

INTRODUCTION

This thesis is in four parts.

The chapters in Part One set out the theories and models that frame my inquiry.

Part Two contains phenomenological and hermeneutical accounts of my lived embodied experience.

Part Three addresses the issue of love in organisation and is in the form of a series of iterative reflections on my leadership practice. From this I develop praxis¹, my living educational theory of a pedagogy of presence.

I present my findings in Part Four where an account of current practice is judged against criteria developed in Part One. In the final Chapter, I consider the contribution that my inquiry makes to the academic audience.

PART ONE: THEORY

Part One is concerned with ideas, models and my methodology. I use theory as a mental frame, not a two-dimensional picture frame to be seen from outside, but a three-dimensional doorframe, through which I pass.

I write knowing that my words and language are culturally determined, that even my sentence construction supports and defines my way of seeing and explaining the world. In Part One I first declare the grounding from which my language springs, and secondly provide the reader with a reference to the ideas which explain and justify my inquiry perspective.

Initially these ideas and models enable me to connect with what I know already and enable me to acknowledge the cultural roots and the values embedded in my thinking. How I come to put words to what I know is described in Part Two. New concepts and ideas then inform me as my inquiry develops, and I document this

¹ Definition taken from Park, 'The notion of praxis...gives action or practice the primary role in the relation between action and theory, such that theory is thought of as experienced based.' (Park, 2001 p. 87)

process in Part Three. Then in Part Four I pause the theory frame and look back on how my embodied knowledge has been changed, recontextualised and reframed by these new ideas and new models.

So Part One describes these theories, separating them out from the lived experience and the lived practice of my inquiring so that the connections between theory, experience and practice can be made clearer.

I begin in Chapter One by defining what I mean by love. These meanings were developed over the course of the inquiry, and have been distilled and re-presented in order to clarify my definitions for the reader from the outset. Drawings, a photograph and a CD-ROM provide supplementary illustrations of these meanings of love.

In Chapter Two I write about the ideas of others and illustrate what I mean using examples and illustrations. These ideas informed my inquiry and coloured my thinking.

In an example of reflective writing I demonstrate how I write holding the sensed memory of love in my mind, which is then expressed through these philosophical frames.

I show how I understand the socially constructed nature of language, and maintain that my reflexive use of language enables me to develop propositional knowledge by glimpsing and reflecting on the meanings underlying my choice of words and my use of language.

I go on to suggest ways in which religious cultures influence the construction of the self and explain the theories of pedagogy (Bernstein, 2000) and inclusionality (Rayner, 2004) that significantly influenced my inquiry. Finally, I defend my decision to inquire from a value-laden perspective and make the links between developing propositional knowledge and the development of my unique living educational theory of a pedagogy of presence.

In Chapter Three I take the action research models of Reason (Reason and Bradbury, 2001), Heron (Heron, 1996), Marshall (Marshall, 2005) and Whitehead (Whitehead, 1988) from which I have developed my inquiry methodology. I show

how I use the dialogic relation between incongruent life experiences and the dissonances of embodied knowing. I apply Whitehead's question, 'How do I improve the expression of loving values through my actions?' and give a case example that demonstrates my dialectical approach. The example shows the relational mode of my inquiring, and also shows how I develop propositional knowledge from practical knowledge in the extended epistemology of Heron (ibid. p. 57).

I start Chapter Four with a journalled account of action and show how my methodology is disclosed in cycles of action and reflection as described in the previous chapter. In the process of applying the 'ordering principles of language' I show how my methodology surfaces contradiction, and how I judge the 'truth' of my method by testing the congruence of my methodology against accounts of my leadership practice. I maintain that the silence experienced in spiritual practice reorders my thought. I go on to develop three criteria against which this inquiry and my practice can be judged. These criteria are surfaced from a reflective process that combines the ordering principle of silence and the ordering principles of language.

PART TWO: LIVED EXPERIENCE

In Part Two my inquiry begins by following the logic of my sensed experience. Both chapters in Part Two describe how I make sense of living in the world as I think through the relation of language, feeling and embodied knowing.

In Chapter Five I hold the embodied memory of love in my mind as I put my experience of love into language. I do this by referring to the ideas of others as they influence my feeling and thinking process. As I follow through on this process, some of the 'theory' contained in Part One is repeated as I begin to identify three aspects of love: eros, agape and divine love. This chapter develops its own logic, and does not have an 'argument'.

Chapter Six highlights the dynamic relation of my mind and body as I learn through experience of the phenomenon (letting it speak to me) rather than by

analysing the phenomenon (deciding how the phenomenon should be categorised or quantified) (Bortroft 1996)².

In this Chapter, I show how I use the ordering principles of language and silence to surface meanings and make them socially relevant. I illustrate this with a case example, which provides evidence of the connection between my learning and teaching yoga. This demonstrates how my propositional knowledge influences my practical knowledge, which is 'knowing the truth in the action' (Heron, 1996, p. 57).

PART THREE: PRACTICE

In Part Two, Chapter Five, I discriminate between eros, agape and divine love. Now in Part Three these three aspects of love are brought into a new relation with my leadership practice.

As I continue to write and reason through feeling, theory is reframed and re-contextualised as my understanding alters and my inquiry progresses. Starting with living systemic thinking (Marshall, 2004), I develop my understanding of love using the dynamics of Inclusionality (Rayner, 2004) where meaning and context interact³ and co-create.

Each chapter is structured to show the iterative relation of action and reflection. I draw on accounts of my leadership practice and reflect on the gaps between practical knowing and experiential knowing.

Chapter Seven develops these themes by considering an account of my leadership practice through the lens of eros. I critique Torbert's Leadership Development Framework (Fisher, Rooke and Torbert, 2000). There is no argument; instead there are iterative reflections on the effect of erotic extremes in a practical organisational context. At the end of this unstructured free flowing process I have clarified the meaning of eros in an organisational context,

² Bortroft's theories are discussed in Chapter Two.

³ See Rayner (2004). Rayner's theories of inclusionality are covered more fully in Chapter Two.

critiqued a skills based approach to leadership development, and begun to appreciate the learning that arises from my inquiry process.

Chapter Eight follows the same action and reflection format used in the previous chapter. I take the perspective of agape and consider the potential for organisational structures to be derived from relation rather than hierarchy. I do this by referring to Complexity Theory and self-organising systems (Griffin, 2002), (Shaw, 2002), and by reflecting on my experience of conversation in an organisational context, in an inquiry group and amongst friends. By the end of this chapter I have realised how I combine action research practice with spiritual practice, and become clearer about my decision making processes.

I deliberately collapse the distinction between the private 'self' and the public 'other' in these two chapters. By doing this I develop praxis, my living educational theory, which crystallises in Chapter Nine. Here I show how standing on the edge of the unknown is part of my learning process as I reflexively inquire into the meanings underlying action. I draw together the knowledge gained from the previous two chapters, and bring this into alignment with Bernstein's theories of pedagogic communication⁴. In this chapter I develop my theory of how love can be transmitted through embodiment in a pedagogy of presence. By the end of this chapter I know how it is possible for me to become an instrument of love's purpose, and how I can influence the meanings of love through the inclusional flow.

In Chapter Ten I reflect further on the inclusional⁵ dimensions of eros and agape and the social construction of relationship. I establish the relevance of 'nonmaterial regions of influence' (Jaworski, 1998) and spiritual practice in an organisational context. I refer to Scharmer's theory of 'presencing the future' (Scharmer, 2000) and use his inspirational example of how presence can influence organisational practice (Senge and Scharmer, 2001).

⁴ Bernstein's theory is also discussed in Chapter Two

⁵ Theories of Inclusionality are covered in Chapter Two.

PART FOUR: FINDINGS

The two Chapters in Part Four draw conclusions and substantiate the links between theory and practice.

In Chapter Eleven I summarise my findings. In a further account of current practice, evidence is provided to support my claim that love can be brought into my professional practice through a pedagogy of presence. I apply the criteria set out in Chapter Four and evaluate my practice using these standards.

Finally, in Chapter Twelve I demonstrate the relevance of my inquiry to the academic audience and beyond. I consider four action research accounts and papers (Reason, 2000), (Winter, 2003), (Heron, 1996) and (Torbert, 2001), and four academic perspectives (Cho, 2005), (Griffin, 2002), (Fraser, 2003) and (Biberman and Whitty, 2000) and assess the contribution of this inquiry to those discussions.

EPILOGUE

Finally, I give an account of the learning derived from the process of representing my inquiry and the re-submission of this thesis, and then evaluate my inquiry taking into account both the examiners' requirements and my first standard of judgement set out in Chapter Four.

STRUCTURE AND PROCESS

The presentation of this thesis in a four-part structure does not reflect the messy reality of my lived inquiry and writing up processes. It was messy because the form of my inquiry was emergent at every stage and in every way.

The reality is that I started inquiring by plunging into descriptions of the felt experience of love and writing Chapter Five, then Seven, then Eight and then Ten, not knowing whether this journaling could be either practical or relevant. For these chapters I journalled pages and pages of felt responses to events and then interwove these feelings with further thoughts provoked by my reading;

incorporating and referring to ideas that I felt either drawn to or with which I disagreed.

I explain my methodology in Chapter Four. I had generated a lot of data in my reflective writing, and much of this writing did not seem very relevant to my project, but my aim was to be an instrument of love's purpose, not to be instrumental. This meant not constructing an argument, but allowing themes to arise from within the 'data set'.

However, in the later stages I began to realise that I had been using my data in particular ways and that there were underlying principles shaping my inquiry, principles that I could point to and that I could use as 'tools'. This is how I came to denote the ordering principles of language, and the ordering principle of silence, at the end of Chapter Four.

These ordering principles became very useful as I began to consider how to present my findings to the reader. As I wrote up my inquiry I realised that I needed to summarise the data generated in Chapters Seven and Eight. I then summarised further, taking my findings into a separate chapter, Chapter Nine, which clarified the nature of the tacit pedagogic transmission I was writing about. Putting these summaries at the front end of the data might have made my 'arguments' clearer, but I had determined to find love's purpose from within process, and so I ask the reader's forbearance in this matter. I am presenting a 'truer' picture of my process by drawing findings from data rather than justifying already stated conclusions.

Considering how to present my thesis from the reader's perspective also highlighted two further aspects of this inquiry. Not only is my reflective learning style weighted towards the absorption and realisation of knowledge, where knowledge arises from within and so is not easily located in a particular context, but it is also holistic in the sense that it is derived more intuitively than analytically.

I address this in Chapter Two when I begin by showing that I am sensible of cultural frame within which I act and from which my knowledge is produced. But then, in the middle of this Chapter, I move away from privileging a predominantly analytic mode of knowledge production to privileging a more disclosing and

holistic mode of knowledge production. And I make a similar distinction between the analysis of action research models in Chapter Three and the disclosure of my methodology presented in Chapter Four.

The implication of this holistic approach means that my 'realised' knowledge appears as if from nowhere. It means that when I write about what I know it can be received by the reader as an 'assertion' rather than as a thought that arises from embodied and embedded knowledge resulting from lived experience and lived practice and made in a relational response to the people and events around me.

Chapter Six shows how these 'assertions' arise. One of my purposes in writing this Chapter was to demonstrate how my speech, my teaching and my decisions are made in an embodied, grounded and relational way.

Finally, in Chapter Eleven I provide evidence to substantiate my findings. Both Chapters Eleven and Twelve were written with the reader held firmly in my mind, I spoke to the reader, 'held the reader as a part of myself', as I analysed, interpreted and evaluated my findings. These chapters, together with the Prologue, were written in the order in which they are presented to the reader.

DATA, FINDINGS AND EVIDENCE

My aim was to explore how I might become an instrument of love. In order to do this I immersed myself in a sensed memory of love. (I write about love in more detail in Chapter One) The thoughts that arose as I held this inward sense of love as a part of myself and then focussed my outward gaze on accounts of my actions in the world gave rise to 'reflective writing'. (I write about methodology in Chapters Three and Four). This reflective writing generated a huge amount of data. The writing was loosely formed, not guided by anticipated outcomes, not deliberately structured. However, it was this method that enabled me to look beneath my actions and surface the meanings of love that underlay my actions in the world. And one of the consequences of the process is that there is 'unused' data, data that appears to have nothing to do with the findings but data which is nevertheless integral to my inquiry process.

At the end of each reflective cycle I summarise my findings still guided by the embodied memory of love, but now asking the question, 'What does this data tell me about becoming an instrument of love?' And the summaries are my responses to this question. Chapter Nine is the final summary of this process in which I justify my understanding of a pedagogy of presence.

Finally, in Chapter Eleven, I provide an action account as evidence of the way that I bring love into my action, validate the underlying presence of love, and evaluate my research process with reference to action research models.