

**30 YEARS ON: CREATING A LIVING EDUCATIONAL THEORY FROM
QUESTIONS OF THE KIND,
'HOW DO I IMPROVE MY PRACTICE?'**

**Jack Whitehead
University of Cumbria
November 2019**

**Update of the paper published in the Cambridge Journal of Education, Vol. 19,
No.1,1989, pp. 41-52**

We shall not cease from exploration, and the end of all our exploring will be to arrive where
we started and know the place for the first time.

T. S. Eliot

SUMMARY

30 years ago, in 1989, a paper of mine was published that is most often referenced in relation to my work in Living Theory research. In this 2019 issue of EJOLTS I revisit the paper in order to share my present living-educational-theory as an explanation of educational influence in my own learning, in the learning of others and in the learning of the social formations that influence my practice and understandings. What I have done, using the hypertext facility enable by EJOLTS, is to add links to the 1989 text that engage with the issue under discussion and update it with my 2019 insights as I continue to generate my living-educational-theory. The hypertext facility I use in this update is just one of the technological advances that have influenced my educational practice and research. Another is the use of digital visual data, from educational practice and educational relationships, in clarifying and communicating the meanings of my embodied and ontological values as explanatory principles in explanations of educational influences in learning. In 1989 I could not produce convincing evidence that living-educational-theories could be awarded doctoral degrees. In 2019 I can provide the evidence, from Universities around the world, that such explanations of educational influences in learning have been recognised and received academic accreditation. Having satisfied myself that the validity for this claim is beyond reasonable doubt I now focus on extending living-educational-theories from the explanations of individuals of their educational influences in their own learning, into explanations of educational influences in the learning of learning of others and in the learning of social formations. The explanatory principles I use are also extended to include living global citizenship.

Introduction

The 2019 hypertext linked updates to the 1989 text are focused on the following 6 issues in the production of a living-educational-theory:

Producing a living-educational-theory

The 1989 paper is still relevant for practitioner-researchers who are exploring the implications of asking, researching and answering questions of the kind, ‘How do I improve what I am doing?’ where the implications include the generation of a valid explanation of their educational influences in their own learning. The extension and transformation of these understandings with my insights in 2019 are focused on the generation of valid, evidence-based explanations of educational influences in the learning of others and in the learning of the social formations that influence practice and understandings with the value of living global citizenship. I now make a clear distinction between a living-educational-theory and Living Theory research. Living-educational-theories are the explanations that individuals produce to explain their educational influences in their own learning in the learning of others and in the learning of the social formations that influence practice and understanding. Living Theory research is the conceptual framework that enables individual practitioner-researchers to locate their enquiries within this research approach. It is important to understand that no living-educational-theory can be generated from the conceptual framework of Living Theory research. Each living-educational-theory is unique to the individual and distinguished by the unique constellation of values that the individual uses as explanatory principles in their explanation of their educational influence in learning. In traditional theories, the behaviour of an individual is explained through a process of deduction from the general concepts of the theory to the individual case that is subsumed by the theory.

1) [‘How do I improve my practice?’ - a question of methodology.](#)

In 1989 I focused on the inclusion of ‘I’ in the research methodology and the use of action reflection cycles in the enquiry, ‘How do I improve my practice?’ In 2019 I continue to include ‘I’ and action research cycles in my living-theory-methodology. This methodology has now been extended to include insights from other methodological approaches such as narrative inquiry, phenomenology, case study, action research, grounded theory, ethnography and autoethnography.

2) [A question of acknowledging one's existence as a living contradiction.](#)

In 1989 I distinguished my rationality as dialectical with its nucleus of contradiction. I continue to experience myself as a living contradiction and value the response of my imagination in creating a future that resolves the contradiction in living more fully the values that I use to give meaning and purpose to my life. However, in 2019 I distinguish my rationality, as a form of inclusion that is distinguished by a relationally dynamic and living logic.

3) [How do we show our values in action?](#)

In 1989 I highlighted the importance of values in forming explanatory principles in explanations of educational influences in learning. Following Feyerabend I believed that I could clarify the meanings of my values in the course of their emergence in practice. In 2019 I continue to believe this. However, following an insight shared by Laidlaw in 1996, as I supervised her doctoral research programme, I now stress the importance of understanding that the values themselves are living and capable of evolving. I also now understand the importance of the relationally dynamic nature of values as they exist and interact with other values in an individual’s unique constellation of the values they use as explanatory principles in explanations of educational influences in learning. In 1989 I was aware of the importance of visual data in clarifying the meanings of values. The advances in digital technology have

enabled me to use of process of empathetic resonance, with digital visual data, to clarify and communicate the meanings of embodied expressions of values as explanatory principles. These advances also enabled me to understand better some of the limitations of print-based media for communicating the meanings of these values.

4) [How do we know that what the researcher says is true? - a question of validity.](#)

In 1989 I believed it to be important to strengthen the validity of a living-educational-theory by subjecting drafts to the mutual rational controls of critical discussion in a validation group of some 3-8 peers. I advocated the use four questions concerned, comprehensibility, evidence, sociohistorical and sociocultural understands and authenticity to help to strengthen the validity. I continue to hold firmly to this belief.

5) [How can we move from the individual to the universal? - a question of generalisability.](#)

Many traditional theories explain behaviour and events in terms of general, linguistic concepts that apply to all the behaviours and events that are subsumed by the theory. This kind of theory has generalisability in that it applies to all. In 1989 a common criticism of a living-educational-theory was that it was anecdotal, subjective and could not be applied to all. To meet this criticism I pointed out that what I later referred to as Living Theory research was generalisable in referring to all, but not from within a general linguistic concept. In Living Theory research 'all' refers to the shared form of life between the individuals who are generating their own living-educational-theories. In 2019 this idea of a shared form of life is related to communities of Living Theory researchers who are focusing some of their attention on contributing to Living Theory research as a social movement. The activities and relationships of Living Theory researchers are shown within a collection of Living Theory doctorates, living-posters, contributions to EJOLTS and to a Living Theory wiki..

6) [Which power relations influence the academic legitimacy of a living educational theory? - a question of the politics of truth.](#)

In 1989 my understanding of power relations and the politics of truth was mainly influenced by the ideas of Michel Foucault on power/knowledge. In 2019 my understanding has been deepened and extended by Boaventura de Sousa Santos ideas on epistemicide. These ideas implicate my own contribution, as a Western Academic, for a failure to recognise the contribution of indigenous knowledge to a global knowledge- base. In relation to the politics of truth I continue to support the legitimation of practitioner-knowledge with values of human flourishing as explanatory principles as a contribution to the spreading influence of Living Theory research as a social movement.

At the risk of overloading you with my writings you can access the archive of my writings between 1989-2019 from <https://www.actionresearch.net/writings/writing.shtml>

The 1989 paper with updates using a hypertext link at the beginning of each section

**CREATING A LIVING EDUCATIONAL THEORY FROM QUESTIONS OF THE
KIND,
'HOW DO I IMPROVE MY PRACTICE?'**

SUMMARY

This paper argues that a living educational theory of professional practice can be constructed from practitioner's enquiries of the kind, 'How do I improve my practice?'. The significance of 'I' existing as a living contradiction in such enquiries is considered and other epistemological issues related to values, validity and generalisability are discussed from the living perspective. The process of gaining academic legitimation for a living form of theory is examined in terms of the politics of truth within our Institutions of Higher Education.

Have you ever made a claim to know your own educational development and subjected the claim to public criticism? If you have, what does such a claim to educational knowledge look like?

I'm assuming that all readers of this Journal will at some time have asked themselves questions of the kind, 'How do I improve my practice?', and will have endeavoured to improve some aspect of their practice. I believe that a systematic reflection on such a process provides insights into the nature of the descriptions and explanations which we would accept as valid accounts of our educational development. I claim that a living educational theory will be produced from such accounts.

The idea that philosophers interpret the world whilst the point is to improve it, is not a new idea. I have been urging my fellow academics for some years (Whitehead 1982) to carry out an investigation into their own educational development as they question themselves on how they are improving their practice. I believe that academics who write about educational theory should do just that: make a claim to know their development and subject it to public criticism. In this way I believe that they will come to see that it is possible to create a living educational theory which can be related directly to practice.

PRODUCING A LIVING EDUCATIONAL THEORY

The traditional view is that a theory is a general explanatory framework which can generate descriptions and explanations for empirically observed regularities and the behaviour of individual cases. The explanations are offered in the conceptual terms of propositions which define determinate relationships between variables. Piagetian Cognitive Stage Theory is a classical example of such a theory. By their nature concepts involve grasping principles thus ensuring that theories are presented in general terms.

A commitment to the propositional form can also be seen, surprisingly, in those researchers who are committed to a reflexive approach to understanding. For example, Kilpatrick's (1951) view on the importance of dialogue in educational theory is presented in a propositional form. A more recent example in the work of Gitlin and Goldstein (1987) on a dialogical approach to understanding shows the authors presenting their case within a propositional form. Whilst I can recognise the importance of what they say, about teachers forming relationships that enable school change to be based on a joint inquiry into what is really appropriate, I believe that the propositional form of presentation will prevent them getting closer to answering their final, dialogical question, 'How can we encourage the conditions necessary for teachers to enter into a dialogue aimed at understanding?'.

Even those academics one would expect to understand the need to create an alternative to the propositional form of theory remain within it. For example Donald Schön (1983) points out that,

"when someone reflects-in-action, he becomes a researcher in the practice context. He is not dependent on the categories of established theory and technique, but constructs a new theory of the unique case."

Schön is however committed to the fundamental category of established theory in holding to the propositional form,

"Theories are theories regardless of their origin: there are practical, common-sense theories as well as academic or scientific theories. A theory is not necessarily accepted, good, or true; it is only a set of interconnected propositions that have the same referent - the subject of the theory. Their interconnectedness is reflected in the logic of relationships among propositions: change in propositions at one point in the theory entails changes in propositions elsewhere in it.

Theories are vehicles for explanation, prediction, explanatory theory explains events by setting forth propositions from which these events may be inferred, a predictive theory sets forth propositions from which inferences about future events may be made, and a theory of control describes the conditions under which events of a certain kind may be made to occur. In each case, the theory has an 'if...then....' form."
(Argyris,C. and Schön,D. 1975)

I am arguing that the propositional form is masking the living form and content of an educational theory which can generate valid descriptions and explanations for the educational development of individuals. This is not to deny the importance of propositional forms of understanding. I am arguing for a reconstruction of educational theory into a living form of question and answer which includes propositional contributions from the traditional disciplines of education.

Gadamer (1975) points out that despite Plato we are still not ready for a logic of question and answer. He says that Collingwood (1978) helped to move us forward but died before he could develop this logic in a systematic way. Collingwood points out that if the meaning of a proposition is relative to the question it answers, its truth must be relative to the same thing. I agree with his point that meaning, agreement and contradiction, truth and falsehood, do not belong to propositions in their own right, they belong only to propositions as the answers to questions.

In saying that the theory should be in a living form, I recognise that this creates a fundamental problem. The way academics think about theory is constrained by propositional logic. All academics working in the field of educational theory present the theory in terms of propositional relationships. However, the purpose of my own text is to direct your attention to the living individuals and the contexts within which a living theory is being produced (Lomax 1986) . Again I wish to stress that this is not to deny the importance of propositional forms of understanding. In a living educational theory the logic of the propositional forms, whilst existing within the explanations given by practitioners in making sense of their practice, does not characterise the explanation. Rather the explanation is characterised by the logic of

question and answer used in the exploration of questions of the form, 'How do I improve my practice?'

In developing such an approach I have had to come to terms with questions concerning an appropriate methodology for enquiries such as, 'How do I improve this process of education here?'. In looking at video-tapes of my practice I have had to confront the questions which arise on recognising the 'I' in the question as existing as a living contradiction. In the production of an explanation for my practice I have had to question how to include and present values whose meaning can only be clarified in the course of their emergence in practice. I have had to face questions related to validity and generalisability. I have also had to question the power relations which influence the academic legitimacy of a living educational theory.

In such a short article all I can do is outline the present state of my thinking in relation to these questions.

1) ['HOW DO I IMPROVE MY PRACTICE?' - A QUESTION OF METHODOLOGY.](#)

If we look at the locations where a living form of educational theory is being produced (Lomax 1986, McNiff 1988) we can trace the development of a number of teacher/researchers who have used the following form of action/reflection cycle for presenting their claims to know their own educational development as they investigate questions of the form,

'How do I improve this process of education here?'

I experience problems when my educational values are negated in my practice.

I imagine ways of overcoming my problems.

I act on a chosen solution.

I evaluate the outcomes of my actions.

I modify my problems, ideas and actions in the light of my evaluations ...(and the cycle continues).

This form of enquiry falls within the tradition of action research. It can be distinguished from other approaches in the tradition through its inclusion of 'I' as a living contradiction within the presentation of a claim to educational knowledge.

2) [A QUESTION OF ACKNOWLEDGING ONE'S EXISTENCE AS A LIVING CONTRADICTION.](#)

My insights about the nature of educational theory have been influenced by viewing video-tapes of my classroom practice. I could see that the 'I' in the question 'How do I improve this process of education here?', existed as a living contradiction. By this I mean that 'I' contained two mutually exclusive opposites, the experience of holding educational values and the experience of their negation.

I searched the back issues of Educational Theory to see if I could find details of similar experiences reported by other researchers. I began to appreciate how the crucial issues of logic and values continued to reappear in the Journal. From Cunningham's (1953) analysis of the 'Extensional Limits of Aristotelian Logic', through Mosier's (1967), 'From Enquiry logic to Symbolic logic', to Tostberg's (1976), 'Observations of the Logic Bases of Educational Policy', the debate about the logical basis of educational theory continues to rage in the literature.

A similar debate can be seen in the realm of values. We have "The role of Value Theory in Education" (Butler 1954), 'Are Values Verifiable (Bayles 1960), 'Education and some moves towards a Value Methodology (Clayton 1969) and 'Knowledge and Values' (Smith 1976). What these articles pick out is the continuing concern of educational researchers with the fundamental problems of logic and values in the production of educational theory.

I began to understand the concrete problems experienced by adherents to dialectical and propositional logics when they try to establish a sustained dialogue. The nucleus of dialectics, contradiction, is eliminated from descriptions and explanations presented in the propositional form (Popper 1963). Dialecticians claim that the propositional form masks the dialectical nature of reality (Marcuse 1964). I traced the tension between these logics to differences between Plato and Aristotle. In the Phaedrus, Socrates tells us that there are two ways of coming to know. We break things down into their separate components and we hold things together under a general idea. He says that those thinkers who can hold both the one and the many together he calls dialecticians. Aristotle, on the other hand demands, in his work on interpretation, that the questioner puts his question into a definite form and asks whether or not a person has a particular characteristic or not. Aristotle's propositional logic eliminates contradictions from correct thought.

An understanding of a living form developed, in my case, from the combination of the following insight from Wittgenstein with visual records of practice.

"I" is not the name of a person, nor "here" of a place, and "this" is not a name. But they are connected with names. Names are explained by means of them. It is also true that it is characteristic of physics not to use these words." (Wittgenstein 1953)

Now 'I', 'this' and 'here', are contained within questions of the form, 'How do I improve this process of education here?'. In viewing video-tapes of our own educational practices I believe that we can see our own 'I's existing as living contradictions. This revelation, through the visual record, is crucial for the reconstruction of educational theory. Yet there is a tendency to reduce the significance of "I" as it appears on a page of text. It is so easy to see the word 'I' and think of this as simply referring to a person. The "I" remains formal and is rarely examined for content in itself. When you view yourself on video you can see and experience your 'I' containing content in itself. By this I mean that you see yourself as a living contradiction, holding educational values whilst at the same time negating them. Is it not such tension, caused by this contradiction, which moves us to imagine alternative ways of improving our situation? By integrating such contradictions in the presentations of our claims to know our educational practice we can construct descriptions and explanations for the educational development of individuals (King 1987). Rather than conceive educational theory as a set of propositional relations from which we generate such descriptions and explanations I am suggesting we produce educational theory in the living form of dialogues (Larter 1987, Jensen 1987) which have their focus in the descriptions and explanations which practitioners

are producing for their own value-laden practice.

3) HOW DO WE SHOW OUR VALUES IN ACTION?

The reason that values are fundamental to educational theory is that education is a value-laden practical activity. We cannot distinguish a process as education without making a value-judgement. I am taking such values to be the human goals which we use to give our lives their particular form. These values, which are embodied in our practice, are often referred to in terms such as freedom, justice, democracy, (Peters 1966) and love and productive work (Fromm 1960). When offering an explanation for an individual's educational development these values can be used as reasons for action. For example, if a person is experiencing the negation of freedom, yet believes that she should be free, then the reason why she is acting to become free can be given in terms of freedom, i.e., I am acting in this way because I value my freedom. If someone asks why you are working to overcome anti-democratic forces in the work place then I believe that a commitment to the value of democracy would count as a reason to explain your actions. I do not believe that values are the type of qualities whose meanings can be communicated solely through a propositional form. I think values are embodied in our practice and their meaning can be communicated in the course of their emergence in practice. To understand the values, which move our educational development forward, I think we should start with records of our experience of their negation (Larter 1985,1987). I want to stress the importance of the visual records of our practice. In using such records we can both experience ourselves as living contradictions and communicate our understanding of the value-laden practical activity of education.

Through the use of video-tape the teachers can engage in dialogues with colleagues about their practice. They can show the places where their values are negated. A clear understanding of these values can be shown to emerge in practice through time and struggle (Jensen 1987). The kind of theory I have in mind forms part of the educational practices of the individuals concerned. It is not a theory which can be constituted into a propositional form. It is a description and explanation of practice which is part of the living form of the practice itself. I have suggested a dialogical form enables such a theory to be presented for public criticism. Within this form the action reflection cycle has been found (Lomax 1986) to be an appropriate way of investigating questions of the kind, 'How do we improve this process of education here?'. In this cycle we can study the gradual emergence of our values through time as we struggle to overcome the experience of their negation. We can describe and explain an individual's attempts to improve his or her educational practice (Foster 1980). This approach to educational theory is being developed in a community of educational researchers who are committed to forming and sustaining a dialogical community (Bernstein 1983) and who are willing to offer, for public criticism, records of their practice which are integrated within their claims to know this practice (Lomax 1986). I am suggesting that a form of question and answer can also show how to incorporate insights in the conceptual terms of the traditional forms of knowledge whilst acknowledging the existence of ourselves as living contradictions as we refer to the records of our practice.

4) HOW DO WE KNOW THAT WHAT THE RESEARCHER SAYS IS TRUE? - A QUESTION OF VALIDITY.

Questions of validity are fundamentally important in all research which is concerned with the generation and testing of theory. Researchers need to know what to use as the unit of appraisal and the standards of judgement in order to test a claim to educational knowledge. I

suggest that the unit of appraisal is the individual's claim to know his or her educational development. Within this unit of appraisal I use methodological, logical, ethical and aesthetic standards to judge the validity of the claim to knowledge (Whitehead and Foster 1984).

Whilst most researchers may find it strange to take a unit of appraisal as their claim to know their educational development I think the unit is clearly comprehensible. My commitment to this unit owes a great deal to the work of Michael Polanyi. As I read *Personal Knowledge* (Polanyi 1958), and reflected on my positivist approach to research (Whitehead 1972), Polanyi's work fulfilled its purpose of, "stripping away the crippling mutilations which centuries of objectivist thought have imposed on the minds of men".

"In grounding my epistemology in Personal Knowledge I am conscious that I have taken a decision to understand the world from my own point of view, as a person claiming originality and exercising his personal judgement responsibly with universal intent. This commitment determines the nature of the unit of appraisal in my claim to knowledge. The unit is the individual's claim to know his or her own educational development." (Whitehead 1985).

I have given above some indication of the nature of the standards of judgement I use to test the validity of an individual's claim to know their own educational development. The questions I ask in judging the validity of the claim include,

- a) Was the enquiry carried out in a systematic way? One methodological criteria I have used is the action reflection cycle described above (Foster 1980, Forrest 1983)
- b) Are the values used to distinguish the claim to knowledge as educational knowledge clearly shown and justified?
- c) Does the claim contain evidence of a critical accommodation of propositional contributions from the traditional disciplines of education?
- d) Are the assertions made in the claim clearly justified?
- e) Is there evidence of an enquiring and critical approach to an educational problem?

I characterise the application of these criteria as an approach to social validation. They are related to Habermas' view on the claims to validity I am making if I wish to participate in a process of reaching understanding with you. Habermas (1976) says that I must choose a comprehensible expression so that we can understand one another. I must have the intention of communicating a true proposition so that we can share my claim to knowledge. I must want to express my intentions truthfully so that we can believe what I say. Finally, I must choose an utterance that is right so that we can accept what I say and we can agree with one another with respect to a recognised normative background. Moreover, communicative action can continue undisturbed only as long as participants suppose that the validity claims they reciprocally raise are justified. However, such claims to knowledge may conform to acceptable standards of judgement yet still raise questions about their generalisability.

5) HOW CAN WE MOVE FROM THE INDIVIDUAL TO THE UNIVERSAL? - A QUESTION OF GENERALISABILITY.

Instead of thinking of an educational theory in terms of a set of propositional relationships

between linguistic concepts I am proposing a view of educational theory as a dynamic and living form whose content changes with the developing public conversations of those involved in its creation (Whitehead & Lomax 1987). The theory is constituted by the practitioners' public descriptions and explanations of their own practice. The theory is located not solely within these accounts but in the relationship between the accounts and the practice. It is this relationship which constitutes the descriptions and explanations as a living form of theory. In being generated from the practices of individuals it has the capacity to relate directly to those practices. To the extent that the values underpinning the practices, the dialogues of question and answer and the systematic form of action/reflection cycle, are shared assumptions within this research community, then we are constructing an educational theory with some potential for generalisability within a culture on inquiry (DeLong, 2019). The 'general' in a living theory still refers to 'all' but instead of being represented in a linguistic concept, 'all' refers to the shared form of life between the individuals constituting the theory. Now History shows us that new ideas have often met with skepticism, rejection or hostility from those who are working within the dominant paradigm. Researchers who are trying to make original and acknowledged contributions to their subject, education, might expect powerful opposition to their ideas.

6) WHICH POWER RELATIONS INFLUENCE THE ACADEMIC LEGITIMACY OF A LIVING EDUCATIONAL THEORY? - A QUESTION OF THE POLITICS OF TRUTH.

My enquiry has led me to the question of how to support those power relations which support the autonomy of practical rationality within education. As part of this enquiry I think it important to examine the power relations which are distorting, undermining and systematically blocking the development of dialogical communities.

"... In addition to the attempt to recover and reclaim the autonomy of practical rationality and show its relevance to all domains of culture, we realize that today the type of dialogical communities that are required for its flourishing are being distorted, undermined, and systematically blocked from coming into existence.... But today, when we seek for concrete exemplars of the types of dialogical communities in which practical rationality flourishes, we are at a much greater loss. Yet we can recognize how deeply rooted this frustrated aspiration is in human life." (Bernstein 1983)

Whilst this part of my enquiry is still embryonic I am continuing to study my own educational development as I engage with the following three problems.

A crucial issue in gaining academic legitimacy for a particular view of educational theory concerns the institutional arrangements for appointing examiners for Research Degrees in Education. For example in some institutions a student is not permitted, under any circumstances, to question the competence of an examiner once the examiner has been appointed by the Senate. Given that the academics in one such institution have committed themselves to the statement, "A University has a moral purpose in society in the sense of upholding certain standards of truth, freedom and democracy", this raises a question on how the academics are upholding these values.

I wish to question the power relations which sustain the view that competence is a matter of appointment rather than of judgement, on the grounds that any academic judgement should, as a matter of principle, be open to criticism and to the possibility of incompetence. Could any academic keep his or her integrity and at the same time accept the truth of power which

sustains the view that no questions of competence can be raised in the light of actual judgements?

I argue that, on principle, the power of truth is served by permitting such a challenge in relation to an examiner's judgement rather than seeing competence to be a procedural matter of appointment.

The second problem concerns the problem of self-identification in texts for publication. A problem I would have had in sending this work to a refereed Journal such as Educational Theory. The problem follows from a central point in this paper that academics and practitioners should identify themselves in their work context and, at some point in their research, offer for public criticism a claim to know their own educational development. However, the guidelines and procedures of the staff of Educational Theory state,

"Manuscripts are subjected to a double-blind reviewing process (i.e. reviewers do not know the identity of authors, the authors will not learn the identity of reviewers) ...

To preserve the advantages of blind reviewing, authors should avoid self-identification in the text as well as the footnotes of their manuscripts."

In asking that an alternative form of presentation is considered by the readership of such Journals as Educational Theory, a presentation which demands self-identification, I am conscious of entering, as Walker (Walker 1985) says, long-standing and fiercely defended positions in the history and philosophy of science. I do not enter such a debate lightly. I have found it necessary to engage with such politics of educational knowledge for the sake of developing an educational theory which can be directly related to the educational development of individuals.

The third problem is one in which the power relations in the academic community support the power of truth against the truth of power. I am thinking about the problem of testing one's ideas against those of others. In supporting the power of truth against the truth of power, academics offer their ideas for public criticism in a forum where the power of rationality in the force of better argument is paramount. Acknowledging mistakes is a fundamental part in developing our ideas.

In his paper, Educational Theory, Practical Philosophy and Action Research, Elliott (1987) treats Hirst (1983) rather gently and chooses a statement which does not fully acknowledge Hirst's mistake in advocating the 'disciplines approach to educational theory'.

"It is not so much that what I wrote in 1966 was mistaken as that what I omitted led to a distorting emphasis. Educational theory I still see as concerned with determining rationally defensible principles for educational practice." (Hirst 1983)

Because our views about educational theory affect the way we see human existence I believe it imperative to acknowledge that mistakes have been made and to understand the nature of these mistakes so that we can move forward.

Paul Hirst has in fact made a most generous acknowledgement that he was mistaken in his view of educational theory.

"In many characterisations of educational theory, my own included, principles justified in this way have until recently been regarded as at best pragmatic maxims having a first crude and superficial justification in practice that in any rationally developed theory would be replaced by principles with more fundamental, theoretical, justification. That now seems to me to be a mistake." (Hirst 1983)

I believe both Hirst and Elliott are making a mistake in their view of rationality. They both subscribe to a view of rationality which leads them to use a propositional form of discourse in their characterisations of educational theory. What I am advocating is that the propositional form of discourse in the disciplines of education should be incorporated within a living form of theory. This theory should not be seen in purely propositional terms. It should be seen to exist in the lives of practitioners as they reflect on the implications of asking themselves questions of the kind, 'How do I improve my practice?'

What I wish to do is to push Elliott's position forward. I think Gadamer points the way, but his propositional logic does not permit him to make the creative leap to a new synthesis.

Elliott points out that in developing our understanding we have to risk our values and beliefs. As we open ourselves to the things we seek to understand they will force us to become aware of problematic pre-judgements and to criticise them in the light of new meanings.

Let us be clear about my purpose. I am attempting to make an acknowledged and scholarly contribution to knowledge of my subject, education. This purpose is part of my contract of employment as a University Academic. I have chosen the field of educational theory because I am committed to the profession of education and believe that it needs a theory which can adequately describe and explain the educational development of individuals. I am writing as a professional in education. In saying this I want to distinguish my activities from those of a philosopher, psychologist, sociologist or historian. I value their contributions to education but I do not believe that educational theory can be adequately characterised by any of them. I believe the limits of philosophers, whose work I have benefited from, such as Elliott, Carr (1986) and Hirst, are limited by the propositional form of their discourse. As philosophers, rather than educationalists, they have not taken the leap necessary to comprehend the nature of educational theory. I am saying that educationalists, through studying their own attempts to answer questions such as, 'How do I improve my practice?', are constructing a living educational theory within which the work of Hirst, Carr, Elliott, Habermas and Gadamer, is usefully integrated (Eames 1987, Larter 1987).

It seems to me to be crucial to ask the right questions in Collingwood's sense of moving our enquiry forward. In his work on Educational Theory and Social Change, Pritchard (1988) says that the questions are: "How much do we wish to see, How much do we wish to understand? What conceptions, and alternative conceptions, of human practices do we have that will enable us to enhance and significantly enrich life and well-being?"

Pritchard argues that we urgently need studies within educational theory which will serve to demystify institutions and to unmask ideologies. He concludes,

" It is evident that the attempt to 'raid' the disciplines of education and to use materials drawn from these areas without considerable theoretical understanding and support is ill-advised and, ultimately, is based upon an incoherent conception of the theory of education."

My worry is that Pritchard's questions are still grounded within the conceptual forms of the disciplines of education. In order to construct an educational theory for professional practice I believe we will have to face the practical and theoretical implications of asking ourselves questions of the kind, 'How do I improve my practice?'

In the past I have been critical of academics who are unwilling to study their own educational development and subject their claim to know this development to social validation (Whitehead and Foster 1984). It seems that Whitty (1986) voices a similar criticism in the context of the work of American and Australian sociologists on the politics and sociology of education.

"Yet, if the prescriptions of these writers are not to remain purely rhetorical, there is an urgent need for them to engage in an active exploration of the implications of their work among the political constituencies in whose interests it is supposedly being carried out."

I hope to demonstrate my own engagement by investigating how relations which support the power of truth against the truth of power influence my own educational development. These influences are emerging as I engage with the politics of truth within arenas such as the Educational Research Associations and Institutions of Higher Education.

In conclusion I identify with a conversation between Giles Deleuze and Michel Foucault which considers the necessity for the practitioner of speaking on his or her own behalf.

"You were the first to teach us something absolutely fundamental: the indignity of speaking for others. We ridiculed representation and said it was finished, but we failed to draw the consequences of this 'theoretical' conversion - to appreciate the theoretical fact that only those directly concerned can speak in a practical way on their own behalf." (Foucault 1980)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argyris,C & Schön,D. 1975 *Theory in Practice. Increasing Professional Effectiveness.* p 5. Jossey Bass. London.

Bayles,E.E. 1960 Are Values Verifiable? *Educational Theory*,20, pp. 71-78

Bernstein,R.J. 1983 *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism.* Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Butler,D.J. 1954 The role of value theory in educational theory, *Educational Theory*, 4, pp. 69-77.

Carr,W. 1986 Theories of Theory and Practice, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 20, pp. 177-186

Clayton,A.S. 1969 Education and some moves towards a value methodology. *Educational Theory*. 19, pp.198-200

Collingwood,R.G 1978 *An Autobiography.* Ch.5: Question and Answer. (Oxford, Oxford University Press)

Cunningham,E.C. 1953 Extensional Limits of Aristotelian Logic. *Educational Theory*. 3, pp. 92-107

Eames,K. 1987 *The Growth of a Teacher-Researcher's Attempt to Understand, Writing, Redrafting, learning and Autonomy in the Examination Years*. MPhil. University of Bath.

Eames,K. 1988 Evaluating a Teacher Researcher's Choice of Action Research. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 212-218.

Elliott,J. 1987 Educational Theory Practical Philosophy and Action Research. *British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol. 35, No.2, pp 149-169.

Forrest,M. 1983 *The Teacher as Researcher- the use of historical artefacts in primary schools*. MEd. Dissertation, University of Bath.

Foster,D. 1980 Explanations for teachers' attempts to improve the process of education for their pupils.MEd. Dissertation, University of Bath.

Foucault,M. 1980 in C. Gordon (Ed) *Power Knowledge* (London, Harvester)

Fromm,E. 1960 *Fear of Freedom*. p18. Routledge & Kegan Paul

Gadamer,H.G. 1975 *Truth and Method* (London, Sheed and Ward).

Gitlin,A.& Goldstein,S. 1987 A Dialogical Approach to Understanding: Horizontal Evaluation. *Educational Theory*,37,No.1, pp. 17-29

Habermas,J. 1976 *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. London; Heinemann.

Hirst, P.H.(Ed) 1983 *Educational Theory and its Foundation Disciplines* (London, Routledge).

Jensen,M. 1987 *A Creative Approach to the Teaching of English in the Examination Years*. MPhil. University of Bath.

Kilpatrick,W.1951 Crucial Issues in Current Educational Theory. *Educational Theory*, 1, No.1, pp. 1-8.

King, R. 1987 *An Action Inquiry into Day Release in Further Education*. MPhil. University of Bath.

Larter, A. 1985 *What ought I to have done? An examination of events surrounding a racist poem*. Paper to the symposium, 'Action Research, Educational Theory and the Politics of Educational Knowledge', at BERA 1985.

Larter,A. 1988 *An Action Research Approach to Classroom discussion in the Examination Years*. MPhil. University of Bath.

Lomax,P. 1986 Action Researcher's Action Research: a symposium. *British Journal of In-*

- Service Education*. 13, No.1. University of Sheffield, 30 August 1985, pp.42-50.
- Marcuse, H. 1964 *One Dimensional Man*. (London, R & K.P.)
- McNiff, J. 1988 *Action Research - Principles and Practice*. (London, Macmillan).
- Mosier, R.D. 1967 From Enquiry Logic to Symbolic Logic. *Educational Theory*, 17, pp. 32-38.
- Peters, R.S. 1966 *Ethics and Education*. Allen and Unwin.
- Polanyi, M. 1958 *Personal Knowledge*. (Oxford, Oxford University Press)
- Popper, K. 1963 *Conjectures and Refutations*. (Oxford, Oxford University Press)
- Pritchard, M. 1988 Educational Theory and Social Change. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol.18, No.1 pp 99-109
- Schön, D. 1983 *The Reflective Practitioner*. Basic Books New York.
- Smith, P.G. 1976 Knowledge and Values. *Educational Theory*, 26, 29-39
- Tostberg, R.E. 1976 Observations of the Logical Bases of Educational Policy. *Educational Theory*, 26, pp.74-82
- Walker, R. 1985 *Doing Research*. p181. Methuen.
- Whitehead, J. 1972 *A preliminary investigation of the process through which adolescents acquire scientific understanding*. Unpub. M.A. dissertation. University of London.
- Whitehead, J. 1985 An Analysis of an Individual's Educational Development: The Basis for Personally Oriented Action Research. Chapt. in *Educational Research: Principles, Policies and Practices*. Ed. Shipman, M. Falmer. London.
- Whitehead, J. & Foster, D 1984 Action Research and professional educational development. *Cambridge Action Research Network*. Bulletin No.6, pp. 41-45.
- Whitehead, J. & Lomax, P. 1987 Action Research and the Politics of Educational Knowledge. *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol.13, No.2. pp 175-190.
- Whitty, G. 1986 Recent American and Australian Approaches to the Sociology and Politics of Education: Review Article. *Educational Theory* Vol.36, No.1, pp81-89.
- Wittgenstein, L. 1953 *Philosophical Investigations*. (Oxford, Basil Blackwell)