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This contribution follows the order of the Abstract and Summary in the AERA 2005 on-line Conference Programme and will focus on educational influences in my learning from the 31 year research programme into a reconstruction of educational theory described in the Abstract. The contribution is focused on relating my learning, from my s-step research, to answering the questions and justifying the claims made in the Summary below. The questions to be answered and the claims to be justified are underlined in the Summary for emphasis. The answers and justifications are included in the Summary in bold italics with an additional reference section of author and dates to distinguish them from the questions, claims and references made in the original proposal with a former colleague, Sarah Fletcher. The placing of this contribution by the SIG programme chair into a session on Renewing the Craft of Self-Study is particularly appropriate to researching a process of enhancing educational influence that involves a commitment to living values of humanity more fully in practice.

Abstract

The paper is focused on research into issues of demography and democracy explicated by our web-based resources that influence our values-based standards of accountability we aspire to in educational practices and influences as professional educators with our students and mentees (1). Self-studies of educational influence from a 31 year research programme into a reconstruction of educational theory and a 12 year research programme into the educational influence of mentoring will be used to demonstrate how a present theory -practice gap, in much educational research, can be overcome. This is accomplished by integrating insights, from the theories produced by adherents to social science and philosophical disciplines of education, into the theories produced by practitioner-researchers in explanations of their educational influence. Demographic differences in standards of democracy used for accountability are addressed in relation to accounts of learning from different countries.

Summary

a. PURPOSES;

We set out to respond to the view (2) that educational researchers should be creating a new epistemology for the new scholarship and the suggestion (3 & 4) that this should be related to
a scholarship of enquiry. Recognising practitioners are sometimes reluctant to engage in ‘research’ (5, 6, & 7) but more willing to undertake educational enquiries into their own practice (8). Our purpose in this paper is to explore how we are enabling practitioner research and how this aligns with our own democratic values and those of the practitioner researchers’ work, in a demographically diverse explication in our websites. We are seeking to understand diverse interpretations of democracy, as teacher researchers hold themselves accountable for influencing others’ learning. We engage with the concern that we should address the theory-practice gap, by finding ways of legitimating in the Academy, where appropriate, the embodied knowledge of professional educators, leaders and administrators as they demonstrate their educational influence in their own learning, their students’ learning (9, 10 & 11) and in the learning of social formations. (12, 13)

b. PERSPECTIVE(S) OR THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK;

The global transfer and legitimisation of the embodied knowledge of practitioner-researchers into the Academy has been well documented (14). Research, drawing on activity theory (15) shows how a theory-practice gap can be transcended in the living educational theories generated by practitioner-researchers in enquiries of the kind, ‘How am I improving what I am doing?’ (16). As we seek to enable a transfer of knowledge in enabling a networking and dissemination of practitioner research accounts on our websites, with more traditional forms of research generated by social science and disciplines based paradigms, we look to understand values underpinning our selectivity and representation of our own and others’ educational enquiries. How far are we reproducing a kind of white western colonialism (17) in our choice of account? Do we adequately represent demographically distinct cultures and their underpinning values? Are we guilty of creating a hegemony of representations of research accounts in our webpages? (17, 18, 19)

The claim above about the research drawing on activity theory is specifically focused on the dialectical logic of activity theory developed by the Soviet logician, Evard Ilyenkov (1977). In the creation of living educational theories, Ilyenkov’s question, ‘If an object exists as a living contradiction, what must the thought (statement about the object) be that expresses it?’, is answered through the enquiry, ‘How do I improve my practice?’ in which ‘I’ exists as a living contradiction (Whitehead, 1999).

In selecting and supporting the flow of accounts through actionresearch.net I use the idea of living educational theory on the frontpage of the web-site:

“What is a Living Educational Theory Approach to Action Research?

In a living educational theory approach to action research, individuals produce accounts or explanations for their own learning in enquiries of the kind, ‘How am I improving what I am doing?’ in contexts where they are seeking to live their values more fully in their practice.

www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/writings/livtheory.html

The living educational theories of practitioner-researchers have been accredited for doctoral degrees by Universities including the University of Bath

www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/living.shtml “
How far am I reproducing a kind of white western colonialism (17) in my choice of account?

Two accounts are on the web of my learning that show my developing awareness of the importance of being a ‘traitor to whiteness’ (Mclaren 2004) where ‘whiteness’ as a concept is used in postcolonial theory to refer to the abuses of white western colonialism. The first account was presented to an AERA 2000 S-STEP SIG session. It was a joint presentation with Paulus Murray, a mixed race educator on, ‘White and Black with White Identities in self-studies of teacher-educator practices’ (Murray & Whitehead, 2000, http://www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/A2/aerapj.htm). The second account was presented to a BERA 2004 Symposium “How Are We Contributing To A New Scholarship Of Educational Enquiry Through Our Pedagogisation Of Postcolonial Living Educational Theories In The Academy?” and my paper was entitled “Do the values and living logics I express in my educational relationships carry the hope of Ubuntu for the future of humanity?” (Whitehead, 2004, http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00003801.htm)

I am also aware that the accounts flowing in web-space from my site are in English and that the spread of English can be linked to economic globalisation and to problems of white western colonialism. I am also aware of my support for the spread of English as a form of communication that can enhance the flow of values of humanity. I try to attend below to the dangers of the former while supporting the latter.

Do I adequately represent demographically distinct cultures and their underpinning values?

In questioning myself in this way I look both historically and to the future. Historically I look at the extensions over the 32 years of my research programme from the genesis of the idea of living educational theories to their developments in demographically distinct cultures with their underpinning values. Seeing the creation of living educational theories from the range of demographically distinct cultures with their underpinning values flowing through web-space from my web-site is a source of the pleasure I associate with living a productive life in education. On this site I see contributions from China, India, USA, Canada, Europe, Singapore and Japan with links to action research sites in Australia and New Zealand. At the age of 60 my thinking about my direct influence in further extensions in living educational theories is tempered with thoughts of mortality! My present interest in the development of the living logics and values of inclusionality (Rayner, 2004) in living educational theories seems to resonate closely with the further development of living educational theories with Chinese, Arab, South African and Russian characteristics. The idea of enhancing the adequacy of the representations from distinct cultures is linked to the idea of enhancing the flow of the ideas from living educational theories through web-space. The more people that engage critically and creatively with the ideas and find them useful in creating their own living educational theories the more productive I feel in relation to the above question of adequacy.

Am I guilty of creating a hegemony of representations of research accounts in my webpages?

This is a useful question to ask myself as I seek to avoid contributing to power relations that can support a hegemony of representations that can stifle freedom of expression and
originality of thought. In the late 1960s I was persuaded by Marcuse’s (1964) analysis of the logic of domination in his ‘One Dimensional Man’ to seek to develop a range of forms of representation in my educational research programme. I felt supported in this aim by Eisner’s (1993) Presidential Address to AERA and by his later analysis of the problems and perils of alternative forms of data representation (Eisner, 1997). One of the ways I have sought to extend the range of forms of representations that can be legitimated in the academy is by enabling multi-media representations to be included within research degrees. The regulations of the University of Bath were changed during 2004 to allow the submission of e-media in research degrees. As a member of the committee that was responsible for recommending this change to Senate, as well as being a member of the Senate that agreed with the recommendation, I feel a sense of satisfaction with a change well made. Perhaps my most ambitious extension of the representations I use in research accounts in my webpages is in the October 2004 web-space of Action Research Expeditions on ‘Do action researchers’ expeditions carry hope for the future of humanity? How do we know? An en enquiry into reconstructing educational theory and educating social formations’ (http://www.arexpeditions.montana.edu/articleviewer.php?AID=80). I am thinking particularly of the points I made in the AERA Action Research SIG Newsletter of March 2005 on Living Educational Theory (http://coe.westga.edu/arsig/PDFs/ARNewsletter_V5_I2.pdf) where I draw attention to the use of the visual narrative of a performance text to communicate the meanings of embodied values and their transformation in living educational standards of judgement.

In using the implied criticism in the above question to improve the quality of my productive life in education I am conscious of a danger of creating a hegemony of representation in which the ‘I’ can appear in accounts of learning to be an discrete, autonomous entity and lacking in interdependence with its context. It may be that the influences of living educational theories from Asian and Arab contexts may help to develop a better understanding of the living logics and values that characterise inclusional (Rayner, 2004) perspectives of educational influences and relationships. Some of these influences can already be seen in the contributions from Punia (2004) and Murray (2004).

Much work needs to be done in clarifying processes of validation that establish the meanings of living epistemological standards of judgement that we demonstrate as researcher–educators. The notion of use and abuse of power exerted by validation groups and the whole question of peer review has been a focus of recent attention in conversations about educational research.

How far am I addressing possible concerns that I am presenting skewed perspectives of practitioner research, given that I select the accounts of enquiry represented on my site?

The introduction to a living educational theory approach to action research on the frontpage of my web-site announces the perspective emphasised in the resources flowing through web-space from this site. There are many research approaches used by practitioner-researchers of which action research is one approach. My main concern about dedicating my productive life to supporting the creation, testing and communication of living educational theories is in the possibility that I might be mistaken in thinking that
this activity is making a contribution to enhancing the flow of values that carry hope for the future of humanity.

I seek to avoid the abuse of power in contributing to establishing the meanings and academic legitimacy of living epistemological standards of judgement, by supporting a process of democratic evaluation that I associate with the work of Habermas (1976). By this I mean that my meanings are open to public criticism, in forums such as these, and I ask people to focus on the extent to which the accounts of learning in which the living standards are expressed are:

Comprehensible;
Make explicit the normative background of the account;
Provide sufficient evidence to justify the assertions in the account;
Demonstrate through time and interaction the authenticity of the writer in being committed to what is claimed in the account.

In thinking more about this question my concern shifts from the presentation of a biased perspective of practitioner-researcher, to some of the problems of meeting the truth of power with the power of truth in the Academy. What I mean by this is that I think that I deal adequately with the issue of possible bias in the presentation of practitioner-researcher accounts for legitimation in the Academy. There can however be problems of bias and inadequate assessment in judgements from the Academy. This is now recognised, since 1991, in the regulations of the University of Bath, where judgements on research degrees can be questioned on grounds of bias, prejudice and inadequate assessment.

Furthermore, we need to understand the democratic values that are represented in the many accounts of practice by the professional educators that can be accessed within our websites.

Do patterns of democratic values converge where, for example, we see writings by groups of teacher researchers in the UK and China, Japan and India, in Canada and the USA? Is there a global congruency in these values-based accounts and how do we detect if such values are used as a form of ‘living accountability’ for and by researcher-educators who authored them?

In the living educational theory and master’s programme accounts at [http://www.actionresearch.net](http://www.actionresearch.net) from these countries (and I would add Argentina and Singapore with the accounts of Beatriz Grandi from Argentina and Peggy Leong from Singapore) there is a convergence of the pattern of democratic value associated with the process of democratic evaluation described above. We can detect this democratic value in the living accountability shown in each living theory thesis by applying Bernstein’s statements about democracy to the living theory accounts:

“First of all, there are the conditions for an effective democracy. I am not going to derive these from high-order principles; I am just going to announce them. The first condition is that people must feel that they have a stake in society. Stake may be a bad metaphor, because by stake I mean that not only are people concerned to receive something but that they are also concerned to give something. This notion of stake has two aspects to it, the receiving and the giving. People
must feel that they have a stake in both senses of the term.

Second, people must have confidence that the political arrangements they create will realise this stake, or give grounds if they do not. In a sense it does not matter too much if this stake is not realised, or only partly realised, providing there are good grounds for it not being realised or only partly realised." (Bernstein, 2000, p. xx).

Within the different sections of our sites, we claim to uphold values of democracy and we seek to test the validity of the knowledge generated through a theoretical perspective of democratic evaluation (20). We formulate an inclusional (21) theory of democratic accountability, through accounts by international educators in the demographic contexts of different continents. Our paper explores our attempts to examine underlying values embodied in research and used by these educators in judging and explaining their educational influence in their students’ learning and in the social formations in which they are living and learning. We ask how far we can learn to improve our own productive lives as we encounter others’ values, which constitute the standards of judgement that concur with or differ from our own.

As I respond through the medium of my website to Chinese teacher-researchers (22) how far do my responses explicate those values that I bring to appreciative critical engagement?

My own responses can be accessed at:

http://www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/moira.shtml

In particular the url:

http://www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/jbs/jbsconnect.html

takes you to my appreciative critical engagement in “Connecting your accounts to international networks of teacher-researchers and other educational researchers. The live urls in the references below should take you to papers to download or in the case of the papers from Educational Researcher to pdf files that you can view on screen, download, or print off. The pdf files may take a little time.”

C. METHODS, TECHNIQUES, OR MODES OF INQUIRY;

The methods used in the research draw on an action research approach to a scholarship of educational enquiry. We seek to know how we all might learn about the underpinning values embodied by teacher educators and how they influence practice in a democratic form of accountability rather than just what can be learnt about everyday practice. This approach to understanding values as living standards of judgement has already been documented (23, 24, 25 & 26). Methods of enquiry include the use of digital technology in the creation of visual narratives that show the transformation of embodied values into living epistemological standards of judgement. They also include textual analysis as educational enquiry communicated through e-mentoring.
The modes of enquiry include the use of peer validation groups to strengthen the validity of the researchers’ interpretations in a process of mutual rational control of critical dialogue.

Two further publications show how a living theory approach to action research can clarify the meanings of embodied values in educational enquiries of the kind, ‘How do I improve what I am doing?’ These publications also show how the process of clarifying the meanings of ontological values can produce living epistemological standards of judgement. These standards can be used to evaluate the validity of the claims to knowledge being made from within a living theory perspective. The two publications are:

1) Do action researchers' expeditions carry hope for the future of humanity? How do we know? An enquiry into reconstructing educational theory and educating social formations. This was published in the October 2004 issue of the e-Journal Action Research Expeditions (Retrieved 29 March 2005 from http://www.arexpeditions.montana.edu/articleviewer.php?AID=80)


D. DATA SOURCES OR EVIDENCE;

The sources of data and evidence are web-based and relate to two complementary websites. They include on-going analysis of teacher researcher reports, produced by novice and more experienced practitioners as researchers from Asia, N. America and the UK. Some of these researchers have offered their reports for formal accreditation. Our data includes doctoral theses, masters’ dissertations and autoethnographic (27) studies of practitioner-researchers whose analyses of their learning and living epistemological standards of judgement (28) have been legitimated within the Academy over the past 15 years.

We put forward evidence that there exist globally congruent standards of judgement, which can arise from the embodied values of practitioner researchers across the continents of this educationally active world.

The evidence I have in mind is explicitly presented in the living educational theories of practitioner-researchers working in different continents. I have already drawn attention to the embodied valuing of democracy in the educational relationships and living theories of practitioner-researchers. Two other standards of judgement that each living theory has fulfilled in order to be legitimated in the Academy are originality of mind and critical judgement. While the national and internationally standing of the examiners of these theses does not guarantee the validity of their judgements, I feel confident that the living theory theses flowing through web-space from actionresearch.net, have been subjected to rigorous scrutiny in testing their validity and academic legitimacy. Another living standard of judgement I would suggest is emerging from the embodied values of practitioner-researchers is love. In my experience, practitioner-researchers love what they do in the
sense that they feel the flow of a life-affirming energy when expressing their values of education in their educational relationships.

As a bedrock of my hope in human existence I bear witness to love as a value of humanity that carries hope for the future of humanity and my own. I love what I do in education. My students tell me that they feel this as a life-affirming energy that flows into our relationship and influences their enquiries. I recognise this love in Cho’s terms when he says that with love, education becomes an open space for thought from which emerges knowledge. For Cho, as for me, it is important to make clear that in explaining the educational influence of love in learning, between two or more people in an educational relationship, it is not a matter of ‘merely caring for one another, nor do they pass knowledge between each other’ (Cho, 2005, p. 95). It is a matter of seeing that love opens a space for those in educational relationships to ‘preserve the distinctiveness of their positions by turning away from one another and toward the world in order to produce knowledge through inquiry and thought’ (Cho, 2005. p. 95).

Love, as an embodied value, an explanatory principle and living standard of judgement is not usually used in evaluating the validity of a claim to educational knowledge in the Academy. In this paper I am going to focus on claims to knowledge that include love as a living standard of judgement and that have been submitted for doctoral examination at the University of Bath after five or more years of enquiry. I am also going to stress the epistemological significance of using ostensive definitions, with the help of multi-media accounts including video-clips of practice, to communicate the meanings of embodied values and their transformation into living standards of judgement. My own University, the University of Bath, has only recently permitted the submission of these accounts. A change in the University of Bath regulations during 2004 allowed the submission of multi-media accounts using e-media.

Two recently completed doctoral enquiries by Mary Hartog and Madeline Church have used a living action research methodology to clarify the meaning of love as an embodied value, explanatory principle and standard of judgement in their living educational theories of their own learning.

Mary Hartog’s thesis ‘A self study of a higher education tutor: how can I improve my practice?’ was the first thesis, under the new regulations, to submit a visual narrative and analysis of educational relationships. The explanation of learning connects, in the visual narrative, ostensive definitions of loving and life-affirming educative relations with lexical definitions:

“Evidence is drawn from life-story work, narrative accounting, student assignments, audio and video taped sessions of teaching and learning situations, the latter of which include edited CD-R files. These clips offer a glimpse of my embodied claims to know what the creation of loving and life-affirming educative relations involves.” (Hartog, 2004, http://www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/hartog.shtml)
Madeline Church (2004) in her doctoral enquiry, ‘Creating an uncompromised place to belong: why do I find myself in networks?’ has successfully defended her thesis, in her viva-voce examination, which included the following claims to know:

“I show how my approach to this work is rooted in the values of compassion, love, and fairness, and inspired by art. I hold myself to account in relation to these values, as living standards by which I judge myself and my action in the world. This finds expression in research that helps us to design more appropriate criteria for the evaluation of international social change networks. Through this process I inquire with others into the nature of networks, and their potential for supporting us in lightly-held communities which liberate us to be dynamic, diverse and creative individuals working together for common purpose” (Church, 2004, http://www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/church.shtml)

Eleanor Lohr’s (2004) prologue to her doctoral enquiry, ‘Love at Work’ presents a visual narrative and analysis of her inclusional value of loving. In the thesis submitted for examination, Lohr makes the claim:

“In this thesis I represent the meanings of love as I experience love at work in my life. By writing, I learn how to craft the words to express that knowledge. By seeing the visual images, I begin to understand the power of loving presence. By listening to the reverberations of my body, I bring critical judgement into my action and articulate this judgement as living epistemological standards of love. These loving standards enable me to judge the value of my practice, and to be better accountable for what I do.” (Lohr, 2004, http://www.jackwhitehead.com/elFront%202.htm)

In focusing on values of democracy, originality of mind, critical judgement and love in this presentation, I recognise that these are only some of the values that carry hope for the future of humanity through education. Other practitioner-researchers have focused on values such as justice (Finnegan, 2000) passion for compassion (Naidoo, 2004) and exquisite connectivity with spiritual and aesthetic values (Scholes-Rhodes, 2002) in presenting the unique constellation of values that are helping to constitute their productive lives and education.

E. RESULTS AND/OR CONCLUSIONS/POINT OF VIEW;

We present our points of view in a dialogical form, looking for on-going engagement in discussion and debate made available through a third website, via the JISC mail forum system.

The living action research site I convene with Je Kan Adler-Collins of Fukuoka University can be accessed from the bottom of the What’s New section of http://www.actionresearch.net

In conclusion the visual narrative that I offer shows how new living standards of judgement have been legitimated in the Academy, where practitioners are asking, researching and answering questions like:
How can I live out my democratic values in practice more fully by using formative assessment techniques to influence my own learning and the learning of others?

How can I help my tutor group to work better together and improve their learning?

How can I influence the creation of a culture of inquiry within a District School Board?

How can love enable justice to see rightly?

A Self Study Of A Higher Education Tutor: How Can I Improve My Practice?

What Constitutes an International Educator with Spiritual Values?

How do I improve my practice? Creating a discipline of education through educational enquiry.

What do I know and how do I know it through my educational inquiry into my practice of community?

How can young teachers in Nepal be encouraged to develop and maintain their professional values?

You can access all the above enquiries from the masters module section or living theory section of http://www.actionresearch.net with the exception of the enquiries with teachers in Nepal. I am hoping that these enquiries will be developed with Nemrata Sharma who has returned to Nepal after working on an action research project in Kenya. You can access details of Nemrata’s work from the details of the Monday evening conversation in Bath on 31 January 2005 from http://www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/monday/mon31Jan.htm

In relation to the visual narratives, I am referring to the multi-media presentations in the two publications above:

Do action researchers’ expeditions carry hope for the future of humanity? How do we know? An enquiry into reconstructing educational theory and educating social formations. This was published in the October 2004 issue of the e-Journal Action Research Expeditions (Retrieved 29 March 2005 from http://www.arexpeditions.montana.edu/articleviewer.php?AID=80)


F. EDUCATIONAL OR SCIENTIFIC IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY.

The educational significance of the study is that it shows how the theory-practice gap that dominates educational research in the Academy, can be transcended through the generating
and testing of the living educational theories of practitioner-researchers, from educational enquiries that draw insights from, rather than omit, the traditional disciplines that have previously constituted educational theory. The study also shows how new living epistemological standards of judgement can be validated and legitimated in democratic processes of accountability in a range of demographic contexts.

The educational importance of our study extends to using a critical analysis of our own practice as demographically engaging and democratically informed researcher-educators. Such critical engagement already exists in the accounts on our websites but what is unique and of global relevance in an era of technologically informed educational practice (29, 30), is the use of our websites as foci for validating our own practice as contributors to knowledge. Through the textual representation of our own and others’ living educational theories and the inclusion of visual narrative in this representation we hold ourselves accountable as educators as we ask ourselves and we encourage those whose work we analyse to ask, How far are we, as a global community, engaged in overcoming traditional demographic barriers to knowledge generation and transfer? In addressing this question, educational research comes of age through the creation of educational theories from analyses of the demographically diverse processes of democratic accountability within the enquiry-based accounts of practitioners’ educational influence and learning, now explicated through text and video and enabled by web based technology.

In answer to this last question I am hopeful that traditional demographic barriers are transforming into more permeable boundaries in supporting the flow of values that carry hope for the future of humanity. Because death seems the appropriate conclusion for a self-study into one’s educational influence in learning, I like to remain open in my educational enquiries to the possibilities that life itself permits! In this spirit of openness I would like to draw your attention to some more action researchers who seem to me to be overcoming traditional demographic barriers, as they transform these barriers into a flow of knowledge generation and transfer through their life-enhancing boundaries. I am hopeful that a conclusion of connections to accounts flowing through web-space will serve to enhance the flow of our life-affirming energies as we help each other to live loving and productive lives in education.

In this conclusion I am thinking of the work of Eden Charles in The Sankofa Learning Centre “We are in the midst of an undeclared crisis. In this situation we have to consider different types of action as a matter of urgency. Sankofa is an attempt to find an alternative path that works from within the Black community.”

http://www.sankofalearning.co.uk/need.html

I am thinking of the work of Professor Sawamoto from Japan’s Womens’ University, Professor Asada from Waseda University and Professor Ikuta from Niigata University. You can see references to the work of action researchers in Japan in Jackie Delong’s (2004) keynote to the Japanese Association of Educators for Human Development on ‘Action Research Implemented in The Grand Erie District School Board: Impact on Teacher Development, Improvement and the Support System’ at:

I am thinking of the work of Moira Laidlaw and her colleagues Dean Tian Fengjun and Li Peidong at China's Experimental Centre for Educational Action Research in Foreign Languages Teaching hosted by Guyuan Teachers College. You can connect with this work flowing through web-space at http://www.bath.ac.uk/~edsajw/moira.shtml

I am thinking of the work of Peggy Leong in her work as Manager of the Academy of Best Learning in Education (ABLE) in Singapore. See in particular the conference papers and presentations at: http://edt.ite.edu.sg/ite_conf/index.htm

as I continue to do what I can to enhance the flow of values that carry hope for the future of humanity and our own in our educational enquiries. Feeling the flow of life-affirming energy, in the above accounts of educational influence in learning with their commitment to democratic accountability, enhances my own and I am most grateful for the pleasure I feel in this recognition.
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