

Draft papers – ML / PM conversations and analyses

Paper 1. Swaroop Rawal – ML / PM conversation 26th February 2021 at https://youtu.be/GbHahbqoaJs <i>Making Magic: What contribution has a Living Educational Theory approach made towards helping me to improve the quality of my practice?</i>		
Pre-conversation analysis (ML)		
	Standard of Judgment 1–5 is the common list Subsequent are author's criteria	Evidence that standard is met
1.	A clear outline and theme	Abstract clear: “This article contributes to a dialogue on the influence Living Educational Theory has had on the practice of a teacher as she tried to answer the question 'How do I improve my practice?' Here I elucidate how my living-educational-theory, through values-based dialogues, has enabled me to achieve practice research competency.” She shows that, offering examples over time. Epilogue particularly redolent of her values. Slightly more explicitness needed in that section.
2.	A clear and relatable (Bassey, 1996) process of generation	Very much so. Throughout, the energy spurred me on. Clear from the outset this is about her I-t as a contribution to LT and full of aspects of educational influence. As a draft for this special issue it is growing in connections with other papers, and her narrative style helps me to engage with the paper throughout. It is clearly related to the field of LT and she offers her contribution in such a way that I can relate to it.
3.	The educational influence (of the EJOLTS process, of LET, of another author) on the given author's I-e-t	Very clear from the outset. I have suggested more inclusion of her past EJOLTS papers yesterday 24.2.21. She locates her I-t clearly in LT and shows how she has learnt and helped others to learn about educational influence with examples. EJOLTS needs more explicit integration, but that is in process.
4.	A contribution to or confirmation of LET	Without doubt. Setting, different strands (Life Skills, patchwork text, narrative style (related to C&J?)) make this unarguably not only an I-t in its own right, but a significant contribution to LT generally. That will be more the case if EJOLTS as the publishing body is more explicitly integrated.
5.	The educational influence on Moira and Pete as readers (and you as authors of the special issue).	Swaroop's texts always have an educational influence on me in terms of narrative style, integration of poetry, pictures, videos to enrich the text. She plays with her creativity in a way that speaks to me directly and makes it reasonable and fitting for me to be more creative myself. Hence my Educational Stories (in process).
a.	Empowerment: intellectual	I see her doing this herself for herself, as she aspires to write (more) texts to explain her intellectual journey and her educational practice. Heutogogy, for example. I see her helping others to liberate themselves (examples towards the end). I see her Life Skills practices as a way of helping others to think in new ways that offer them strength and a greater sense of personal competence. This characterises all her writing about this domain of practice. C&J write about this in their own way as well.
b.	Autonomy: negotiated learning and	This resonates with the previous standard of judgement. She

	heutagogy	shows this by explanation and example, revealing the equality between herself and others
c.	Equality: (no details given explicitly – to be inferred)	This is more implicit than explicit. However, it is clear in the way in which she negotiates with the processes of learning. There's a content, but the processes are arrived at through negotiation. The balance of power is equalised.
d.	Creative thinking engages mental subsets like curiosity, perception and imagination to communicate effectively	The use of poetry, cartoons, videos etc. seem to me to be the result of creative thinking. The desire to know is evident throughout. She communicates through this imagination approach to me directly as a reader. The examples given on pp. 16-18 are powerful. I was in tears. For me that has always been a mark of being struck by the authenticity of a text. I identify with the values that offer hope for us all, even at this benighted time.

Paper 2. Cathy Giffin / Jackie Delong – ML / PM conversation 23rd February 2021 at https://youtu.be/CSMqwuht7s <i>As educators and educational researchers, what contribution has a Living Educational Theory approach made to helping us to improve the quality of our practice and our lives?</i>		
Pre-conversation analysis (ML)		
	Standard of Judgment 1–5 is the common list Subsequent are authors' criteria	Evidence that standard is met
1.	A clear outline and theme	Title, abstract, keywords clear. Logical structure. I wonder if some of it can be trimmed. A reader might discern repetition. It's a balance between an explanation from a dialogue and the dialogue itself. Some interim ends to be sewn up still. Word count etc. Conclusion showing steps forward with intentions clear.
2.	A clear and relatable (Bassey, 1996) process of generation	Very relatable for me. On p. 3 they state the change in the nature of the paper to a format that is dialogical. They make their aim to create dialogue as a form of research into the thing itself. That speaks to authenticity, verisimilitude and for me is a cogently relatable process. See video clip, p. 2. The joy is palpable.
3.	The educational influence (of the EJOLTS process, of LET, of another author) on the given author's I-e-t	Explicit throughout, from the point at which they designate the paper's presentation itself as dialogical. Dialogue and education are linked – EJOLTS papers, their own prior work, show this. Conclusion: 'Never has it been so important for us to focus on our 'individuality and its peculiarity', to personally act in a way more in line with our values than during this global pandemic. To focus our actions on what aligns with our values allows us to experience "the individual joy of knowing my personality as an objective, sensuously perceptible, and indubitable power" (p.19). Paper shows this. Educational value of dialogue within I-ts, LT and as published in EJOLTS. It carries through seamlessly.
4.	A contribution to or confirmation of LET	This is a contribution to LT in the sense of exploring dialogue as a research method in its own right (joint-I-t). Shows, through the research process and their I-t, a confirmation of LT. Offers rich discussion through examples of others' work in the field as well, and their right to behave, act, reflect and conclude through 'their own best knowledge to date' (McNiff

		conversation, n.d.).
5.	The educational influence on Moira and Pete as readers (and you as authors of the special issue).	This has made me see the educational influence of both as they follow and demonstrate dialogue as a research method. It has helped me to understand the close educational relationship over time in a way that isn't always easy to see in a single paper. Dialogue as a research method is relatively new to me. I've written about the democratising potential of dialogical focus in an AR enquiry (Laidlaw, 1994) but hadn't ever seen it as a research method in its own right. It now opens up all sorts of possibilities for my own work with OU students. Their educative relationship has developed over a long time, something that has been raised with Jack and others recently. This is new to me as a vantage point too.
a.	Within comprehensibility we include the logic of the explanation as a mode of thought that is appropriate for comprehending the real as rational (Marcuse, 1964, p. 105).	This comprehensibility works for me in terms of comprehending the real as rational, because they use not only the theory of dialogue, but the practice of it, such that it coheres for me. I believe in it through its comprehensibility and demonstrated standards of judgement.
b.	Within truthfulness we include the evidence for justifying the assertions we make in our claims to knowledge.	I believe in this process as articulated by the authors. I see it as a demonstration of evidence to back up assertions. Cathy: "...the values of vulnerability, trust and authenticity that I identified in my masters research (Griffin, 2011) continue to guide my practice," p.5. interesting link with Mairin's paper in terms of her reflection on being reviewed instead of reviewing. Truth as both authors see it might have different connotations for others, but the transparency of the text has the ring of <i>their</i> truth. I believe it, which is another reason why it speaks to me with rightness, comprehensibility, authenticity, and is invitational.
c.	Within rightness we include an awareness of the normative assumptions we are making in the values that inform our claims to knowledge.	This links for me with educational influence. It's about educational influence – EJOLTS, LT and their own I-t. They should be showing these and they are. See above on comprehensibility. Assumptions are clearly articulated as they make claims to knowledge.
d.	Within authenticity we include the evidence of interaction over time that we are truly committed to living the values we explicitly espouse.	The verisimilitude and integrity, 'walking the talk', avowed and lived values of loving into learning, facing contradictions, power relationships. Time given to work on the issues that arise are presented. At no time do I see living contradictions arising between the authors' avowals and their presentation. Not simplistic, but the simplicity on the other side of complexity.
e.	Invitational : Like Buber, we want to be speaking directly to you and that you feel the need for a response.	Completely. This gripped me from the outset. Not just because of the subject-matter but the integrity of the account. This links with all the EF SoJ above. I felt implicated. I was there. Clip on p. 2 invites me in. Paragraph nearby uses Buber. Again, walking the talk.
f.	Accessible and Enjoyable	Very much so because of the above. Because I find no living contradictions between avowed standards and lived ones, I enjoyed it very much. I can't answer for the reading experiences of others, but terms are explained and the logic flows through the sections. See the clip, on p. 2 with the delight on both their faces. Unmistakeable. That drew me in.

Paper 3. Máirín Glenn – ML / PM conversation 22 February 2021 at

<https://youtu.be/3xdyAuoh3p4>

What is the educational influence of my engagement with EJOLTS?

Pre-conversation analysis (ML)

	Standard of Judgment 1–5 is the common list Subsequent are author's criteria	Evidence that standard is met
1.	A clear outline and theme	Title and abstract indicative of personal and EF's SoJ. Introduces SoJs early – see p.1. p. 3 consolidates plan for paper and comes back to SoJ. She offers the reader clarity around the processes and values of EJOLTS throughout. Democratic emphasised, p.3.
2.	A clear and relatable (Bassey, 1996) process of generation	Her text is logically presented, such that it is easy for me to follow. Top p.2, discussion about personal SoJ as it takes her through the paper. I can relate to this. Fundamental I-t process being developed. I can relate to her struggle for fairness throughout and seeing things from different points of view. It's as if she's set herself a test to see where the living contradictions are. This is both courageous and fulfilling, because she is open in a way that engages me as a reader.
3.	The educational influence (of the EJOLTS process, of LET, of another author) on the given author's I-e-t	Refers to Stephen's paper, p. 3, mentions EJOLTS papers throughout, shows what she learns from them. P. 3 discusses care as a value, being mirrored in EJOLTS papers and working through her own issues. Conclusion summarises for me how she has educated herself and been influenced educationally through this process of writing.
4.	A contribution to or confirmation of LET	Clearly a contribution to LET in its concentration on an ontological SoJ matched explicitly to care and social justice. Fairness comes through a lot in terms of connecting those two. It shows something of the clear dialectic between I-t and LT, in a living dialectic, resting on personal values with universal intent (so to speak).
5.	The educational influence on Moira and Pete as readers (and you as authors of the special issue).	Her elucidation of being in different situations as reviewer, writer, reader, offers a triangulation of viewpoints, bringing out contradictions and challenges to meeting them in fair, socially just ways. I feel I understand the EJOLTS processes more fully and see connections and educational influence through her triangulation in ways I hadn't before. I have concentrated on educational influence between teacher and student in my career. Now, involved in this special issue I am realising its educational significance for me and the wider issues of social educational influence. What you and I are doing together, what we are doing with other authors and they with us, what I am considering in new ways – all this has become more connected and more complex. Our EF needs to be the simplicity on the other side of our complexities too. For me Mairin's paper is already there.
a.	I hold ontological values around care and social justice.	This is clear from the outset. She is concerned to be within a fair process. Her multiple viewpoints offer the reader a way in to determining if she is doing what she says. Her openness throughout, including on p. 10 her concern, for example, about wielding power as a reviewer adds verisimilitude.
b.	These ontological values inspire my epistemological stance	This is clear, because the ontological values necessitate cohering theory and practice and explaining them, rather than

	(Hitchcock and Hughes, 1995).	positing theory and living differently. The paper grows from holding these values to her actions in practice over time in different roles. The weaving contextualises and authenticates her claims. On p. 10 she doesn't want to colonise the thinking of others. That's social justice, that's an ontological stance, that's educational influence.
c.	Through my epistemological stance, I aim to create and participate in an environment that stimulates learning for practitioners, who see themselves as capable of developing their potential as active agents in their own learning.	This is clear from her full and varied participation in the life of EJOLTS and LT and I-t. Her emphasis on learning throughout, for herself, for the Ed. Board, for the writers, readers and reviewers is clearly her intention in the paper. Through her I-t she shows how she is making a contribution to a sense of educational influence in the learning of individuals in social formations for the flourishing of humanity. Her issue of social justice implies, to me, a necessary self-empowerment of all participants.
d.	c. is a living standard of judgment for me and throughout this paper, I continuously check to see if I am meeting this standard.	I think she achieves this as well. I see her doing it, for example, on p. 8 when she writes about the vulnerability of being reviewed and trying to bring that understanding with her when she reviews the work of others. Care, social justice, felt ontologically.

Paper 4. Stephen Bigger – ML / PM conversation 25th February 2021 at https://youtu.be/V8S37L47gqI <i>What is the potential educational influence of the Educational Journal of Living Theories (EJOLTs)? Methodology and Theory</i>		
Pre-conversation analysis (ML)		
	Standard of Judgment 1–5 is the common list Subsequent are author's criteria	Evidence that standard is met
1.	A clear outline and theme	Clear from the beginning. Abstract: 'This paper focuses on a discussion of my experience as reviewer for the journal EJOLTs and my archaeology of personal knowledge that underpins my values.' This describes the achievement, both as an illumination of research paradigms and an 'I' relationship with them. 'The discussion is designed to be helpful to authors of EJOLTs papers, for planning their data collection and theorising.' Thus the educational influence of this paper itself is highlighted and explains later use of examples and vignettes and layout of the paper. The doubt in the title (?) is unhelpful. The themes are woven carefully throughout, culminating in shining a light on the purposes and focuses of this special issue.
2.	A clear and relatable (Bassey, 1996) process of generation	Vignettes powerful. The values section near the beginning is helpful explanatory insights for the reader. The author is clear that this is his own journey as well as an explication of research paradigms. The melding is convincing and draws me throughout. This is a unique contribution to the EJOLTS literature and needs as a result to be convincing to the reader. It's convincing to me through the logical organisation and progression of ideas and the synthesis between individual researcher and research paradigms. It is an I-t, unique in its explanatory power of an 'individual [taking] a decision to understand the world from [his] own point of view, as a person

		<i>claiming originality and exercising his personal judgement responsibly with universal intent.</i> 'I can relate to all this. It is clear to me. Going through illuminative evaluation struck a real chord with me. This set of paradigms whose archaeology reveals an increasing concentration on individuals' own educational development. Yes, very relatable.
3.	The educational influence (of the EJOLTS process, of LET, of another author) on the given author's I-e-t	Large part of the early sections deal with background I-t details, showing his educational influences. Links with social justice issues to Mairin's paper. Very clear exposition of paradigms in qualitative research, showing links gradually closer and closer to LT and EJOLTS. Steady progression of the various ways of seeing research in terms of their educational influences on the author, and their intentions generally to educate, settling finally on LT and EJOLTS.
4.	A contribution to or confirmation of LET	Very clearly the case. It's both a contribution to, and confirmation of, LT. Clear at the end about the unproven nature of some aspects of the paper, but has insights that override this in terms of validity and rigour.
5.	The educational influence on Moira and Pete as readers (and you as authors of the special issue).	Very helpful for me to read something about such a wide subject as qualitative educational research and LT's antecedents, discussed respectfully and with profound insight. Melding that with the author's own I-t is itself educational for me. I had never thought of such an approach before. It's the seamlessness of the whole – personal journey (archaeology) and different forms of research – that has shown me connections and ways of relating to knowledge in new ways.
a.	To clarify and illuminate issues of broad qualitative methodology as may help authors to accumulate rich data to support their arguments.	The issues of broad qualitative methodology to accumulate rich data are interwoven throughout the text, with their educational purposes clear for the reader and author throughout.
b.	To suggest types of theorising and theorising (sensitising) questions to support the construction of their own living-theory.	This is built up through the whole paper to the end, and in 'Motivating Learning', for example, shows what are the challenges to be overcome in promoting the development of the readers' own potential I-ts.
c.	To provide vignettes as exemplars of relevant research I have been involved with.	These bring the text even more to life and demonstrate individuals rather than ideas, to show personal experience as significant and telling (relatable?) for the reader, and instructive for a potential living-theorist.

Paper 5. Brian Williamson / Jack Whitehead – ML / PM conversation 23rd February 2021 at <https://youtu.be/eWSRUaDskMQ>

As educational researchers, how useful is the Living Educational Theory research body of literature as a resource that informs our systematic review meta-analytic (SRMA) enquiries?

Pre-conversation analysis (ML)

	Standard of Judgment 1–5 is the common list Subsequent are authors' criteria	Evidence that standard is met
1.	A clear outline and theme	Very clear from the outset. Abstract, keywords appropriate. p.1 outlines reader's journey through the paper.

2.	A clear and relatable (Bassey, 1996) process of generation	Different kind of relatability from other papers (C&J's and Swaroop's). Intellectual relatability for me. Generation of new ways of thinking about connections broadens potential scope of LET and individual I-e-ts. Thinking about I-e-ts and doing an I-e-t are different. This is valuable because it's more about the paradigm than the fulfilment of one.
3.	The educational influence (of the EJOLTS process, of LET, of another author) on the given author's I-e-t	The criteria relating to EJOLTS throughout is a precise testament to the educational influence of EJOLTS, of LET (other authors) and I-e-ts of others and their own (need to think about this one). Meta-analysis new for Jack; woven into the threads of the paper.
4.	A contribution to or confirmation of LET	Clearly a bid to make a case for LET, adding to LET and a contribution to the paradigm.
5.	The educational influence on Moira and Pete as readers (and you as authors of the special issue).	I am new to meta-analysis and weaving this into the EF guides my learning about a new form of thinking, shows appropriateness of enquiry into linking this with LET.
J&B	Do they show that there are two mutually exclusive cases that are relevant to Living Meta-Analytic enquiry: (1) the generation of a living-educational-theory and (2) the generation of other theories? (Publishing criteria for EJOLTS at: https://ejolts.net/submission#Publishing%20Criteria at Point 5.)	Yes. They are mutually exclusive, but as always, Jack (1989; 2020) endorses the inclusion of other theories and ways of researching as useful additions to the generation of knowledge when engaged in LT research and I-e-ts.
J&B	Do they as LT researchers build their own living-educational-theory informed by their meta-analysis of the living-educational-theories of others?	Title would suggest this. However, this isn't the direct purpose of their paper. It's a contribution to LT research throughout EJOLTS, rather than individuals writing together their joint I-e-ts. It's very important because there are few examples of this in the LET literature. It's a milestone.
J&B	Has the meta-analysis helped the researchers to 'creatively and critically engaged with' [their] 'own thinking and the thinking of others' (EJOLTS criterion: 1)	Clear evidence of creative and critical engagement with their own and others; thinking. Dialectical ways of knowing: "In our collaboration we have aimed to maintain an educational conversation that inspires critical and creative responses in each other as the paper unfolds (p.2)" are flagged up and then shown emerging throughout. This creativity and critical engagement with each others' and themselves reveal themselves in on p. 3 as they develop it with the sense of interviews with oneself and others. Highlights the I – and here, the 'we' as they seek to
J&B	'Are all claims supported by appropriate evidence?' (criterion: 5)	Always.
J&B	Does the account communicate clearly how knowledge claims are validated? (criterion: 6).	Yes, that's a foundation to the paper.