on to discuss what she sees as the next steps for mindfulness as it searches for greater fidelity and integrity. These include:

1. Continued development of definitions, theoretical and philosophical frameworks
2. Working sensitively with religious (and spiritual) mindfulness
3. Develop structures for governance and collaboration
4. Continue to develop teacher training, assessment and supervision models
5. Work towards a consensus on the ethical frameworks for MBPs
6. Create greater access to training.

Once again, I find myself concurring with these steps, but the anxieties explained in this section that I, and others in the field, feel concerning the manner in which these (and other developmental steps) may be taken remain. In response to this anxiety, I often lean into the phrase that we can be “flexible with the form but faithful to the philosophy” when teaching mindfulness (Dobkin and Hassed, 2016, p44). In his 4 F’s model of mindfulness, Hassed claims that philosophy and form are often confused in terms of fidelity in the teaching of mindfulness. This review of the literature concerning attempts to standardise mindfulness in the drive for fidelity demonstrate this and shows how the two discourses have significant overlapping features and influences (McCown, 2014). Despite the increased flexibility in present attempts discussed here, the dominance of the Scientific discourse and the drive for fidelity still prevails.

## 2.4 Contemporary issues in mindfulness

I argue throughout this thesis that the growth of the developing field of mindfulness features many differing and often competing perspectives and approaches. When presenting these for critical analysis in the course being studied, I refer to the ‘issues and debates’ in mindfulness that emerge from and between them. Many of these have already featured in this thesis in terms of their impact upon the pedagogy of mindfulness. As such, I argue that they contribute to the “unstable ground” of teaching mindfulness that McCown, Reibel and Micozzi (2010, p3) identify. A discussion of such

issues and debates is common in the literature concerning mindfulness (Hyland 2015, Ergas, 2018). Whilst I categorise them distinctly to assist their discussion here, it is apparent to me that there are many overlapping features between them.

### 2.4.1 Secularisation and standardisation

According to Hyland (2015, p178), many forms of contemporary mindfulness are "unequivocally secular in all senses of the term" in that they "seek to re-interpret the original spiritual roots of mindfulness in adapting them to therapeutic and developmental purposes". The attempts to standardise and professionalise mindfulness in a secular context have been discussed previously in this chapter and I have commented upon specific aspects of them during this discussion. I view these as causes of concern for two main reasons.

Firstly, I regard them as originating from and reinforcing the dominant Scientific and Western discourses. It seems obvious to me that the attempts aimed to increase the fidelity of mindfulness programmes through exclusion by defining what can and cannot be classed as an MBP or a mindfulness teacher. Those leading this drive are themselves the acknowledged experts in the field, including Kabat-Zinn himself. As such they are the gatekeepers who exert power in the field. As Hall (1997) and Armstrong (2013) highlight in their discussions of discourse, I feel that this power manifests itself in prescribed norms (e.g. the authorised curriculum) in which people need to be coerced to follow (teacher training) and their conformity evaluated (teacher assessment). A course such as the one being studied here, and a teacher such as myself who has not followed a now recognised training programme to teach mindfulness, may well find themselves excluded for not conforming fully to the norms. This is a fear and a pressure that has grown over the years of teaching the course being studied.

Secondly, this reinforcement of the Scientific and Western discourses has led to a response from those who view mindfulness through a more Eastern and/or critical perspective. O'Donnell (2015) argues that the drive for secularisation and

standardisation has actually impoverished the richness of mindfulness. Gethin (2013) agrees and claims that mindfulness currently portrays a minimalist account of the transformational process. According to Van Dam et al. (2009, p1), "mindfulness is in danger of instrumentalising what is essentially a rich and organic transformative practice". Although beyond the scope of this thesis, a consideration of this issue from the perspective of Max Weber's Theory of Rationalization (Whimster and Lash, 2014) would be of great interest.

Whilst I concur with these views, it is the solution suggested that concern me greatly. Although contested (e.g. Shonin, Van Gordon and Griffiths, 2015), the solution suggested has been to pursue the return of mindfulness to its Buddhist roots. Evidence for this can be seen in the development of SG-MBIs that have been criticised for overly basing mindfulness in Buddhist concepts (Baer, 2015).

This issue again highlights somewhat of an identity crisis and disorienting dilemma for mindfulness. In developing the MBSR-model Kabat-Zinn, an experienced meditator from the Vipassanā and Zen Buddhist traditions himself, referred to concepts such as the universal Dharma. Here the underlying mechanisms that cultivate self-development can be the focus in their own value and need not be tied to a wider belief system, ethical framework or lifestyle (McCown Reibel and Micozzi, 2010). Kabat-Zinn is not alone in this focus, with even the Dalai Lama advocating that there is no difference between Buddha Dharma and universal Dharma (Cullen, 2011). Indeed, much of the focus in the field has been on the underlying universal mechanisms of present-centred awareness, bare attention and sustained introspection (Harris, 2014) as the drivers of the benefits of practising mindfulness.

Despite the stripping away of the beliefs, ethics and lifestyle components and the focus upon the underlying mechanisms, there are still some who claim that secular mindfulness represents 'Buddhism through the back door' (Mardula and Larkin, 2013) or 'stealth Buddhism' (Brown, 2014). However, the claim that these underlying mechanisms themselves represent traditional Buddhism is questioned by Sharf (2014), who claims that such mechanisms do not feature heavily in either of the Theravāda or

Zen traditions (which are often discussed as being the roots of modern mindfulness), but rather in classical Indian Buddhist notions of nirodhasāmapatti (a form of non-dual consciousness in which the object and the person perceiving the object cease to be distinct).

From another perspective, some argue that the increased focus upon the underlying mechanisms of mindfulness has reduced it to the domain of psychology, or, more specifically, cognitive and biological psychology (Stanley, 2012). Regardless of this issue, with the focus upon universal Dharma and underlying mechanisms, mindfulness may well be much more humanist than it is Buddhist (Hyland, 2015). Although, in yet another reflection of its identity crisis and dilemma, McCown, Reibel and Micozzi (2010) claim that the MBSR model, and associated MBIs, are in fact deeply rooted in a universal expression of the Buddha Dharma.

From my perspective and journey with mindfulness this drive to return mindfulness to its wider Buddhist base is a source of concern and disappointment. It is another example of the drive to develop the field by restriction. Unfortunately, even though the MBSR programme model is positioned as a middle-ground approach, Kabat-Zinn himself claims that it is “virtually essential and indispensable for teachers of MBSR and other mindfulness-based interventions” to have “strong personal grounding in the Buddha Dharma and its teachings” (Kabat-Zinn, 2011, p299). As a result, I have constantly asked myself where this leaves non Buddhist-based mindfulness teachers and courses as the field develops? Where does it leave courses that acknowledged and invited a personal exploration of the full spectrum of mindfulness? Is there be a place for AO-MBPs?

These questions have often resulted in me questioning my own role and the approach of the course being studied. There have been times when I felt that I should simply teach the MBSR curriculum as is from its Buddhist-base. At others I wondered whether I should pursue the then developing mindfulness training qualifications. However, neither of these are an authentic expression of my being, my journey and, as I argue in this thesis, of mindfulness itself or the nature of its pedagogy. I feel that a return to Buddhist-based mindfulness (even through the standard MBSR) would be equally as

restrictive as I have argued the dominance of the secular and scientific approaches is. As a consequence, I feel that such a return would be devasting to my personal and professional relationship with mindfulness. I fear that it would also alienate the many current and possible travellers on the mindfulness path who did not subscribe to the Buddhist-based approach. Many of whom have attended the course being studied here.

The personal journey of the learner of mindfulness is central to the pedagogy of the course being studied. Here there is a fundamental synthesis and synergy between the philosophies and epistemologies of mindfulness and the constructivist nature of its pedagogy (McWilliams, 2010). As such, rather than conforming to the pressures in the field to move my teaching and the course either further towards a secular, scientific position or towards a Buddhist-based position, I have decided to continue forging a pathway that seeks to be grounded in both mindfulness and constructivism in the support of personal journeying. To be authentic to both of these requires a pathway that allows those working within mindfulness to be “flexible with the form but faithful to the philosophy”, as Dobkin and Hassed (2016, p44) have suggested. I argue here that in being faithful to the philosophies of mindfulness and constructivism naturally leads to a flexibility of form.

### 2.4.2 Ethics, morals and spirituality in mindfulness

The debate regarding secularisation and standardisation in mindfulness seems to act as a container for many issues and I have presented it as such in the course being studied. This is certainly the case when considering the role of ethics, morals and spirituality. With the decoupling of mindfulness from Buddhist philosophy and beliefs (O’Donnell, 2015), mindfulness has struggled to address the role of ethics, morals and spirituality in its teaching. This struggle forms a key component for those who claim that modern mindfulness suffers from being a reductionist version of itself (e.g. Gethin, 2013) in that it has diluted the significance of these dimensions in the process of secularisation and rationalisation.

From the secular perspective, there has been a motivation to avoid imposing external ethical and moral frameworks on learners (Monteiro, 2016) and this value-neutrality has certainly made it more acceptable and accessible to Western populations. As such, in FG-MBIs (e.g. MBSR and MBCT) issues of ethics and moral are implicitly taught and individually constructed. It is this approach that I adopt for my own teaching as I feel that it represents an authentic expression of both mindfulness and the constructivist nature of its pedagogy. However, not everyone in the field concurs.

In response to criticisms that the removal of explicit teachings concerning ethics, morals and spirituality have led to a reductionist approach, SG-MBIs (e.g. Meditation Awareness Training [MAT]) were created that, according to Shonin, Van Gordon and Griffiths (2015, p1491):

> *explicitly teach a greater range of meditative and/or spiritual practices (i.e. in addition to mindfulness) and tend to be more overtly spiritual in nature.*

These SG-MBIs were critiqued by Baer (2015) for their teaching of Buddhist tenets and terminology, which has contributed to the before-mentioned fear that mindfulness represents 'Buddhism through the back door' or 'stealth Buddhism' (Brown, 2014; Mardula and Larkin, 2013). In the case of some SG-MBIs, mindfulness can be viewed as Buddhism through the front door. However, in countering the critiques of Baer (2015), Shonin, Van Gordon and Griffiths (2015) argue that, although concepts such as the noble eightfold path and five ethical precepts of Buddhism are often explicitly referenced, the majority of empirically studied SG-MBIs were actually more secular in nature. Further, they argue strongly against the distinction and competition between FG-MBIs and SG-MBIs, claiming that there is only one mindfulness but many forms of teaching it, echoing the previously mentioned view that I subscribe to (Dobkin and Hassed, 2016). Indeed, they state that the varied forms of courses and interventions in the wider family of MBPs represents strength for the field. Certainly, I concur with this statement and that the full spectrum of mindfulness needs to be acknowledged, accepted and cultivated for mindfulness to develop in an authentic manner.

In terms of the pedagogy of mindfulness, the competition and tension arising from the questions regarding how to teach ethics, morals and spirituality is a difficult one. Upon reflection I have to admit that I have not made many advancements in this area but do recognise the potential to do so from a constructivist perspective. I also recognise that a value-free approach may be most appropriate for AO-MBPs. Interestingly, the constructivist nature of the pedagogy of mindfulness that is often *not* advocated by those from the secular perspective actually aligns with secular attempts to teach ethics, morals and spirituality. Here, the learner is directing their own construction of their ethical, moral and spiritual framework from which to operate. For some, this may be based upon a pre-existing religious or non-religious framework. For others it may not.

On the course being studied I have had a range of learners with various religious and non-religious beliefs. I have always presented mindfulness as a vehicle by which to travel with them driving the direction of their journey. Ethics, morals and spirituality feature implicitly in a value-neutral manner. Thus, the pedagogical approach for the course would align more with FG-MBIs but represents an expression of the constructivist nature of the pedagogy of mindfulness in a manner that spans the discourses. However, Monteiro (2015) makes a strong case for the perspective that ethics, morals and spirituality are neither implicit nor value-free, even in secular-based courses. She agrees with Grossman (2015) that ethics and morals are embodied in every MBP. This is evident in the curriculum, the person of the teacher and the persons(s) of the learner(s). In discussing this further, she leans into the Buddhist concept of the 'Noble Person', who transcends their own ego in the service of others. Here the teacher of mindfulness embodies this and is leading learners on this process too. In this sense mindfulness "…becomes a moral psychology" (p221) for the inner and outer world.

Although I concur with the central theme of Monteiro's (2015) argument, that ethics, morals and spirituality are embodied in every MBP (to whatever degree they are), I disagree with her view that mindfulness necessarily needs to lean back into Buddhist tenets regarding these. This seems to be part of the wider movement toward Buddhist-based mindfulness and represents another restricting factor. Once again, my fear here is that it may lead to the non-engagement in mindfulness by many people who may

actually benefit from it. In what is seemingly an advocacy of a constructivist approach here, Monteiro (p220) does state that:

> *If we trust in the capacity of participants in MBIs to take cognitive and experiential responsibility for their well-being, then we also trust in their capacity for insight in how their ethics and values guide them.*

Whilst this is certainly a position that I also hold, Monteiro then states that “it cannot be left to chance through an implicit process” (p220) and leans once more into the Buddhist concept of the Noble Person. In her own argument, Monteiro highlights the difficulties surrounding issues of ethics, morals, spirituality and religion in mindfulness. Possible developments in these areas was something that I am particularly interested in from this research. One aspect of Monteiro’s argument that I fully concur with is that MBPs (including AO-MBPs) should be transparent in terms of their approach and values in these areas so that potential learners are fully informed before engaging with the intervention or course.

### 2.4.3 Social action and democracy in mindfulness

I teach mindfulness as an approach whereby internal changes express themselves externally in line with a learner’s personal journey. Such an approach is consistent with the MBSR model (Kabat-Zinn, 2011). With its preliminary focus upon the inner condition of the human being, however, mindfulness has often been criticised for being apolitical and lacking a social action and democratic dimension (e.g. O’Donnell, 2015). Some commentators go as far as to claim that mindfulness is a self-centred form of navel gazing that is devoid from any social or political activism (Comstock, 2015). Interestingly, I have often been asked early in the course being studied whether mindfulness will make them more passive and detached. My reply, from my own journey, my understanding of mindfulness and through working with many clients over long periods of time was that this is certainly not the case.

Mindfulness shares many criticisms with constructivism and transformative learning (Hyde and LaPrad, 2015, Mezirow, 2006) and the relationship between these would be an interesting area of exploration that has yet to receive empirical attention. Despite such criticisms, Hyde and LaPrad (2015, p1) argue strongly that mindfulness and democracy are both process-oriented rather than ends-oriented and understanding injustice involves cognitive, emotional, relational, embodied and spiritual domains. They claim that "mindfulness is a criterion for empowerment and the praxis of human solidarity for the betterment of our democracy" (p5), and:

> *Mindfulness is a complimentary and, perhaps, necessary component of democracy. Both require the same dispositions and actions. Both are self-directed, internally assessed, and always unfinished. (p10)*

Comstock (2015) supports the position of Hyde and LaPrad and claims that mindfulness is an asset to democratic governance. Interestingly, the UK parliament is a leading advocate for making mindfulness available to politicians through the Mindfulness All-Party Parliamentary Group (MAPPG). The main driving force here is that mindfulness may aid decision making (by bringing ego defenses, habits and differing perspectives into awareness in the decision-making moment) and there is growing evidence in this area (Pless, Sabatella and Maak, 2017). On the course being studied I constantly refer to the importance of present-moment awareness in detaching from habitual responses leading to the possibility of choosing a different one if required.

### 2.4.4 The commodification of mindfulness

One of the biggest issues within the field of mindfulness concerns its commodification in Western societies. In the course being studied this concern has often been expressed by learners many weeks before it appeared in the curriculum. From a lay perspective, there is a heightened awareness and criticism of this commodification, with Shumpeter (2013, p1) stating that the biggest problem with mindfulness is that it is "becoming part of the self-help movement – and hence part of the disease it is supposed to cure". From within the academic field there is also concern (O'Donnell, 2015). Sharf (2014) discusses

the reduction process of Buddhism to meditation and of meditation to mindfulness, culminating in modern mindfulness that is touted as a panacea for the ills of modern urban life and a "practice that leads to an emotionally fulfilling and rewarding life" (p. 3). Safran (2014) uses the term 'McMindfulness' to describe the branding and commodification of mindfulness. In using this term, they argue that mindfulness is marketed as a fast-working, off-the-shelf approach that requires little effort or engagement with to consume. In seeking to attract more consumers, it may actually be cultivating the very ego-driven characteristics that, in an authentic expression of itself, it aims to transcend. Purser and Loy (2013) further articulate this critique by stating that:

> *Rather than applying mindfulness as a means to awaken individuals and organisations from the unwholesome roots of greed, ill will and delusion, it is usually being fashioned into a banal, therapeutic, self-help technique that can actually reinforce those roots (p. 1)*

The dangers of the McMindfulness approach can be seen in the use of mindfulness in corporate and even military environments. Purser (2014) argues that the benefits of mindfulness practice, such as increased resilience, emotional clarity, cognitive effectiveness, etc., are sought in order to increase performance in military contexts but are estranged from, and at odds with, the ethical and moral groundings of traditional mindfulness (such as the 'do no harm' mantra).

Whilst the secular branding of mindfulness has made it (and the benefits of it) more attractive, accessible and applicable for the secular world, it may also be responsible for some negative consequences and processes in other ways. For example, there has been an increase in anecdotal accounts by students of mindfulness courses reporting negative effects, including headaches, troubling memories, increased anxiety and panic attacks (e.g. Booth, 2014;). Indeed, such negative effects have received empirical attention (Monteiro, Musten and Compson, 2014).

From my perspective and understanding of such negative experiences, I feel that a lack of depth in engagement may well be contributing to such reports. As the first

developments with mindfulness concern an increase in awareness, if the learner never learns how to use that awareness positively then they may be left only with a greater awareness of their own negative issues. Although there is no current research in this area, from my experience this could occur for a number of reasons. These include expectations that have emerged from increased commodification, the short nature of the MBSR-based courses (8-weeks), poor teaching, an underlying clinical problem or a lack of attendance or engagement with the course and/or practices. Further, it may simply be that this aspect of the journey did not manifest itself to that person at that time. This suggests that it is imperative that the field offers continual guidance beyond a standard-length MBP. It is my view that such barriers to the mindful journey deserve more empirical attention going forward.

In what I consider to be another expression of the dominance of the Western and Scientific discourses, O'Donnell (2015) gives an in-depth discussion on the commodification of the spheres of psychic and affective experience, with attention being of particular worth to 'capitalist spirituality'. The effect of the targeting of these spheres for commercial use and gain has resulted in a situation where people experience continued and increasing demands for their attention and emotional responses. Rather than highlighting the negative effect of this demand, which would be a more authentic expression, it seems that mindfulness is touted as a method to increase our capacity to deal with this demand whilst maintaining, and even increasing, performance. Thus, the journey of mindfulness has been reduced from a critical cyclical consideration of the inner and outer conditions of the person to the inner only. In this sense, mindfulness has become individualised and psychologised to serve capitalist society through a focus upon wellbeing as factor that impacts upon performance (Stanley, 2012). The drive for fidelity from the Scientific discourse seeks to provide a standardised and efficient means to this end. Indeed, scientific management is a key component of the rationalisation and McDonaldization process (Ritzer, 2013). For some though, there is an inherent disconnect between the 'being' focus of spiritual mindfulness and the 'having' and 'doing' focuses of neoliberal corporatised society (Segal, Williams and Teasdale, 2002).

### 2.4.5 The opportunities and dangers of professionalisation

Attempts to standardise mindfulness have been accompanied by attempt to further professionalise it. This is evident to me in the Standards of Practice document (Santorelli, 2014), the MBI-TAC (Crane et al., 2012), teacher training pathways and emerging qualification routes. At the beginning of the writing of this thesis there were many divergent training pathways and qualification routes available. Even between the 3 leading universities for mindfulness in the UK (Oxford, Bangor and Exeter) there was much variety. As there is no governing body for mindfulness, and so no agreed upon training pathway or qualification structure, it is a very confusing landscape. This is an area in which I welcome greater standardisation, but again advocate for a more flexible approach that would be more of an authentic expression of the fundamental elements of mindfulness.

As it pursues greater professionalisation the field would be wise to lean into its educational-orientation and consider the journeys of adult education and coaching in this context. According to Jarvis (2010), there was a clear distinction between adult education as a semi-professional field and as a fully professional field. When semi-professional, Jarvis described the field as having the following characteristics:

1. No firm theoretical base
2. Less specialisation
3. No monopoly of skills or competence
4. Led by non-professionals
5. General rules that guide practice
6. A service ethic.

One could argue that traditional mindfulness and the early development of modern mindfulness share many of these features and is/was semi-professional in nature. However, using the widely accepted model of professionalisation proposed by Wilensky (1964), it seems that mindfulness is following adult education on the path to becoming professionalised. Wilensky describes this path using the following characteristics:

1. The occupation becomes full-time
2. It forms a professional association
4. It establishes links to universities
5. It establishes training programmes

3. It publishes its own code of ethics and practice
6. It seeks to develop an area of exclusive competence.

It seems to me that mindfulness is developing these characteristics and, apart from forming a professional association, has achieved them. Whilst increased professionalism is certainly a component of the drive for fidelity, it is also at risk of diverging away from the authentic expression of the philosophy of mindfulness.

Potential dangers concerning power, training, qualifications and specialist knowledge in professionalisation have long been discussed in the Lifelong Learning (LL) sector (Becker, 1970). Wilensky's (1964) views here align with Foucault's notions of discourse. For Wilensky, increased professionalisation creates gatekeepers whose position is maintained and strengthened through the control of training, the regulation of standards and the admission (or not) of individuals into the profession.

In mindfulness, as in LL, teachers are often "dual professionals" (Robinson and Rennie, 2014, p506) in that they may also be a specialist in another field too. In mindfulness this is evident to me in the fact that many mindfulness teachers were existing clinicians, therapists, counsellors, teachers, etc. Indeed, my own journey was an example of this. How a teacher of mindfulness navigates the dual responsibilities and follows the guidelines, programme models, frameworks, etc. of each has been difficult for the FE/HE/LL fields and represents something that mindfulness needs to be aware of going forward.

From leaning into adult education, I also find that there are arguments that increased standardisation and professionalisation eventually leads to de-professionalisation in that the teaching and learning processes become so formulated that the personal skills, expertise and being of the teacher become less and less important (Beck, 2008; Seddon and Brown, 1997; Hoyle, 1995). Concerning this, Hyland (2014b, p5) states that in the post-school sector there has been:

> *…the rise of undifferentiated skill-talk, an obsession with prescriptive learning outcomes and the dominance of competency-based education and training. All these trends have resulted in the radical deskilling of countless occupations (including teaching), the downgrading of vocational studies and the rise of a perversely utilitarian and one-sidedly economistic conception of the educational enterprise in general.*

Based upon these perspectives, it can be claimed that deprofessionalisation is a genuine danger in mindfulness with the increasing attempts to standardise, manualise and monitor its teaching. Indeed, the increased bureaucratisation and focus upon abstract performance criteria in mindfulness again suggests an analysis from the perspective of Weber's Theory of Rationalization (Whimster and Lash, 2014) could yield some interesting and useful illuminations. Braverman's (1974) concept of the degradation of work and its subsequent developments (Previtali and Fagiani, 2015) would also be useful perspectives to consider.

Another field that seems further down the pathway of professionalisation than mindfulness is that of coaching. Here, the drive for professionalisation is the same as is claimed by the gatekeepers of mindfulness – to ensure the quality of provision. Whilst I share this view, the direction of travel in both fields demonstrates a move away from the authentic expression of themselves.

Despite being further along the pathway to professionalisation, Lane, Stetler and Stout-Rostron (2014) describe coaching as an "emerging profession" (p377) that does not fulfil all of the characteristics proposed by Bennet (2006). A key characteristic that has yet to be met is the forming of a unified professional association. Rather, in a manner that is shared by mindfulness, a range of differing definitions, approaches and (in the language adopted for this thesis) discourses led to a wide variety of competing association to be formed. Each of these has its own training pathways, codes of ethics, standards of practice and professional memberships. This has left the field with a fracture identity and has led to confusion amongst the people that could benefit from coaching.

In discussing the problems of the emerging profession of Coaching, Lane, Stetler and Stout-Rostron (2014) themselves lean into the experience of another field – Psychotherapy. This field has also travelled down the path of professionalisation and has met the same difficulties. In doing so it highlights a key issue that I feel is extremely important for mindfulness to consider. This was that the market and/or state would favour and support approaches that were "short-term, cost-effective interventions" that represent "evidence-based practice" (p382). Of course, with the critiques of the dominance of the Western and Scientific discourses, 'McMindfulness' and the commodification of mindfulness, it seems plausible to suggest that mindfulness is particularly vulnerable and has already developed along these lines.

I find further synergies between the journeys of coaching and mindfulness from Hawkins (2008). In a discussion of coaching he argues that it was in danger for a number of reasons. Firstly, the increase in the popularity of coaching resulted in a greater supply of professionals than there was demand. As a consequence, the gatekeepers moved to protect their status and restricted differing and innovative developments. Secondly, accreditation standards became too formulaic and monitoring systems too authoritarian. Finally, the field became very insular and self-serving. These again represent dangers along the pathway to professionalisation that mindfulness has already moved towards or is particularly sensitive to.

From the perspective developed throughout this thesis, it is the direction of travel and the flavour of the attempts at standardisation and professionalisation that concern me. This is because they appear to be moving mindfulness further away from an authentic expression of its own fundamental elements. Due to this, mindfulness could well be heading along the same pathway and to the same difficulties as experienced by the other fields mentioned here. However, with a greater consideration of the journeys of these fields and by leaning into its fundamental elements and educational-orientation, mindfulness could develop in a manner that is authentic to itself. To conclude though, it needs to be careful to avoid becoming limited by what Langlands (2005, p6) highlighted concerning LL when he stated that it was characterised by:

*professional accountability shaped by third party regulation, market forces and a tough regime of standards, performance monitoring and mandatory continuing professional development.*

## 2.5 Pedagogy

With the attempts to standardise mindfulness have come increasing discussion about the nature of the pedagogy of mindfulness. In exploring these I concur with Jarvis (2010, p244) that:

*underlying every programme of education there is a philosophy, whether it is explicit or implicit, considered or rarely thought about, consistent or inconsistent.*

In terms of mindfulness, McCown et al. (2010, p29) claim that "mindfulness pedagogy has been but barely visible: under-researched, under-theorized, and under-taught". Therefore, a deeper analysis of the underpinnings of the pedagogy of mindfulness is central to the development of the course being studied. I agree with McLeod (2003) that any programme of study should be constructed upon the theoretical bases in which it is grounded. I feel that such an analysis has a vital role to play in the development of any educational course, as expressed by Aspin and Chapman (2012, p3) when they state that:

*attention to the philosophical questions that are part and parcel of thinking about lifelong learning is not only a crucial and indispensable element of the framework within which lifelong learning programmes and activities are conceived and articulated, but also that the conclusions that are reached as a result of philosophical enquiries have practical implications for developing programmes, curricula and activities of a lifelong learning character.*

Although McCown (2017; 2014) acknowledges the constructivist nature of the pedagogy of mindfulness, it is not a universally held view. Those who are grounded in the Scientific discourse often hold a more traditional pedagogic perspective, in which the teacher