
The following contributions of the 13 chapters in ‘Being Self-Study Researchers in a Digital World, are from individuals who have made important contributions to the Self-Study movement since the inauguration of the Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices (S-Step), Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association in 1993:


In reviewing this book I am focusing on the potential value of the text for Educational Action Researchers. My first point is that the book is mainly a printed text that makes almost no use of digital technologies. However Bullock et al. do point out that:

The body is an important epistemology for teaching about teaching in any environment – new technologies offer new challenges for teacher education. (p.45)

The potential of digital visual data to show self-study researchers expressing their embodied values and understandings in educational relationships, is already a major influence of self-study researchers who are also educational action researchers making original contributions to educational knowledge that is being accredited within Universities for masters and doctoral degrees.

Pithouse-Morgan and Anastasia Samaras focused on the importance of digital technology in creating less printed text dependent accounts when they include a screenshot of their second, less text dependent virtual mood-board.

“As we embraced becoming less text dependent, our meaning-making became more translucent. We distilled two research poems from 40 pages of
emails and letters and used these poems to create a second, less text dependent, mood board representation to ‘see’ the ‘essence’ of our dialogic thoughts in space (see Fig 10.2). In our second mood board, we aimed for balance between visual images and typescript.” (p.144).

Their claim is that:

“Our demonstration of collaborative professional learning through virtual bricolage self-study will be useful to others interested in exploring dialogue, polyvocality and transdisciplinarity in higher education teacher development”

Chairty Dacey et al. in considering the future of self-study through and with technology also make an important point about technology as a courier for “with each other” thoughts:

Once we considered technology as enabler of our relationships, over time we reconceived our technology-enabled exchanges as love letters to one another. This, then, positioned technology as a courier for our “with each other” thoughts rather than an inadequate substitute for real, in-person dialogue. (p.171)

This book claims to be presenting research on the intersection of self-study research, digital technologies, and the development of future-oriented practices in teacher education. It claims to highlight how digital technologies can enhance the pedagogies and knowledge base of teacher education research and practice while remaining circumspect of grandiose claims.

The main problem for me, with this book, as both a self-study and educational action researcher, who uses digital technologies in his own teaching and research, is that its communications are limited by the domination of printed text. In 2009 the self-study researchers, Tidwell, Heston and Fitzgerald, produced an excellent text on ‘Research Methods for the Self-Study of Practice’ in which they provided concrete illustrations of both verbal and visual data collection and analysis in self-study methodology in a variety of contexts.

I should have also appreciated some engagement with the most advanced social theories of the day such as the ideas of Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2014), to explore the possibility that the logic and language used in this book are contributing to what Santos has referred to as ‘epistemicide’ in terms of the killing off of indigenous knowledges. The book offers no discernible challenge to the dominance of what Santos refers to as the Epistemologies of the North. The recognition of the use of digital technologies, especially with their potential for gathering visual data that can be used as evidence in explanations of the educational influences of self-study and educational action researchers in their own learning, in the learning of others and in the learning of the social formations that influence the practice and understandings of the researcher, is unfortunately completely lacking in this text. Educational action researchers could engage with the text to understand the limitations of this form of representation by some self-study researchers in contributing to educational theory and knowledge. It would however be more educative, in relation to the educational
uses and influences of digital technology, to engage with Anne Keizer-Rommers’ (2017), self-study and educational action research, doctoral thesis, from the University of Life Sciences in Utrecht, on ‘Underneath the Surface of Cosmopolitanism: In search of cosmopolitanism in higher education’.
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