastery before they can be a steward. This means that people have to know who they are a person, so they can be true to the principles of stewardship (personal communication, Marlene Ruck-Simmonds, October, 7, 2004). Educators who are trained in a program where they learn to compel and direct students in all things, something a masters degree might do, may end up teaching in such a way that pupils never gain the strength and growth they need, because they did not have a chance to exercise their own agency - find their inner power. If graduate schools decided to prepare stewards, they would have to socialize educators to the importance of being accountable for their actions. Personal growth comes from dealing with the demands that people place upon one's life.

Preparing educators to be stewards would entail providing them with opportunities to find their inner power, exercise that power, and take responsibility for their actions (Smoot, 2002). If educators perceive themselves as stewards, they may be more inclined to prepare pupils to be stewards, and to be more accountable citizens.

Cooperation and Progressiveness Principles

Stewards are bound by their own sense of responsibility to cooperate (Ford, 2004). Cooperation is the antithesis of competition, which can be a hallmark of a master's degree (discussed earlier). Preparing graduates to be stewards of education entails the collaborative approach to learning, rather than the practice of dominion over knowledge and learning. Collaborative learning is an umbrella term for a variety of approaches in education that involve joint intellectual efforts by students and teachers. This approach negates the assumption that the teacher is the expert, the master of the learning process. It assumes that everyone has something to bring to the learning table.

The stewardship approach can help people gain a degree of autonomy that allows them to be educators who feel comfortable expressing and exhibiting progressive beliefs (Ford, 2004). The basic progressive vision is that of community - as family, a caring, responsible family. Progressives envision a community where people take care of each other, not just themselves (antithesis of survival of the fittest). They act responsibly with strength and effectiveness for each other. Basic progressive principles include: equity, equality, democracy, government acting in the name of community, and the presence of ethical business (Wikipedia, 2006i).

Responsibility Principle

Ford (2004) offers the useful idea that to be a steward is to assume responsibility for oneself, and to hold others accountable for their actions. In meeting these responsibilities, stewards will be called upon to act in one, or a combination of, four roles: (a) decision maker exerting influence in the course of events (arbiter); (b) ambassador and advocate; (c) activist; and (d) a shield, as well as a sword, in the face of human or earth suffering (guardian). He argues that as long as the ultimate objective is the pursuit of truth and ethics, these four roles are justified.

Non-Violence Principle

This paper takes issue with the guardian role as Ford (2004) defines it. He says that an arbiter has to be willing to make the hard decisions, which includes using force and violence. Because this suggestion is grounded in the master's paradigm, it is necessary to recommend that non-violence be a perspective shared by a steward. Non-violence is a set of assumptions about morality, power and conflict that leads its proponents to reject the use of violence in efforts to attain social or political goals. Instead, from this perspective, a steward of education would appreciate that there are techniques for social struggle that rely on the collective power or a mobilized citizenry rather than on access to wealth, property, or weapons (Sharp, 1973). Peaceful pedagogies and non-violent classrooms would be the underpinnings of a steward degree.

Of special interest to this discussion is the meaning of power from a non-violent perspective. While the competitive and war paradigms assume that power over someone comes with the possession of armies and politicians willing to carry out a ruler's (masters) commands, non-violence assumes power depends on the cooperation of others. If people do not cooperate with the master, the master loses power. This loss can readily happen in a classroom when pupils do not cooperate with the teacher who is in control of the learning process. The teacher loses position power, feels threatened, and responds back with sanctions, disciplinary actions, and threats. The cycle of master over student is perpetuated, even when this is not the intention.

Abundance, Voice and Sustainability Principles

Good stewardship requires careful consideration of the needs of others, and respect for their voices and contributions. It involves encouraging everyone to give generously of their time, talents and resources, rather than hoarding them, and assuming that things are scarce, and in demand. The former promotes sharing and collaboration while the latter promotes competition and isolation. Stewardship is the experience of having one's basic needs met in spite of scarce resources. It involves socializing people to believe that stewardship means being treated fairly while they assume responsibility for their membership in a moral community, one that seeks to care for the most people over the longest time (Engel, 2000). This approach to socializing pupils is in direct contrast with the mastery notions of survival of the fittest, the economic concept of scarcity and the competitive paradigm - winner gets all, losers get what they deserve.

Knowledge Management and Relationship Principles

Stewards are not concerned with information per se. They have a special conception of knowledge. Gottschalk (2002) provides a very useful distinction between information and knowledge. He notes that, while information can be stored on paper or in computers, knowledge can only be stored in the human brain. Information becomes knowledge when the human brain processes it - knowledge is what the knower knows. Knowledge is information *combined with* one's experiences, the context, one's interpretation of that information, critical reflection on the information, and one's intuition and creativity. Stewards are not the owners of knowledge; rather, they are acting on behalf of others, to maintain and assure their future. They are holding the future in trust (Sheldon, 2004).

This is a very different approach than the assumption that humans have dominion over earth and others (the master's paradigm). If educators were prepared to be stewards of knowledge, they would see themselves as caretakers of learning and teaching, rather than masters of information and facts. They would assume the responsibility of maintaining and enhancing the quality of knowledge shared with pupils in the school system, and in other learning environments. They would know that knowledge does not belong to anyone. It is meant to be shared, nurtured, and communicated widely. Indeed, stewardship is a practice of giving back to others, because stewards know that relationships sustain everything. Masters would assume that the relationship is one way, with the master being in control.

Trust, Transparency and Letting-Go Principles

Stewardship is about the responsibility for taking good care of something or someone that is entrusted to one. To entrust is to hand over to someone for care. It is common for parents to see themselves entrusting their children to the school system, and for teachers to perceive themselves as a trustee. While teachers are not trustees in the true sense (they are not unpaid volunteers), they can be perceived as being in a fiduciary position requiring them to act for the pupils' benefit within the scope of their relationship. In this role, educators acting as stewards are not looking for blind obedience as is a master. They are looking for people with initiative who are doing what they do because they consider it a worthy objective for societal well-being. Rather than controlling, the steward uses persuasion, openness, and transparency. Rather than using one's positional authority (teacher in front of a class), the steward facilitates consensus building through convincing instead of using coercion, threats and punishment (Spears, 2002). Stewards rely on bravery, and forgiveness. They believe in letting go of control, letting go of ego, and involving those affected by the work. Educators prepared to be stewards would create very empowering learning environments. They would create pupils (citizens) who are healthier, wiser, freer, and more autonomous (Wheatley, 2004).

Stewards as Leaders

Greenleaf (2002) developed the concept of servant leadership. One of the 11 characteristics of a servant leader is stewardship. He maintains that people are driven to be leaders so they can serve society better, not so they can increase their power over events, things and people (as would a master). They eschew the top-down hierarchical leadership style (so prevalent in today's school system and classroom), and opt for collaboration, trust, empathy, listening, foresight, and the ethical use of power. The objective is to "serve others" while staying focused on achieving results in line with society's, or an institution's, values and integrity. Graduate school could be designed so that educators have a chance to reflect on this leadership philosophy. A strong sense of stewardship would mean that educators (in their role as leaders) would appreciate that their idealistic vision of the future works even in today's competitive world.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This paper assumed that, to build cultures of peace, people have to confront the issues of dominance, power, control, and dependency that perpetuate society. Part of this process involves examining the labels used to describe graduates within the educational system. This paper purposely took issue with the use of label *masters of education*. The intent was to unhook people from the tacit assumptions that are embedded in the current graduate school infrastructure. Stewardship was offered as an alternative designation (destination?) to mastery. Stewardship provides new language, metaphors, values, and principles. It opens the door for dialogue about how people "label" the graduates from educational institutions, and the power this label holds over them, and society. Stewardship has ethical and moral dimensions. It implies a fiduciary role.

A fiduciary acts with honesty and care, and it is honesty and care that are so urgently needed in society. Stewards are entrusted to imaginatively generate new knowledge, and to critically conserve valuable and useful ideas, the intellectual assets of a discipline, even a peaceful culture (Golde & Walker, 2006).

This idea will not be palatable to everyone. Block (1993) agrees, noting that stewardship is, simultaneously, a radical treatise as well as a useful lens from which to revise educational practices. In order for people to embrace this idea, they must be convinced that it is a welcomed ideal, but also that it can muster the test of the marketplace; it must be practical and economic. It must inspire educators to be citizens of the world. If recent work commissioned by the Carnegie Foundation (Golde & Walker, 2006) is any indication, the academy may be ready to bring the notion of stewardship to bear on the emergent dialogue in higher education about the meaning of degree designations.

Imagine people lining up to enroll in Stewards of Education degrees with the intent to build sustainable cultures of peace. A whole new generation of citizens could be socialized to value the principles of a culture of peace, simply by being taught to be stewards, instead of masters. They would respect and value the principles of: sharing, personal mastery, cooperation, care, peace, progressiveness, responsibility, non-violence, justice, abundance, sustainability, voice, transparency, relationships, and trust. As fiduciaries of the stewardship ideal, holders of a Steward of Education degree would be models to be emulated as leaders for the 21st century.

References

- Block, P. (2003). *Stewardship: Putting service ahead of self-interest*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Canadian Association of Graduate Studies. (2003). *The completion of graduate studies in Canadian universities: Report & recommendations*. Retrieved October 18, 2006 from http://www.cags.ca/pdf/completion_grad_studies_2003.pdf
- Chilton, S. (1998, December 22). *How do the bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees differ?* Retrieved October 7, 2004 from <http://www.d.umn.edu/~schilton/Articles/BAMAPhd.html>
- Comer, D. (n.d.). *Notes on the PhD degree*. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from <http://www.cs.purdue.edu/homes/dec/essay.phd.html>
- Dictionary.com. (2006). *Masters*. Retrieved October 13, 2006, from <http://www.answers.com/masters&r=67>
- Elgar, F. (2003). *PhD degree completion in Canadian universities*. Retrieved October 13, 2006, from http://http_server.carleton.ca/%7Efelgar/dts/phdcompletion.pdf
- Engel, J.R. (2000). Earth spirituality is a many splendored thing. *The Journal of Liberal Religion*, 1(2), http://www.meadville.edu/journal/2000_ronaldEngel_1_2.pdf
- Ford, O.T. (2004). *The stewardship site*. Retrieved October 19, 2006 from <http://the-stewardship.org/introduction.htm>
- Golde, C., & Walker, G. (Eds.). (2006). *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline - Carnegie Essays on the Doctorate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gottschalk, P. (2002). A stages of growth model for knowledge management technology in law firms. *Online Journal of Information, Law & Technology*, 2 http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/law/elj/jilt/2002_2/gottschalk/
- Greenleaf, R,K, (2002) *Servant leadership* (25th Anniversary Edition). Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Grey, D. (1999, March). Knowledge mapping: A practice overview. *Talking Culture, Talking Knowledge Online Journal*, Retrieved October 19, 2006, from <Http://www.smithweaversmith.com/knowledg2.htm>

Jacoby, D. (2001). Apprenticeship in the United States. In R. Whaples (Ed.), *EH. Net Encyclopedia*, <http://eh.net/encyclopedia/article/jacoby.apprenticeship.us>

James, B. (2002). *Craft, trade or mystery*. Retrieved October 13, 2006 from <http://www.takver.com/history/benefit/ctormys.htm>

Knowles, A.S. (Ed.). (1977). Degrees, diplomas and certificates. *International Encyclopedia of Higher Education*, 4 (pp.1230-1241). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

McGregor, S.L.T. (2006). *Transformative practice*. East Lansing, MI: Kappa Omicron Nu.

MG Taylor Corporation. (1997). *The learning path: Five points of mastery*. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from http://www.mgtaylor.com/mgtaylor/glasbead/five_points_of_mastery.htm

Pelcovitz, R. (2003). The Jewish view of ecology. *The Jewish Environmental Education Program Bank* [Electronic version]. Retrieved October 19, 2006 from <http://www.coejl.org/programbank/displayprog.php?id=153>

Redfield, J. (2003). *October 5 sermon*. Retrieved October 19, 2006 from http://www.christchurchgp.org/archive_sermon01.html

Sharp, G. (1973). *The politics of non-violent action*. Manchester, NH: Porter Sargent.

Sheldon, J.K. (2004). *Stewardship, endangered species and the environment*. Retrieved October 19, 2006, from <http://www.grinningplanet.com/2004/07-13-2x/christian-stewardship-environmental-article.htm>

Singh, J. K.S. (2002). *Still a single sex profession? Female staff numbers in Commonwealth universities*. Retrieved October 18, 2006 from <http://www.acu.ac.uk/womens/single1.pdf>

Smoot, C.E. (2002). *Principles of stewardship*. Retrieved October 19, 2006, from Brigham Young University Web site: [Http://www.byui.edu/News/Newsreleases/devotional_020611.html](http://www.byui.edu/News/Newsreleases/devotional_020611.html)

Spears, L.C. (2002). On character and servant leadership. *Concepts & Connections*, 8(3), and at http://www.greenleaf.org/leadership/read_about_it/Servant_Leadership_Articles_Book_Reviews.html

Spurr, S. H. (1970). *Academic degree structures: Innovative approaches, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education*. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Wheatley, M. (2004). The servant- leader: From hero to host. In L. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), *Practicing servant-leadership* (Chapter 12). Indianapolis, IL: Jossey-Bass.

Wikipedia. (2006a). *Academic degree*. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Academic_degree#_ref_oxb_0

Wikipedia. (2006b). *Apprenticeship*. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apprenticeship>

Wikipedia. (2006c). *Bachelor*. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/bachelor>

Wikipedia. (2006d). *Doctor of philosophy*. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PhD>

Wikipedia. (2006e). *Guild*. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from <Http://en.wikiGuild>

Wikipedia. (2006f). *Honorary degree*. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Honorary_doctorates

Wikipedia. (2006g). *Journeyman*. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Journeyman>

Wikipedia. (2006h). *Masters degree*. Retrieved October 18, 2006, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Masters_degree

Wikipedia. (2006i). *Stewardship*. Retrieved October 19, 2006, from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stewardship>