

***PART THREE: TOWARD A
HUMANE AND CRITICAL
SCHOLARSHIP OF PRACTICE***

CHAPTER NINE: DEVELOPING A CONNOISSEUR’S EYE: EXPLORING THE AESTHETICS OF MY TEACHING AND LEARNING RELATIONSHIPS ON MAPOD

In this chapter I aim to test my claim to originality described in my abstract as “embodied in the aesthetics of my teaching and learning relationships, as I learn to respond to the humanity of my students and their educative needs, listen to their stories and find an ethic of care that contains them in good company, returning them to their stories as more complete human beings”. It is about showing my values in action; in other words, the ideas and embodied nature of my values that constitute loving and life-affirming educational practice.

In doing so, I respond to Eisner’s (1997) injunction to use alternative forms of representation to explore this phenomenon by drawing on visual evidence contained in video clips of my practice and on narrative accounts to illuminate the qualities that have been experienced. In explaining and presenting what I do in these teaching and learning relationships, I also draw on ideas in constructivist and interpretivist approaches to human inquiry (Schwandt, 1994) as a means to help construct and explain the qualities of my own ‘living theory’ (Whitehead, 1989) as embodied in my practice.

Whitehead suggests that visual forms of representation may overcome the constraints of text-bound accounts of action research and illuminate values in action:

“One of the constraints on developing dialectical forms of representation of educational and curriculum theories could be the text-bound nature of much educational research and theorising. It could be that a breakthrough in dialectical forms of representation is imminent in the recent developments in image-based research (Prosser, 1998), where the meanings of values, such as freedom, respect, care, love and compassion can be shown in the process of their

emergence in practice... These multi-media forms of representation may help curriculum action researchers to show the meanings of the values which are embodied in their educational relationships” (Whitehead, 1999:80).

In exploring the aesthetics of my teaching and learning relationships, I will begin by outlining the tenets of those propositional theories that inform my understanding of what I do, and then examine the presentational forms contained in the video clips to illuminate, interpret and appraise the qualities of my practice that I describe in my living theory explanations. In particular, I will draw on video material that shows me working with Louise and Margaret (students on MAPOD 4), and Marcia and Sue (students on MAPOD 5). By drawing on these visual images of my practice, I aim to illuminate and support my claims to contain them in good company and to return them to their stories as more complete human beings. I want to describe this process as one of collaborative co-authoring in which *I take my lead from them* in the facilitation of their learning journey, as I work with them individually and alongside their peers toward a process of coherence and clarification of their own narrative accounts.

In this thesis I have suggested that one of my values is to honour the experience that students bring with them. Indeed, the experience that I have in mind is in respect of lived experience; in other words, life learning and not just work experience. In this regard they are the experts and I am the learner, and as such I approach their stories and every learning conversation from a position of genuine interest and curiosity and, like Anderson and Goolishian (1992), from a perspective of *not knowing*, thus being open to new possibilities emerging in the stories told and lived.

Introduction

Interpretivist thinking is concerned with “grasping or understanding the meaning of social phenomena” (Schwandt, 1994:119). What I am concerned to grasp and bring to light in this account are the aesthetic qualities of my teaching and learning relationships in the context of MAPOD, as I learn to develop a connoisseur’s eye and develop my own artistry in facilitating the process of narrative accounting in student learning. I want to suggest that this artistry is central to my inquiry, as I seek to live my values in action and keep in mind questions of the kind “How do I improve my practice?”. By drawing on ontological hermeneutics, I accept that we are constrained by our language and history, and it is these limits that make the process of meaning construction hermeneutical. Interpretation is thus conditional to human inquiry and not merely a methodological option. Interpretivism holds that “human behaviour is purposive” and suggests that:

“Social agents are considered autonomous, intentional, active, goal directed: they construe, construct, and interpret their own behaviour and that of their fellow agents” (Schwandt, 1994:120).

It is these qualities of agency that are being exercised by my students as they seek to construct accounts of their own knowing through their assignments and dissertations on MAPOD, and in my role as educator I seek to facilitate them in the production of coherent accounts. Schwandt (1994:121) tells us that a “hermeneutical undertaking is analogous to the interpretation of a text”; in other words, a reading of the social situation, in which the interpreter participates in the production of meaning via participation in the *circle of readings or interpretations*.

It is this sense of the hermeneutic circle of meaning that I want to suggest provides a helpful way of thinking about the qualities of my facilitation as I help

students search for meaningful constructions within their own assignments. I help them toward a construction of the whole in relation to the parts, through listening carefully to their telling and retellings, and responding to their storied accounts.

The concept of ‘educational connoisseurship’ is grounded in the “consummatory function” of aesthetic knowing - “the developed ability to experience the subtleties of form” (Eisner, 1985:28, cited in Schwandt, 1994:129). Schwandt tells us that the connoisseur perceives and/or experiences qualities in the sensory features of a phenomena, and these are not merely impressions, but more specifically a perceptual and cognitive framework, enabling the connoisseur to develop:

“...a kind of heightened awareness or educated perception - a particular kind of attention to nuance and detail, to multiple dimensions or aspects - that comes from the intimate familiarity with the phenomenon being examined” (Schwandt, 1994:129).

Polanyi (1962:54) suggests that connoisseurship can only be demonstrated by example and not precept. He argues that skill and connoisseurship come as much from the art of doing as knowing. Taking the medical practitioner as an example, Polanyi suggests that the recognition of symptoms comes through repeatedly learning from cases where the symptom is known to be authoritatively present, side by side with cases where it is known to be absent.

Similarly, educative connoisseurship, I suggest, develops over time as the practitioner learns to attend to individual cases, recognising not only common learning problems but also the unique difficulties experienced by individual students and gaining familiarity with their case histories in the course of the learning relationship.

It is the paradox of this intimate knowledge of individual learning and development histories, combined with not knowing how their particular storied accounts might unfold, that in my view heightens the senses. In the case of my students, the phenomenon being examined is their narrative account of lived experience, embracing their personal and professional learning histories, linked to their particular MAPOD enquiries.

Their narrative accounts represent an expression or a reconstitution of their lived experience. In facilitating this, I am concerned with the production and process of their enquiries, enabled by an aesthetic appreciation of and familiarity with the intimacies, details and nuances of their stories, over time. The video clips provide a glimpse of my developing connoisseur's eye, as I come to better know the intimacies of my own practice in my learning relationships with them, and in the process develop a more reflective, appreciative and critical stance toward it. Although it cannot show you my embodied knowledge, perhaps it can point toward the values that guide my knowing in action.

In the Context of MAPOD

The learning relationship on MAPOD is organised in a way that allows individuals to present their individual experience and understanding(s) of those experiences within the frame of reference of their individual enquiries. The learning relationship is organised in the social context of the action learning set, where individuals present their problems posing agendas in the company of their peers and, in some cases, in a one-to-one conversation with a tutor.

The taken for granted is that each person brings a life perspective and the skills of sense making and meaning generation to these learning conversations. It is through the processes of social construction and dialogue that understanding

and meaning emerges, giving meaning and organisation to lived experience. Furthermore, it is in this understanding of narrative reality that human action takes place and where the capacity for human agency may be either enhanced or diminished. The MAPOD as an educational developmental programme serves to develop the human potential of individual actors in the context of personal, professional and organisational learning. Organisations exist within the wider social sphere and the working lives of employees are not solely contained within the organisation; rather, the organisation impinges and draws on the life world of the individual, and is itself a product of the wider social system.

Communicative action, meaning generating discourse and dialogue, occurs within the social, organisational and educational systems, and is shaped by the conventions of those systems and their perceived functions and purposes. The narratives told by individuals in these systems will either enhance or inhibit personal perceptions of competence, freedom and agency to act. The educational arena can provide a space in which a more critical discourse can emerge, as a means to facilitate the competence of the individual and in so doing enhance their sense of personal and professional empowerment. Thus, as my practice has evolved in the context of MAPOD, I am concerned to facilitate:

- a problem posing and critical space;
- the development of voice and mind;
- the process of personal and organisational learning and change; and
- the education of the social formation in both the academy and the particular practice context of the students.

The dynamics of the action learning process create a context for reflective ‘learning’ conversations, and these involve a mutual search and exploration through dialogue. Such conversations facilitate the emergence of different

perspectives in a free flow of ideas, which in turn enable new meanings and understandings to continuously emerge and evolve. It is through these socially reconstructed meanings that voice and mind may be reclaimed and through which our meanings and perspectives may change. As the action learning set and the tutor facilitator listen to the stories told, the question is always being asked “What is going on here?”. Citing Geertz, Schwandt (1994:123) puts it more bluntly, saying “the trick is to figure out what the devil they think they are up to”. It is in response to this process of social inquiry that either support or challenge is presented to the narrative, as participants draw out collaboratively the coherence and truth of the story told. In this sense the action learning set functions like a reflecting team, providing feedback and monitoring of the story told, generating new ideas and possibilities for interpretation, the purpose of which, is to help the individual consider their position (account) by increasing the range of options available to them. Anderson and Goolishian (1992) refer to the conversation as a linguistic event in which new meanings are continually evolving.

“Learning then, is the generation of new knowledge through conversation. By conversation, we mean a generative conversation, a dialogue in which there is a ‘talking with’, a co-exploration that leads to the co-development of alternative views, new learning and solutions” (Anderson and Swim, 1993:146).

The reflecting team shares with the humanistic co-operative inquiry model (Reason, 1988) its three characteristics of participatory and holistic knowing, critical subjectivity and knowledge in action, both recognising the multiversity, reflexivity and the emergent process of inquiry and learning.

The tutor role, as I see it, is that of conversational artist or connoisseur of the dialogical process, whose expertise and authority is concerned with the creation of a space to facilitate a dialogic conversation. I am not claiming it is my job to ‘create change’ in a individual, rather, to facilitate the dialogic creation of new

narratives. The tutor is in one sense a participant observer and thus a ‘part’ facilitator of this learning conversation. As participant observer, I pay particular attention to the holistic sense of the narrative account, reflecting and clarifying the shared meanings and understandings of the parts in relation to the whole. I am also part of the process I seek to observe as a self-reflective inquirer of my own living theory and, as such, I try to be mindful of my own feeling, bias and potential for prejudice in the meaning constructions that I contribute, and to those that may emerge from other participants in the process. I am acutely aware of my own humanity, in that I am not infallible, and consequently experience myself in the course of conversation as a ‘living contradiction’, in other words “holding educational values whilst at the same time negating them” (Whitehead, 1989:45). The artistry is then in the exercise of my inquiry, as I observe the process of conversation of which I am a part by:

- questioning and probing the speaker for clarification of their account;
- formulating tentative hypotheses of the narrative account(s);
- testing out of these hypotheses, both my own and those shared with other participants in the action learning set;
- gathering the fragments or parts of the narrative account, feeding it back to the individual and the set in relation to the whole; and
- drawing out the narrative account through the circle of meaning that is co-created.

When I speak of collaborative co-authoring, I am referring to the sense making that arises out of this dialogical process, in the form of narrative evolution. This process of inquiring hypothesising serves to reorganise information and generate further information. Its primary concern is to help make sense of a situation, rather than with the truth or falsity of a claim; however, the ‘truth’ may unravel in the process as the narrative account is constructed with more coherence. This process of inquiring hypothesising is how I claim *to do* inquiry

with my students in the teaching and learning relationship, and in the process develop my connoisseur's eye, as I respond to my living inquiry of continuous practice improvement.

Distress and development are tensions that have to be worked with in narrative inquiries. The MAPOD process of narrative accounting seeks to address the personal, professional and organisational in relation to one another. Reason and Marshall (1987:115)¹ forewarn us of the potential for past distresses to emerge in the course of an inquiry, and they reinforce this message in their more recent writings on working with reference to several students.

“From this view of individual psychological development, we argue that researchers often choose (consciously or unconsciously) research topics which will re-stimulate old patterns of distress, and invite a renewed attention to restrictive patterns: it is as if we are not content with our distorted experience and behavior” (Reason and Marshall, 2001:414).

They further suggest that if the tendency toward defensiveness can be avoided the student may be able to “transcend this re-stimulated distress” and the response may be “creative and developmental” (ibid.). What they recommend is a systematic discipline or practice that enables the student to explore how their unaware distress distorts their inquiry. Furthermore, they suggest that the action reflection cycles of inquiry, supported by the reflections of a supportive group of peers, can provide such a discipline. It is precisely such a critical reflective posture that the action learning set and tutor-facilitator bring to the conversation, which in turn can facilitate empowerment. Ghaye describes empowerment in the following way:

“Empowerment is about individuals and groups coming to know, express and critically analyse their own realities and having the commitment will and power to act to transform

¹ In “Research as a personal process”.

these realities to enhance personal and collective well being, security, satisfaction and working conditions” (2000:79).

Distress may reveal a sense of *incompleteness* to oneself as a human being.

Freire² asserts that humanisation is man’s central concern. He says:

“Within history, in concrete, objective contexts, both humanisation and dehumanisation are possibilities for man as an uncompleted being conscious of his incompleteness. [Humanisation he argues, is] ...thwarted by injustice, exploitation, oppression, and the violence of oppressors; it is affirmed by the yearning of the oppressed for freedom and justice, and by their struggle to recover their lost humanity” (1972:20).

Although I had read Freire’s work, I did not appreciate the significance of the notion of man as an uncompleted human being conscious of his incompleteness, until Louise, one of my MAPOD students (a mature student in her mid-fifties), used this quote in the framing of her dissertation. Louise had been exploring the utility of a change intervention called ‘Future Search’ as a possible vehicle for facilitating community voice in the London Borough of Newham, where she worked as a training manager. She had prepared a first draft of her dissertation and had asked me to go through it with her to check for coherence and understanding. Reading aloud her introduction, so that I could listen for clarity, she introduced the quotation by saying:

“While the subject matter of this study is focused on Future Search, this section starts by explaining the significance of undertaking an M.A. and my journey as a life long learner.

This quote describes my journey as a learner from my first years in school until now as I think and write this MA dissertation. The human mind is what distinguishes us from other forms of life, the ability to draw on a wide range of flexible responses to think creatively, to draw on emotion and access the soul. The mind is precious, an obvious statement, but one worth re-stating within this particular context. If formal education is the vehicle that assists ‘people to be more fully human’ this was not the case in my formative years. In fact, I was less able to think in certain areas, less certain of myself, after only the first few years in

² In the introduction to *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.

school that was to determine the next twenty years of my life. I would go as far as saying that this early experience was like having my mind interfered with. This may seem a dramatic description of what is, after all, many young people's experience of learning, but I choose these particular words quite consciously and purposely in order to convey the impact of what it has felt like being *an incomplete human being, conscious of their incompleteness and a lifetime of attempting to be more fully human*".

This was an impressive introduction and yet I was curious to know what she meant by having her mind interfered with, so I asked her "what do you mean by this?". As part of our process we were working with an audiotape, so that Louise could capture our conversation and draw out points for clarification in her dissertation. This is how she responded:

"What do I mean by that? What is education? In my experience, this is how we are taught: Education is not about the essence of the person, we think about it as if it is information. This is the best way I can describe it, imagine being a little person all happy with the world, we use words like 'my confidence is blown' but what is confidence? It is about how you feel deep, deep, inside. Logically, there should be no reason why I should struggle to write this MA, yet I do. It's my experience that the formal education system, like the mental health institutions, have disregarded experiential forms of sense making because they are more interested in training people to conform, to become workers and not thinkers. It is a by-product of capitalism. To say this in the public domain is scary, how will it be received?"

Later on in the tape we returned to this theme as Louise teased out the similarities of peer and self-organisation in the beliefs and practice of Future Search and re-evaluation counselling.³ Louise explained how she made her own way in the world, when at sixteen she left school to join and live in a house belonging to the Jewish Socialist Youth Movement, where they performed plays, worked on the land and learned how to live together, in preparation for life on a kibbutz. Additionally, she described joining the women's movement in

³ Louise belonged to a re-evaluation counselling group, and she had shared some of the ideas of this peer counselling process with the MAPOD community, but I had never understood why she was so committed to it, or indeed, how or if at all there were any links between it and how she worked, or what her values were as a change agent.

her twenties, where she says traditional ideas about what constituted knowledge were being questioned. More significantly, she spoke about the re-evaluation counselling movement, which she joined, as having goals concerned with the total functioning of human beings. She said that re-evaluation counselling assumes that those outstanding abilities present in some people are latent in everyone. She spoke of meeting the founder, Harvey Jackins, who told her that he “had the highest expectations of her, and believed that she would become a leader”. Louise said that “this is the first time in my life that anyone had any expectations of me, and they were the highest, he was so full of expectation”. Louise further explained that once she had failed her eleven plus, there were no further expectations of her in school, and she described being put in a class with people who were deemed to have the lowest educational abilities.

For the first time in two years I understood what the underlying distress was that had caused Louise to struggle with her writing on MAPOD, and possibly why she had expressed on the page so many muddled thoughts in her earlier assignments. She had lost her confidence in her ability to think, and this explained why she found thinking hard, why her search for clarity of mind and expression was important. I also understood for the first time why re-evaluation counselling was important to her, and furthermore I now understood the links she could see between this and Future Search, both of which were processes of facilitating voice that shared the fundamental values of inclusiveness, self and peer organisation, and why they did not need experts.

In her dissertation Louise says: “The writing of this dissertation serves a number of purposes, one of which is that it is the vehicle that I am using to reclaim my mind”, and she links her quest to reclaim her mind with her paid role as a training manager to ‘engage’ other people’s minds in ideas such as the learning organisation.

Louise had lost her train of thought so many times when writing assignments, it had frustrated her and her peers. On the tape she tells me she had experienced “a brilliant piece of teaching” in our conversation and she asked me “what did you do to get that out of me?”. I was lost for words and unable to answer her for, after all, all that I had done was to listen to her, respond to her account, ask questions and seek points of clarification, returning her story to her as she linked the parts to the whole. Grumet (1991) talking about the politics of personal knowledge,⁴ reminds us that “telling a story involves giving oneself away”. She says:

“So if telling a story requires giving oneself away, then we are obligated to devise a method of receiving stories that mediates the space between the self that tells, the self told, and the self that listens: a method that returns a story to the teller that is both hers, and not hers, that contains her self in good company” (Grumet, 1991:70).

What I am suggesting is that the process of narrative posturing in the teaching and learning relationship mediates a space that helps the student give birth to their knowledge (the knowledge of their lived experience, linking the parts to the whole) and then returns the story to the knower, that is both hers and not hers. By this I mean the story has evolved or changed as a direct result of this learning relationship and the educative influence that has been exercised in the dialogic conversation, and finally, that it is in the context of this relationship that the knower (storyteller) is contained in good company, one that is humanising, in which past distress may quite literally dissolve in the process.

In terms of the problem identified in the previous chapter of students being ‘in over their heads’ (Kegan, 1994) as they grapple with the academic demands of constructed knowing, what I am suggesting here is that the process of narrative posturing (which is intimately connected to the stories told by the students as

⁴ In *Stories Lives Tell*.

described above), is an act of loving and life affirming education that helps returns the knower to the known, whilst at the same time helping her grapple with the procedural demands of academic disciplines and the reconstruction of new knowledge. This is made possible by creating and sustaining a learning environment that contains her in good company. Let us look at this claim more closely in the video clips.

Working with Louise

I suggest we begin by returning to Louise at the action learning set meeting of January 2001, when she presents her full draft to the set.⁵

This meeting brings together Louise, Margaret, Sam and me. With the exception of Louise and Margaret, the other set members (Gareth, John, Kate and Sam) completed in November 2000. Finding a time when everyone can be present is becoming increasingly difficult as people have to manage existing work commitments. However, there remains a commitment to Louise and Margaret, such that those unable to attend in person have read Louise's draft and telephoned and/or e-mailed her with feedback.

I begin by suggesting that we start with a 'check-in', which provides those present with an opportunity to share how they are feeling at the moment and update their peers on what the key events or issues are in their lives at this time. In her check-in, Louise describes "eating and living and breathing" her dissertation, and thanks her peers for coming. Margaret shares her experience of losing her father and uses the time to re-connect with the set. Sam describes "sleeping through December" in a post-dissertation phase of relaxation. I express my pleasure at being here for Louise, and share the sentiments of a

⁵ Click on CD-R, File 2, named Louise's dissertation. See Appendix 2 for instructions on how to use the CD-R..

conversation I had with Kate the previous evening, in which we jointly expressed the view that “Louise had travelled a great distance in the production of draft”. I thus begin from a place of admiration.

Louise is then asked how she would like to proceed. She reminds us of her assessment criteria and invites feedback on the clarity of the draft, asking us to differentiate between that which is essential and that which is desirable, and she expresses “feeling good about who is here” to help her with this task. We agree to begin with a ‘round robin’, each taking a turn to share what resonated or stood out for us in the account.

Having worked closely with Louise, and being genuinely delighted for her in the progress that she has made, I have been concerned to ensure that my feedback is not limited by my familiarity and intimacy with her work, and that other students do not feel that Louise is given an unfair advantage by my judgment or what may be perceived as my vested interest in her success. With this in mind I asked Peter, a MAPOD colleague, to read Louise’s draft and provide written feedback (I met with Peter to discuss the similarities and differences in our perspectives before the set meeting). I inform the set that this is what I have done, and explain that I will be feeding back these shared perspectives. Louise indicates that she is pleased to have Peter’s feedback included.⁶

In the first clip I can be seen summing up this shared feedback with the intention of helping Louise further (clarifying her writing and framing of her account). I feel pleased and satisfied at the coherence with which the feedback appears to capture the focus of this research.

⁶ Although Peter was not one of the original tutors for this cohort, he took over the facilitation of one of the dissertation sets when their tutor withdrew from the programme. He also had developed a good working relationship with the MAPOD 4 community, working with this cohort on their community review module.

The second clip begins with me framing a question to Louise about when she first noticed that her inquiry had taken a reflective turn, by which I was referring to the linking of the personal with the organisational process of this inquiry. This question serves to open up a conversation between all members present. It begins with Louise responding by saying “I couldn’t begin anything without looking at it from a personal perspective first”, followed by Margaret recalling her memory of how Louise began this inquiry. Margaret suggests that Louise first introduced ‘future search’ as something she might be interested in, with the organisational use of it being an afterthought rather than the primary driver. Louise seems to agree with this recollection of events. Although it may not be critical to know which came first, the personal or the organisational, I would suggest that it is useful to reflect on the process and where possible capture the order of one’s process, as it can help understand the primary motivations behind an inquiry. This can help point to where muddle or confusion may be presented in an account and help clarify one’s explanations and accounting. What emerged that was relevant to Louise as a result of this conversation, was that she had in mind two different audiences as she was writing her account, those being the academy (and the company of her peers) and her employing organisation. In her attempt to speak to the different interests of these two audiences, without signalling or acknowledging who she was addressing, Louise was contributing unwittingly to her own muddle and thus impeding her own clarity of expression.

So why show these two moments in the conversation? My point is to show how these moments punctuate the collective process of inquiry, and specifically to show my influence in this process. In the first moment, I might be forgiven for my enthusiasm to help Louise gain greater clarity in her account, but it is also an example of a living contradiction, in that I have fallen in love with my own ideas; in other words, my way of seeing things. I am not thinking

reflexively in the process, and it is only the intuition of my gut that leads me to ask Louise the question about the point at which the reflective turn was taken in the inquiry, that opens up a space for a new and more ‘truthful’ story to emerge.

Working with Margaret

The second video clip that I want to show you is of Margaret’s ‘check-in’. In my chapter “Working with Margaret” and in my comments above, I mention how the ‘check-in’ provides Margaret with an opportunity to reconnect with the set and with her own research project following a period of absence, during which she has suffered bereavement from the loss of her father. I want to show you this clip because I believe it offers a glimpse of how the MAPOD process contains an individual in good company, and more specifically, how the check-in prepares me to work with individual students. Although this check-in is at the set meeting to work specifically with Louise and her draft dissertation, it also serves to set a tone and prepare the way for Margaret and I to work together on a one-to-one basis in the coming weeks. For me, it is an important part of my process of inquiry, in that the meaning of the event influences my way of being with Margaret in our subsequent meeting and thus influences the quality of the learning relationship between us.

The file is in three parts.⁷ It shows the set listening to Margaret as she takes the time to tell us of her experience during the final days of her father’s life and of his funeral and memorial service. What I notice as I view this scene through the eye of the camera, is how we are with Margaret, how we watch and listen and

⁷ To begin click onto the CD-R, File 1 named “Louise check-in Part 1”. This contains Louise’s check-in and is followed by the beginning of Margaret’s check-in. Then proceed to Part 2 and then Part 3 to continue Margaret’s check-in.

pay attention to her story. How, for example, we acknowledge her telling of the circle of men who gather around her father as he reaches his final hours.

I see myself wiping away a tear as I watch Margaret's eyes water, as she holds back her tears, composing herself to continue her telling. I sense her emotion, mindful of the nature of her inquiry of self-identity and voice, and her relationship with voices of authority (one of whom was her father), and I wonder how she is feeling and coping with the swirl of emotions that may arise. I understand the love for and the loss of a father, having lost mine in 1996 (two years into my inquiry) and consequently, I understand the range of emotions and responses that the loss of a father can bring forth. As I reflect on the emotionality of the bereavement process, I am aware of what is 'my stuff' and what is not Margaret's. I admire her composure.

Kegan (1994:8)⁸ tells us that "Wondering at is watching and reverencing; wondering about is asking and reckoning", the former being Eastern, contemplative, aesthetic and feminine, and the latter being typically Western, analytical and masculine. He does not favour one mode of attending to our lives over the other, but suggests his approach to understanding the challenges of learning in postmodern times involves drawing deeply on both. Through the visual images (records that I have made as an aid to reflect on my practice), I have come to appreciate more fully how I draw on these different modes as I feel for and respond to the necessities of my students.

At the end of her check-in, Margaret says:

"It is so vital to connect with you guys. All through this, my POD group has been part of my extended family support, the letters, the e-mails and telephone calls. It has helped me be reflective in the midst of it, and has given me an awareness of how I would discuss this with you guys".

⁸ In the prologue to *In Over Our Heads*.

Implicit in this comment is, I suggest, Margaret's own acknowledgement that she is "contained in good company".

The next clip I would like to share with you was recorded in December 2000 and involves working with Marcia and Sue from the MAPOD 5 cohort who have brought some work in progress with them for their change agent assignment. I have worked with Marcia throughout her time on the programme, and with Sue since the third assignment toward the end of year one. Let us begin by looking at Marcia's session.⁹

Working with Marcia

Marcia is a health visitor working in one of the most socially deprived estates in Hertfordshire, on the outskirts of London. I had worked with Marcia continuously since the start of the programme and I had become quite familiar with her learning journey when we began this assignment at the beginning of year two.

At the residential for the change agent module, Marcia shared with her peers her knowledge of what being a reflective practitioner involved, and introduced a number of models commonly used in nursing to the group; including Kim's (1999) model of the reflective process, which involves three stages from description, to comparative analysis and finally to critique. Marcia had expressed a concern about whether she could call herself a change agent, regarding the term as more fitting to large-scale strategic interventions that many of her MAPOD management consulting peers were engaged with, her role having more of a one-to-one relationship with clients. She had brought with her

⁹ Click onto CD-R File 3 named "Marcia change agent". There are five short clips of Marcia's session.

some writing, which she introduced to us by reading it aloud. This is how she begins:

“Bump, bump, bump Christopher Robin is coming down the stairs holding Pooh bear with one hand and dragging him backwards down the stairs, his head bumping on each stair as he descends”.

I am aware that I am uncomfortable with children’s stories and cartoons that proliferate in the popular management ‘how to’ books, and so I have to make myself pay attention and not switch off. I have a lot of respect for Marcia’s integrity and she has mentioned before that she often uses ideas from *Winnie the Pooh* when she is working with nurses and teaching them about reflective practice. She claims they love these examples, so I begin to listen more carefully, wondering what she will reveal. I wonder out loud if bumping is a ‘rude awakening’? Marcia describes bumping as a metaphor for the chaos and complexity of everyday life that some of her clients experience.

She then moves her account to her clinic where she has a room full of waiting mothers and approximately ten minutes of time allocated to attend to each of them. Mary, a young mother has come in some distress.¹⁰ There is a story about one of her children having difficulty sleeping and she wants to let Marcia know that she is again involved with psychiatric services, she reveals that her boyfriend is living back with her and the family, and that he is injecting again. Marcia has prior knowledge of Mary and recalls a similar scenario some time back. This is how Marcia describes her reflective process:

“This is the doing I do.”

“In the ten minutes I had in a busy waiting room with other mothers waiting I had to very quickly decide, prioritise and act. A number of things guided me in this process. I usually start with a process of self-questioning. National and local

¹⁰ ‘Mary’ is not the real name of Marcia’s client but a pseudonym, used to preserve client confidentiality.

policy further informs decisions, for example *The Children Act (1989)*, the principle of the paramount welfare of the child, local child protection procedures. Ethical interests of the child and the family as a whole come into play.”

There are potential child protection issues here. Marcia makes an appointment to see Mary at her home the next day where she can spend a longer period of time with her, and with Mary’s permission arranges to speak to psychiatric services beforehand. Explaining her reflective process further Marcia tell us:

“That evening I thought a lot about Mary. As a person I really liked her having now spent many hours with her. I feel very sad at the hand life has dealt her and feel that there is a great missed potential. I also have feelings of anger and frustration around Mary’s relationship with John. It causes me to pause and question my own beliefs and values. Could I display that degree of loyalty, although misguided and misplaced? Can Mary not see that she is being a mother to John rather than a partner? My attitudes towards drug and alcohol misuse, my place as a parent, could I ever reach a point where I would place my children in this position? I had a great concern that Mary appeared to have little insight into the effects that the current situation may be having on her children, where do I begin to untangle this mess?”.

Marcia has the full attention of both Sue and I as she relays this account. I ask whether she has to have Mary’s permission to speak to psychiatric services or whether it is a matter of protocol? Marcia explains that they are not very forthcoming without it, so it is easier if she has it. This question serves to open up a conversation that explores the role of psychiatric services in relation to the health visiting role. It becomes apparent that whilst psychiatric services deal with Mary as an individual client they do not take the whole family into account. This leads us to reflect together on the ‘big c’ (change) issues and systems interventions, with Marcia telling us that local management, in the form of the primary care trusts, are likely to impact on these services to the detriment of the care for and well-being of the client. Marcia suggests that the ‘big c’ for her is contained in the possibility of working with many more Marys and that she tries to influence change in the everyday factors affecting the lives of women like Mary on this estate, by being active as a school governor and

working with partnership projects that are concerned with improving the housing estate.

I explore how much of this work is a matter of Marcia's own initiative and what would come within the expected remit of her role. It becomes clear how Marcia's work is guided by her own values and how these determine the level of contribution she makes, over and above what is expected. At the end of this review Marcia tells us that she can now see that the 'small c' is ok, "I can work with what is me, that's good enough". I respond with "It's more than ok".

I am not suggesting that I am teaching Marcia anything. On the contrary, she has taught me a great deal, but I am suggesting that both Sue and I are helping to contain her in good company, that our attention to her story, our attempt to help her draw out the link between the so-called 'little c' interventions and the 'big c' issues, helps affirm Marcia in the value of the work and contribution she makes to the lives of women like Mary and her family. In the face of cuts in services we are, I suggest, helping Marcia sustain her contribution and value what she knows to be a quality of care given in the most difficult of circumstances.

Conclusions

In the three examples that I have given, illuminated by the visual representation of CD-R, I have sought to show what the qualities of loving and life affirming educative relations mean to me in respect of the individual relations I have with these particular students, as I respond to their educational needs and, with others, strive to contain them in good company. Additionally, I suggest that the CD-R reveals something about the nature of who I am as an educator, who we are as a community of learners on the MAPOD programme and how the working

alliance created within this community has created an educative practice that helps return individuals to their stories as more complete human beings.

It is precisely because the CD-R reveals who we are as teachers and educators that it has value in respect of both enhancing the validity and quality of educational action research.

“An existential orientation leads us to focus on who we are as teacher educators, the decisions that we make and the actions we take that construct who we are, and the acceptance of our responsibility for who we are” (Feldman, 2003:27).

Eisner (1997:9) asks the questions “How can we display what we have learned?”, “What forms can we trust?”, “What modes are legitimate?” and “How shall we know?”. Such questions and how we explore them, he suggests, will help redefine what educational action research means. We are, he says, “exploring the edges”.

“There is no better place from which to see the stars and no better place from which to discover new seas than the view one gets from the edge” (Eisner, 1997:9).

“‘Come to the edge’, he said.
They said, ‘We are afraid’.
‘Come to the edge’, he said.
They came.
He pushed them.

And they flew.”
(Appollinaire, cited in Eisner, 1997:9).

To come to the edge is an injunction that I have responded to in the course of this inquiry and in the construction of this thesis. It is also a metaphor that I have used with MAPOD students to encourage them to risk themselves in exploring new possibilities for their inquiries. As Feldman suggests, self-study and the validity of self-study “is a political work and has implications for policy makers” (2003:27). He also describes it as a moral work, the ambitions of which

extend beyond the particulars of our personal study, improving and influencing what happens in our colleges, universities and schools.

In this chapter I have, by accounting for myself in the form of alternative visual representation, sought to reveal my embodied values in action and the subtleties of my way of being in teaching and learning relationships with particular students on the MAPOD programme.

The representation of my inquiry in this way provides a way of accounting for my professional development in respect of the aesthetic qualities and artistry of my practice, developed over time. In other words, revealing the emergence of my connoisseur's eye as I worked with students on cohorts 4 and 5 of the MAPOD programme, practising with a heightened awareness and skill that guides me in my learning relationships. The visual form supplements the descriptions and explanations I give about my practice, revealing qualities of graceful and reciprocal educative relations that I dimly apprehended at the early stages of this inquiry. As a sociology of method, it serves to remind me how I need to be with students if I am to live my values more fully in practice, and reveals those moments when I experience myself as a living contradiction.

CHAPTER TEN: EDUCATING THE SOCIAL FORMATION: REFLECTING ON THE INFLUENCE OF MY LIVING THEORY INQUIRY

Introduction

In this chapter I reflect on the challenge of educating the social formation and transforming the educative sphere. I do this by reflecting on the influence of my living theory inquiry by asking what difference this has made to both my practice and that of my students. In addition, I ask the question “How can we create a good social order in the field of higher education?” and explore what this means for the academy. Reason and Marshall (1987) identify stakeholders of the personal process of human inquiry as ‘me, us and them’, and I utilise these labels to frame and organise this chapter.

For Me: How Has My Living Theory Influenced and Changed My Practice?

Background

When I began this research I had little understanding of how to put my ‘I’ in the centre of my inquiry. First of all, I had to understand the context of my inquiry in respect of the broad aims and objectives of the MAPOD programme. During the early years of MAPOD (see Chapter Six) my attention focused primarily on external factors that influenced learning such as the strategy and design for learning, the actions and activities of others, and the theory and rationale for self-directed adult learning. My focus of attention at this early stage included:

- establishing the conditions for a learning community;
- encouraging the staff team to reflect on our practice; and

- working out how to move from teaching about personal development to doing personal development work with students.

Whilst all these factors were important, what I had been missing was an inner focus of attention on my own practice. Nevertheless, the external focus of those early years had been necessary, precisely because they provided me with a context of experience that enabled me to recognise the emergence of my values in practice, and the experience of their denial in practice by myself and others. The very nature of my experience of the early years served to shape my perception of my underlying purpose as an educator that emerged as a concern for finding and facilitating voice, both for myself and for my students. Specifically, this involved addressing the experience of being silenced, revealed in learning histories and life stories in an attempt to overcome the damage that had been done to individuals in terms of a loss of voice or sense of self or mind.

Learning to put my 'I' at the centre of inquiry involved becoming a reflective practitioner. To become a reflective practitioner is a process of personal and professional development that requires a commitment to change our way of being in the world to one that is more consistent with living our values in practice. It extends what traditionally is thought of as professional development, beyond the acquisition of skills and knowledge; in other words, the 'doing' self, to include a focus for transforming the 'being' self. Clarkson (1995) emphasises the importance of feelings as integral to personal development, noting that they are usually omitted from traditional professional development programmes. Recognising the importance of feelings, such as anxiety and its consequences for learning, proved to be an integral part of my own inquiry in coming to know myself as a living contradiction and, in turn, learning to respond with humanity, rationality and justice in my educative relations.

What I had to discover about my practice lay in the gaps between my espoused values and lived reality in my teaching and learning relationships. Whilst I had a fairly clear idea about what I espoused and my ‘living theory’ in practice (Whitehead, 1989), I had not addressed my self as a living contradiction in the early days.

Experiencing my ‘I’ as a living contradiction

Whilst I invariably tried to be fair in my academic judgments, the process of assessment was experienced by some students as more than a rational exercise of judgment; rather it was viewed as a negative experience that diminished the self. What I perceived as a fair assessment based on straight talk of strengths and weaknesses was experienced as a harsh judgment that disempowered rather than nurtured the learner and undermined their potential for growth and development. What I perceived as a strategy of ‘being cruel to be kind’ was not appreciated by students, who were not ready for the complex demands that were being made of them by the academy to be self-directed, especially where they had little or no prior experience of the higher education sector. In paying attention to student feedback of this kind, I began to recognise myself as a living contradiction, and saw the inherent contradictions in the system itself. For example, the assessment process on MAPOD involved power sharing; nonetheless, the weight of power resided in the tutor decision, and in the inherent contradiction of the academic system, in that what the academy required and wanted from a student was not always the same as what they apparently wanted for themselves or what they expected.

Finding a way forward

The experience of this type of contradiction was so fundamental to the values I aspired to live out in my practice I was even more determined to work with them

to find a way forward. The examples given in this thesis mark a move to attend to my inquiry in a disciplined systematic and rigorous manner. As such, I began to experience my 'I' in practice, focused on a continuous process of improvement, as I engaged with my students as collaborators to improve my practice. This dialogic process enabled me to generate theories about what works and what does not in creating an ethic of care in the teaching and learning relationship. As part of my process, I have subjected my claims to public scrutiny in the form of conference papers, testing my theories in the public domain to an audience of critical friends.

In turning my attention inwards, I began by committing myself to a process of inquiry within a model of continuing professional practice, punctuated by cycles of action and reflection. This involved taking time to reflect both on and in my teaching-learning relationships with individual students and groups of students in action learning sets, as can be seen for example in Chapters Seven and Eight. These activities shaped a discipline of personal and professional inquiry that included:

- looking back and learning through my experience;
- developing the quality of my knowledge in action and my associate understanding of my practice;
- development of self-critical reflection, exposing the pretensions of my claims and dealing with the reality of denying my own values in practice; and
- finding ways forward to improve my practice.

I began to articulate this approach to my inquiry as a strategy of humanistic action research (Hartog, 2002a), in that it was person-centred and concerned with creating an ethic of care in my teaching and learning relationships that was responsive to the humanity and educative needs of individual students and

groups. In addition, I began to recognise that qualities of care in respect of nurture, protection and growth were important features of my maternal knowing that were shaping my responses to student needs.

Where did this need for an ethic of care come from?

Firstly, from the student feedback which suggested that I could be a more careful facilitator of their learning, particularly when giving assessment feedback which if unfavourable heightened the pain and anxiety experienced by many in the assessment process. An experience that became an obstacle to learning itself.

Secondly, from the influence of Belenky *et al.* (1986) whose work promotes the strategy of the ‘connected teacher’ whose description is likened to that of a midwife. The midwife helps the student draw out their knowledge in their account, and in so doing helps them find their voice and reclaim their mind. By paying careful attention to what my students had to say and to what they wrote, and by shifting my focus from what they had not said or what appeared to be missing in their work (a strategy typical of the approach many educators take to assessment, which employs general and universal standards to judge a piece of work), I was able to stand alongside my students as they produced their accounts, and in the process create an educative space conducive to loving and life affirming educative relations of the kind to which I aspired.

Becoming a reflective practitioner

The process involved in becoming a reflective practitioner required a shift from advocacy to inquiry, and overcoming the felt need to protect my own ego defences as though they were my integrity, thus learning the skills of what

Rowan (2001) calls maturity. Developing these skills of reflective inquiry involved four distinct stages:

1. Becoming aware of the emergence of my ego defences in response to difficulties or challenges to my decisions.
2. A willingness to be responsible for myself and to address the consequences of my actions.
3. A commitment to get on the inside of my practice, by subjecting it to the scrutiny of others, and a desire to better understand and improve it.
4. A shift in what Rowan describes as the mental ego, in other words a position of power over others, to the mature ego of power with others.

Marshall (2001) emphasises the dynamic process of inquiry that is framed by inner and outer arcs of attention. This dynamic, I suggest, is significant in facilitating the step change that is necessary to shift from a mental ego to a mature ego. In my case, the inner focus centred on my practice. Running in parallel was a focus of inquiry that drew in my life story and learning history, and an outer focus that formed a critique of the academy itself. Having got on the inside of my practice, I had to turn my attention to the context in which my practice was based.

From the inside-out

What began to dawn on me in the course of my inquiry was the problematic nature of the modular system in relation to the goals of MAPOD that encouraged deep learning, and personal and professional development. There was a tension here between what traditionally is being assessed at Masters level, in terms of skills and knowledge, and what we were trying to do on MAPOD, i.e. integrating the developmental process and asking students to address their process in the learning accounts.

The modular system contains the teaching, learning and assessment process within a given unit of learning that is usually fixed to a timescale,¹¹ at the end of which a number of academic credits are awarded for successful completion of the module. As a learning device it breaks the learning down into bite-size chunks. Whilst this works reasonably well for knowledge and skills-based learning, it can be problematic where the learning goals include personal and professional development or deep learning of the kind we were working towards on MAPOD.

I began to see the systemic problem that undermined our MAPOD goals as one where the tail was wagging the dog. The benefit of longer timeframes between periods of action and reflection, typical of a more traditional course based structure, became very apparent when the MAPOD 4 students elected to extend the time taken to complete their dissertation to include the two full academic years. I began to wonder whether the assessment if managed differently, perhaps as an integrated programme and assessed over the longer term in the form of a portfolio or a series of projects, might better serve the learning needs of all our MAPOD students.¹² We never did get to take these ideas further as the university decided to close the programme on financial grounds, before it got to the end of its fifth year when we would have gone back to a validation panel.

Looking beyond my practice to a critique of the wider system

Boud (2002) argues that assessment is problematic, precisely because in his experience it causes the student pain, and he calls for a rethink and critique of the assessment process.

¹¹ On average, twelve weeks.

¹² One of my colleagues believed that we should run MAPOD as a development programme without academic credit.

Though MAPOD used many practices that Boud advocates, such as self and peer assessment that involves the student in the process of assessment and gives the student a greater degree of responsibility for their learning, my own inquiry had led me to wonder about the ethics of containing MAPOD within the modular framework, since the very system that framed the teaching, learning and assessment process seemed to be contributing to undermining the very process of learning itself.

Boud (2002) calls for a critical review and by implication he is indicating that assessment tends to be regarded as a technical activity, not unlike an accounting technique. In higher education, the goals of assessment serve to accredit and mark the achievement of an award based on a course of academic study.

Let me indicate here, by drawing on Bauman, the potential perversity of a technical approach to assessment. Bauman (1996), drawing on his analysis of the holocaust, claims that we can better understand how managerial practice can dehumanise. He argues that managerial techniques can erode sympathy for the other in that they can serve to authorise violence, routinise actions and dehumanise victims. This is the danger that an inappropriate academic framework and a technical approach to the assessment process can have. Bauman (1996) further argues that developing an ethical attachment to other people is a fundamental aspect of ethics and he contends that we need to educate for the other.

The assessment process removes the apparent need for ‘empathy for the other’ from the equation, since our taken for granted protocol for assessment is deemed principally to be a technical and rational process.

Although the modular framework is relatively recent (at MUBS we adopted this framework to ‘manage’ teaching, learning and assessment in the early nineties), assessment is institutionalised as a normative process based on a rational discourse of reason and argument and many people have an investment in it. Indeed, I would argue that tutors share that investment, as Boud rightly points out, they have survived it, they are the successful ones, regardless of whether they have experienced themselves as the victim in the course of their journey.¹³

I am not suggesting that because something is institutionalised it should not or cannot be changed if it is damaging those whose interests it seeks to serve, of course it should. The dilemma as I see it is how to find a way forward that gives the academic process integrity and at the same time meets the learning and development needs of the students in a more humane way.

Beyond awareness: toward a system for loving and life affirming educative practice

Boud’s (2002) lecture invokes moral reasoning and invites a critique of the system that manages teaching, learning and assessment in the academy, but it does not show how to develop awareness of the other. This is where reflective practice, in the form of my thesis as a self-study of a tutor in higher education, makes an original contribution. It shows my process of inquiry toward developing loving and life affirming educational practice, as I learn to invoke my maternal knowledge in my practice, and work towards an ethic of care in my teaching and learning relationships, recognising that care alone is not enough. However, a practice that is informed by both care and critique may go a long way to improve the rationality and justice of educative relations.

¹³ Though I would suggest that the majority of academics who have come through the British system are likely to have experienced a more integrated programme-based education than the modular approach that is so prevalent today.

Notwithstanding these factors, in developing my connoisseur's eye, I discover a way of being in educative relations with my students through 'connected' educative relations that contain them in good company and return them to their stories as more complete human beings. It is this practice of connoisseurship that has made a fundamental difference to my practice.

Educating for change

The other side of the coin involves educating, critiquing and, where appropriate, campaigning to change those parts of the system that undermine the very process of learning itself. In this regard, I have taken the first steps of putting my ideas and learning from my inquiry into the public domain in conference papers and publications.

Writing about ethical education, McPhail (2001:282), an accounting lecturer in higher education, identifies three objectives:

1. disruption;
2. the development of a broad view of the profession; and
3. the development of moral sensitivity .

To Sum Up: 'For Me'

For me, the self-study of a higher education tutor combines a process of critical self-reflection of one's own practice and an associate critique of the wider academic system. In short, it facilitates a process of ethical awareness, disrupted by helping the tutor appreciate the impact of their actions on the *other*, particularly in the appreciation of how routine actions can have an impact, such as our taken for granted approach to assessment as a technical exercise.

Ethical awareness does not mean having a solution. Indeed, it is precisely the lack of a fixed solution that fosters a grappling with and reflection on the process. This does, however, enable the tutor to come to see the values she has about teaching, learning and assessment, and to notice where they fall short in practice from those that may be espoused. Not necessarily having a solution enables one to be self-reflexive and aware of the distinctions between the self and the role one occupies.

McPhail (2001:285) draws our attention to the debate in moral philosophy that distinguishes between ethics as a process of reason and that which shows ethics as a process of moral sensibility. It is only when emotion is legitimised in the teaching and learning relationship that we can begin to fully appreciate the pain or anxiety the student experiences, and it is this awareness that may help us shift our thinking from seeing and regarding assessment purely on technical and rational grounds.

“Understanding how and why individuals may be affected in particular ways by your actions is one thing but entering into the anxiety, pain, fear, despair and hatred that another sentient human being experiences as a result of your actions is far more disturbing and disrupting. This objective goes to the core of ethics” (McPhail, 2001:284).

What I want to suggest that my inquiry has done is to help me know and articulate my educative values within a framework of an ethic of care in my teaching and learning relationships. It has enabled me to develop myself as a moral agent through a process of self-critical and critical inquiry. In addition, the process of my inquiry and the descriptions and explanations contained in this thesis as I have responded to the core question of my inquiry, “How can I improve my practice”, have enabled me to communicate that process to others, adding to the body of knowledge in respect of how we might create loving and life-affirming practice in education, and showing how self-study combined with

critique of the wider academic system can help us live our values more fully in our practice.

For Us: Making a Difference

For my students, my inquiry has influenced their experience of higher education and participation on a Masters degree programme, and their ability to make a difference in their own organisations or professional sphere. The programme, whilst seeking to develop student autonomy in learning, embraced the following ideas:

- working with real live issues;
- action learning;
- community building;
- responsibility for the learning of self and others;
- linking the personal and the organisational process; and
- becoming critical and organising reflection.

Though I was not the only tutor to conceive the MAPOD programme, there is no doubt that several of these ideas have evolved as a direct result of my own inquiry. By asking the question “How can I improve my practice?”, I have implicitly been asking “How can I better support and facilitate the learning of my students?”. Perhaps the most significant development for ‘us’ has been the work that my inquiry has facilitated in respect of:

- working with life story and learning history to help students link personal and professional narratives;
- integrating these through critical action learning; and
- the organisation of reflection on practice.

Critical action learning, as defined by Wilmot (1994), challenges the potential for ethical neutrality inherent in more conventional action learning interventions, in that it depends on critical reflection on practice, which includes being prepared to challenge the status quo and/or taken for granted assumptions, as well as drawing on critical theoretical traditions that uncover the assumptions or rhetoric inherent in much conventional management theory. Furthermore, it extends the curriculum beyond the definition of the manager and organisation to include in its scope society and the wider stake-holding community. As such, it places the management learning and development agenda beyond the individual manager (student-practitioner) to one that is interdependent with the well-being and learning of society at large.

Two examples of student success stories, in respect of critical action learning and organising reflection, are provided. I want to suggest they are exemplars of the quality of work that some MAPOD students were able to achieve. They are success stories, and it is the success of the students that I want to advocate, and not solely the influence of my inquiry process. These case examples have been included with the consent of the students (Hartog, 2004).¹⁴ This chapter grew out of a paper¹⁵ originally written for a teaching business ethics conference, and later accepted for publication.¹⁶ This paper marks a significant transition in my thinking about how to better influence the social formation between ‘us’ on the MAPOD programme, by formalising my approach to the facilitation of learning from action learning as a problem solving approach to a critical approach to action learning and a problem posing approach.

¹⁴ In “Educating the reflective educator” (Hartog, 2004), a chapter for a book entitled *Organizing Reflection*.

¹⁵ Called “Critical action learning: teaching business ethics”.

¹⁶ With some amendments, in the *Journal of Reflective Practice*, due to be published during 2004.

Anthony's (1998) critique¹⁷ resonated with the approach that I had been developing on MAPOD, hitherto informally guided by the issues that students had brought to action learning sets. Avoiding any prescriptive educational endeavour, Anthony suggests we should look to our students to guide us, by helping them draw out and learn from real-life work-based issues that go to the heart of the matter, asking the question "What is the nature of the ethical problem here?".

His position that managers are moral agents, coupled with Wilmot's stance on what distinguishes a critical approach to action learning from a traditional approach, helped me find a way forward that challenged the ethical neutrality of our action learning interventions. This enabled students to challenge the status quo, formalising and legitimising such a critique within a body of legitimate knowledge, namely critical management theory.

The reason for including this paper in Appendix 1 is because it is relevant to my thesis, precisely because it helped me shift the management learning agenda on MAPOD beyond the individual manager (student practitioner) to one that is interdependent with the well-being and learning of society at large. Moreover, it helped me to integrate and better understand how I could be in educative relations with my students and hold together in the dialectical tradition both a humanistic, feminist and critical perspective in order that I might better live my values in practice. This paper can be found in Appendix 1.

¹⁷ "Management education: ethics versus morality".

Organising Reflection as a Critique to Practice

Case Study 1

Nigel sets out his stall to become an ‘active listener’, by which he expresses a desire to develop his own practice and leadership style to listen to what his colleagues (500 subordinates) need from him and his management team, in the context of a period of long-term change in the business. His role is that of Operations Director for a business unit of a multinational bank.

Confronted with a piece of secondary data from an employee opinion survey, he determines a need to dig deeper to understand the responses to the survey, which indicate dissatisfaction with some aspects of management practice, leadership and organisational culture and support. He decided to follow up with his own local focus group, in order that he and his management team could both understand better the feelings behind these responses and begin to create a supportive culture of employment during the coming years.

He identifies his colleagues as significant stakeholders, as well as shareholders, whose primary concern is profit. He explains how he invites his senior local managers to facilitate this focus group with him, encouraging ‘buy in’ from them to ensure that action and outcomes are followed up on the ground. He shares his reflection of the focus group meeting:

“I remember that it did not feel like a formal meeting at all but as a group of individuals holding a conversation about something that was important to all parties.”

Following the focus group, there was a communication event by each manager with their immediate teams, where Nigel outlined his plans to continue an active listening approach in his work with people in the organisation. In particular, he

commits to follow up the coming employee opinion survey as a process of continuous growth for ‘me, us and them’.

During the introduction to his dissertation, Nigel reflects on his early career with the bank and his perceived transition from manager to leader. He suggests that his own career development was shaped by a pedagogical approach to learning which equipped him to follow the rules. He reflects on how obedience to this rule-based and autocratic culture earned him early promotion in the ranks, but how it was achieved at a cost to his personal and work-based relationships.

“I was clearly being responsible for taking ownership for delivering the results, but at what cost to my reputation as a human being? Was I becoming simply a tool of the organisation, being led and clearly not listening to others? I had not considered the need to share my thoughts about what was to be achieved either for me, or collectively, or more fundamentally consulted about the systems I felt were appropriate.

I believe that my natural style has in the past been built around the coercive-authoritative style of manager, as distinct from leader, coupled with a strong tendency to ‘over manage’. This did not create the space for individual growth and personal development amongst my team, or perhaps for me as an individual.”

He suggests that he has shifted toward a “democratic, pacesetting and affiliate style”. Additionally, he discusses his experience of being invited to apply for redundancy a few years ago, and his shock at the lack of regard for him as a person in the way this was handled.

So how is this student organising reflection?

- His focus of attention goes beyond improving his practice as a leader, to changing the culture of leadership itself.

- He invites colleagues, in the context of a focus group, to engage and participate in this process within his directorate, and to create an alliance with him to change the leadership culture.
- Based on his experience of facing redundancy, he knows that employees, no matter how effective and loyal, are expendable. As a response he favours a leadership style that supports coaching and personal development, so that in the event of future change those employees are more equipped to find alternative employment inside or outside of the bank. These are important pragmatic issues where organisations cannot guarantee jobs for life, which goes to the heart of the psychological contract.
- He appreciates that employees have, as stakeholders in the firm, rights and expectations that go beyond a utilitarian approach to employee relations. Furthermore, his stance in relation to profit and growth is to go beyond the bottom line, enacting through his leadership a process of social accounting and not just one that is based on profit.
- He recognises that the employees have overlapping stakeholders' interests as employees of the bank, shareholders and as citizens; a position which is not insignificant in that his critical approach to action has an impact beyond the firm, to society, facilitating the long-term prospects of these employees as employable citizens who ultimately can continue to contribute to the wealth of the nation.
- His action (inviting his managers to engage in a focus group to understand better what the employees need of him and them, towards a leadership style of shared vision) is evidence that he is prepared to act on his espoused values.

How did the action learning set help?

The action learning set provided Nigel with support in setting up a dialogue with the employees. Earlier on in the programme, the set fed back to Nigel that participative leadership was more than him consulting with an employee about his plans; rather, it was a two way process of engagement, his actions suggest that he had learned to apply a different perspective from this earlier critique.

Case Study 2

This case study is drawn from the work of a student in the health service. Marcia is a nurse by profession and a qualified health visitor. She perceives that health visitors, as a group, are effectively silenced by lack of inclusion in the discussions taking place around the establishment of the new primary care trusts, and that decisions about the future of the health visiting role did not reflect an understanding of that role or the needs of the client groups. She believed that the practice of health visiting would be constrained by the proposals. Time taken, for example, to visit clients would be limited. Who might get the service of a health visitor would also be subject to the limitations of the local resources. Marcia could see the dangers of a policy and practice that restricted proactive health visiting, both for the clients and for the very survival of the profession itself. Like children, she could see that her professional colleagues “were seen and not heard”.

Marcia invited health visitor colleagues from three primary care localities to attend one of several lunchtime focus groups to explore the future of health visiting in the light of the change to primary care trusts. The health visitors were invited to frame topics for discussion, which included:

- the current change agenda;

- the future role of health visiting;
- the nature of health visiting; and
- women and voice.

In framing her dissertation, she discusses the role of caring as the basis for the nursing profession, exploring the nature of ‘dirty work’ and emotional labour that is central to nursing. In health visiting, this includes dealing with domestic violence, drug and alcohol abuse, and child protection issues. Much of the work is with women and children.

Marcia describes the role of narrative telling, i.e. listening to stories, as being a key component of the job. She discusses the politics of how these skills and this knowledge are taken for granted as ‘women’s work’ and not valued. She argues that the politics of marginalising women’s issues confounds silence all round. She goes on to critique the effect of bringing nurse education into the university sector and how, in her opinion, these valuable skills are further diminished and even lost within the rhetoric of scientific knowledge.

Marcia also reflects on her experience as the manager of an acute care project for children who need 24 hour nursing but who live at home and whose care is managed in the community. All the professionals knew the care demands of setting up a project like this in the community, yet adequate resources were not forthcoming. Marcia got to a point where she felt that the risks were too great for the children, her own family and for herself to continue. Exhausted, she resigned shortly before joining MAPOD because of the impossible demands that were being made of her to be on call 24 hours a day for weeks on end. She was critical of the health care system that allowed this to go on.

So how is this student organising reflection?

- Spurred on by her recovered sense of voice and mind she organised focus groups, inviting health visitors to explore and discuss their role.
- Marcia undertook to moderate and facilitate each focus group, taking responsibility for recording the discussions and for co-ordinating a report on the outcomes of those discussions. Her objective was to make the process as co-operative as possible. These groups were well attended and included experienced health visitors and newcomers to the profession.
- Her organisation of reflection in the focus group helps her health visitor colleagues generate insights about their role and the structures and relationships that silence them, e.g. “It is a quiet role”.
- She organises a series of recommendations that reflect back the issues arising in the focus groups, framing them “for us”, e.g. health visitors need to take stock of what they view as the core aspects of the role and in the direction they wish to take the profession, and “for them”, e.g. managers need to pay attention to the level of disenfranchisement among their staff at ground level.

How did the action learning set help?

As evidenced by her own reflective comments, the set provided her with support, creating a learning environment that encouraged her to critique her experience and practice. Pointing her toward relevant literature such as *WWK* (Belenky *et al.*, 1986) helped her link the issues of silence and voice in both her personal and organisational experience.

To Sum Up: For ‘Us’ Making a Difference

Organising reflection as a social process can have a transformative effect on the reconstruction of personal and professional identities that serve to critique and change practice and influence the social sphere. Organising reflection can

reveal and uncover the universal stories of oppression, such as silence, that can serve as a spur to action by linking the personal and the political.

Organising reflection as a social process involves the participation and engagement of individuals with one-another in a collective learning process. It involves a search for meaning with people, which emerges as a process of shared understanding, thus educating the social formation, not just the individual.

Educational action research and critical action learning are both concerned with improving the rationality and justice of practice settings, and their critical approach to organising reflection demonstrates the interdependence of individuals and society. For critical educators, the values that they bring to their practice provide them with standards of judgment whereby their practice might be subject to critique, helping them reveal and know themselves as ‘living contradictions’. It is commitment to action to find a way forward where we may live our values more fully in our practice that is essential if education for democracy is to be realised. One measure of how they may be realised is, I suggest, how our educative practice influences the work of our students; in other words, how they create their own ethic of practice and extend democracy in their professional and organisational contexts.

For Them: How Can we Create a Good Social Order in Higher Education?

In other words, how can my inquiry contribute to educating the social formation in the academy? In UK universities, the separation of theory and practice in respect of those who do research and those who do the teaching, is a significant problem. The challenge, I suggest, concerns how we link the ‘actor’ and the ‘spectator’ in educational judgment. The problem is exacerbated by the RAE (the research assessment exercise) that privileges research over teaching

(practice), driven by harnessing financial reward and academic recognition to the output of publications.

Coulter (1999) suggests that if research knowledge is to contribute more to public and professional understanding, the emphasis needs to shift from the generation of research knowledge to consideration of the justification of what counts as appropriate and useful knowledge. In a subsequent article, Coulter and Weins (2002) argue that despite a proliferation of research paradigms we are in danger of producing ‘new’ old ways of understanding the relationship between educational practice and research knowledge. Furthermore, they suggest that we need to understand teaching as more than knowledge, but as a form of embodied judgment that links knowledge, virtue and reason (phronesis – roughly translated as judgment). They draw on the work of Arendt, who argues that we need to link thinking and acting without privileging either in the conception of judgment, thus providing a resource for educational dialogue between teachers and researchers.

Though I believe the self-study of teacher researchers can overcome the theory-practice divide, it is the understanding of the relationship between thinking and action, and the role of educational judgment in arriving at a good social order that Coulter and Weins point to, that I suggest is useful to expand on here. Drawing on the work of Arendt, Coulter and Weins (2000) retrace the debated conceptions of judgment in the traditions of Aristotle and Kant:

- Phronesis involves an amalgam of knowledge, virtue and reason, enabling one to decide what to do.
- The Aristotelian conception of practice contrasts, on the one hand, practice as craft and, on the other, practice as praxis; in other words, moral-political action. Praxis is also linked to the notion of leading a worthwhile life.

In Aristotelian terms, knowledge and virtue are linked to community. However, Coulter and Weins (2000) caution us to see the problematic nature of this, since in Aristotelian times this was linked to the male citizens of ancient Greece, and is, by modern standards, elitist rather than democratic. Secondly, Coulter and Weins (ibid.) argue that in today's complex multiracial world, conceptions of virtue and community are perhaps even more hotly contested. Additionally, in Aristotelian times, phronesis was achieved by leading the contemplative life, in other words by the privileging of the spectator over the actor.

In the academy we might do well to consider whether the separation of teaching and research is a modern-day social and cultural anathema, i.e. one that perpetuates old prejudices, privileging an elite group of academics to the exclusion of others. My own experience suggests that this is so, and in my own organisation the current proposal to create a graduate school staffed solely by people who are designated as research active would, in my view, serve to exacerbate this problem.

A Kantian approach begins by rejecting the elitism inherent in the Aristotelian conception of phronesis. The categorical imperative or the notion of the universal law obliges everyone to do their moral duty according to that law. 'Determinant judgment' includes political, moral and educational matters. "Judging involves using the knowledge of good ends to decide appropriate means" (Coulter and Weins (2000:16).

In educational terms, the application of theory to practice model would be an example of determinant judgment.

Kant distinguished another form of judgment, that being 'reflective judgment'. Coulter and Weins tell us that reflective judgment was "primarily concerned

with aesthetic taste” and inspired Arendt to generate what they suggest is a more “powerful conception of judgment for education” (2000:16).

In contrast to determinate judgment (where meaning is found in the general), in reflective judgment, meaning is to be found in the particular. Laws and rules cannot apply the particular to the general, rather the link can be found in using the imagination. Secondly, the ‘common sense’ that can be found in the general and universal is inherent in the critical nature of the act of reflection.

Coulter and Weins remind us that there is no community standard of beauty, and that the capacity for judgment about matters of aesthetic taste is “within the capacity of us all” and thus not subject to an elite minority. They state:

“Dialogue about reflective judgments, however, is both possible and required: aesthetic criticism presumes the possibility of persuading others of the quality of the judgment without epistemologically or ethically secure foundations. (Otherwise why bother?)” (2000:16).

Arendt’s work is concerned with trying to understand what it means to be an actor and what it means to be a spectator. This is driven by her experience as a student of philosophy and of her relationship with Heidegger (her mentor and lover), who was seduced by the Nazi party and who was, in her mind, a good thinker but poor judge. Arendt, a Jewess, fled Germany in 1933, later settling in the United States. Drawing on the philosophical traditions of Western thought, Arendt is attempting to explain and prevent another holocaust. A key question for Arendt is why ‘good people’ become bystanders to acts that diminish the humanity of others.

Reviving the *poiesis praxis* debate, Arendt distinguishes between labour as work and praxis as action. She points to the importance of others in the making of and understanding of our lives (plurality). Additionally, she points to the

importance of human agency or freedom in action (natality), arguing that since humans have agency they have also a responsibility to judge. Coulter and Weins (2000) tell us that this understanding of action is controversial; for example, a Foucauldian analysis of power complexes would suggest that there are limitations to what an individual actor can do, as there are already conditions and circumstances in place when we are born into the world that we have to contend with. Arendt explains how the totalitarian regime of the Nazi party sought to expel Jews from the public sphere, serving to deny this basic aspect of human agency. This invisibility, in Arendt's words, served to darken the public sphere.

“To be a judging actor involves considerations of publicity, but Arendt's public is not an abstract public sphere, but a world of diverse and unique individuals, all capable of public agency” (Coulter and Weins, 2000:18).

Can academia learn anything from Arendt's work?

Personally I think we can. We must ask whether the separation of teaching and research is being organised and pursued in such a way as to render teachers in higher education invisible. We might also wonder about the effects of current changes in higher education that are being driven primarily on economic grounds and that may diminish the potential for 'human potential' and growth in the process. In my own organisation, plans to create a separate graduate school staffed solely by research active colleagues pose a real threat to teachers and students. This scenario, I suggest, will render all teachers who do not meet the RAE criteria invisible, and deny students the benefit of the experience that those practiced teachers have hitherto brought to the teaching and learning relationship.

Though we are told that good teachers will be recognised for the contribution they make to teaching and learning, what is ignored if not denied, in such a split in the organisation of teaching and research, is the possibility and indeed the

desirability for academic staff (who have traditionally been seen as teachers) to develop through their scholarly activity and the self-study of their practice, skills and competencies, to also be recognised as research active, if they so wish. Ironically, management is asking how we could better link research to teaching and learning, yet the contradictions inherent in the graduate school proposal are not seen. Respect for diversity thus requires dialogue to understand diverse standpoints and the respect for uniqueness that does not collapse into an amalgam of the general. Despite the rhetoric of the institution on valuing diversity, this does not seem to be reflected either in the making of this policy or in its implementation to practice.

Just as the teacher to be a good judging actor must listen to students, visiting their points of view before, during and after the educational encounter, in turn, it requires academic managers to do the same with their higher education teachers, recognising their plurality and natality; in other words their differences and their desire for agency. It requires a ‘visiting imagination’.

In this thesis I have shown through a self-study of my own practice, asking questions of the kind “How do I improve my practice here?”, that I have been working toward becoming a good judging actor; discovering what it means to have a visiting imagination as I work alongside my students, listen to their stories and find an ethic of care that contains them in good company. In so doing, I have sought to account for myself through my research activities by putting my ideas into the public domain in the form of conference papers, articles and other scholarly contributions; yet ironically I am still only assessed by my university as ‘research potential’. As such, I fear for my invisibility within the academic system, and find myself voicing those fears from the margins.

During Eichman's trial for his war crimes, Arendt became curious about what made a thinking spectator? Arendt notes that Eichman had "an almost total inability to ever look at anything from the other fellow's point of view" (1963:48). This is evidenced in its extremity by his account of the 'Vienna' episode, where acting on the orders of the Reich to make it '*juderein*' (free of Jews), Eichman, pursuing this policy through forced emigration (which continued up to the fall of 1941), describes how "he and his men and the Jews were all pulling together" and whenever there were any difficulties the Jewish functionaries would come running to him "to unburden their hearts" (*ibid.*). From Eichman's perspective, the desires to emigrate and the desire to see the Reich *juderein* coincided.

Arendt's conclusions in respect of Eichman led her to observe that he refused to think about what he was doing, and that he was incapable of uttering a single word, even a stock phrase or cliché. "The longer one listened to him, the more obvious it became that his inability to speak was closely connected with an inability to *think*, namely, to think from the standpoint of someone else" (Arendt, 1963:49). It was this lack of thinking that she saw as an explanation for his behaviour and lack of conscience, not some innate evilness. Arendt (1963:52) points to the mendacity of the German mind that she suggests became an integral part of the national German character. I cannot help wondering about the mendacity that is inherent in the management of UK higher education institutions.

So where is there a lack of thoughtfulness in higher education?

The first is with regard to assessment and its management in relation to the goals of learning, particularly where systems such as the modular framework get in the way of the very process of learning itself. Secondly, in the separation of teaching and research that perpetuates old hegemonies and privileges elite groups.

A Unified Approach to Teaching, Learning and Research

Shulman (2000), in his role as President of the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, makes an impassioned argument for the unity of teaching and research, reminding us that we are members of two professions, our discipline and teaching. He calls for a deeper discussion of teaching in higher education, a dialogue in which our work becomes public, peer reviewed and critiqued, shared with other members of our profession so that they in turn can build on our work.

One of the consequences of running higher education along the same lines as a global business is that teachers are required to be compliant labourers, to stay ‘on message’ and deliver the curriculum, using what is often called best practice, but which may be little more than a convenient method of quality control. Such practice is institutionalised in the QAA (Quality Assurance Assessments) that universities are now subject to in respect of the quality of their teaching and learning. Whilst I have no objection to the demand to improve quality in teaching and learning, on the contrary, I am passionate about it, I am concerned that the emphasis put on feeding the administrative system for quality assurance gets in the way of teachers spending time either privately or publicly in dialogue with others (students and colleagues) or with themselves reflecting on their educative practice and pursuing opportunities to use either visiting or critical imagination.

Davis (2003)¹⁸ argues that in spite of teaching quality assessment, little appreciation is given to good teaching, not least because research funding continues to go to elite institutions that also operate the most highly selective

¹⁸ In her article “Barriers to reflective practice”.

admissions criteria. This, she points out, is demoralising for other staff who feel undervalued, which she suggests leads to an attitude of ‘why bother’.

The current environment in higher education seems designed to promote Eichmanism. The paradox is that at the same time, traditional university researchers continue to be rewarded by grant-funding committees and substantial time allowance devoted to research; conceived of as withdrawing from the world of action and generating knowledge.¹⁹

Educational judgment is at stake. We have an opportunity in higher education to challenge the hegemonies of research, and the self-study of our practice as educators is one way we can do that, and in the process help teachers and researchers to become both judging actors and judging spectators.

Lomax (1994), in her professorial inaugural lecture, suggests that we have to learn to accept difference and live constructively with it. Lomax cites MacIntyre’s (1990) conception of a post-liberal university as being an imperative for survival in a postmodern world. In such a university:

“...rival standpoints exist - academics can enter into disagreement with one another - a place of constrained disagreement - a place where lecturers can initiate students into conflict rather than brainwash them into consensus” (Lomax, 1994:5).

At the end of the day, I believe most educators want to enhance the capacity of our students to think for themselves, to act with integrity in the world and to make their contribution in society as citizens, able to take wise decisions and be able to reflect on the integrity of their actions. It is unfortunate, if not ironic, that the very skills many organisations now recognise they need graduates to

¹⁹ Measured by the number of peer reviewed articles in academic journals, that might or might not be used to prescribe other people’s practice.

have are precisely those that their tutors have less freedom to exercise in their professional lives as a result of the commodification of the education system.

Critical education is important because it challenges the status quo and tutors are no less exempt from this than their students. What is at stake here is the very integrity of what a university education stands for.

Lomax (1994:5) suggests that the new universities are particularly well placed to challenge the old research hegemonies, despite what she describes as “the unashamed belligerence of the RAE”. Given the practice origins of many higher education tutors in the new universities, I would tend to agree with her. We are uniquely positioned to embrace an alternative approach to research and the new scholarship of teaching and learning. Addressing questions of the kind “How do I improve my practice?” is, I suggest, one way forward, serving to educate not only the tutor but educating the social formation in the process. Davis is less optimistic, and despite the trend for reflective practice she argues that fundamentals need to be addressed such as:

- “Commitment to staff by policy makers and management alike.
- Recognition that staff cannot be all things to all people.
- Recognition that teaching is as valuable to the institution as research.
- Commitment of staff to their own development.
- Provision of appropriate resources.
- Understanding of reflective teaching” (Davis, 2003:253)

Indeed, Davis (*ibid.*) suggests that staff, “especially in the post-1992 universities” are being “pulled apart” by the current changes. She does have a valid point.

To Sum Up: ‘For Them’ Where to From Here?

The creation of a good social order in higher education is a challenge of our time. Notwithstanding the need to address fundamentals of organisation and management in higher education, reflective practice does have a part to play and, as Lomax suggests, the conditions of change facing those in the new universities provide an excellent opportunity through which those committed to a new scholarship of teaching, learning and research can contribute to the education of the wider sphere.

Changing and educating the social formation is a major political endeavour and my contribution may be but a drop in the ocean. To date, I have taken small steps in this direction to educate and influence colleagues, both in my own institution and elsewhere, by organising an international conference in April 2001,²⁰ and with Diana Winstanley (one of the conference founders) producing two special issues from that conference, the first being Winstanley and Hartog (2002)²¹ and the second Hartog and Winstanley (2002).²² At a recent ethics conference held in 2003,²³ along with four other contributors from Middlesex University, I co-presented a paper on the rhetoric and reality of work life balance with a colleague, which was later published (Frame and Hartog, 2003).

As well as making inroads into the HRM and ethics academic community, I have also sought to contribute to a conference on teaching business ethics. It was at this forum that I presented my paper²⁴ on critical action learning. Additionally, at a recent “Teaching Business Ethics” conference (November 2003) with my colleague, Frame, I presented a paper on reflective teaching and

²⁰ On “Ethics and human resources management: professional development and practice”.

²¹ In *Business Ethics, A European Review* (which included my own conference contribution, Hartog (2002a), “Becoming a reflective practitioner: a continuing professional development strategy through humanistic action research”).

²² Selected papers for the *Business and Professional Ethics Journal*.

²³ Challenge of Business Ethics Conference, held at Selwyn College, Cambridge, 7-8 April 2003, combining the 7th European Business Ethics Network-UK (EBEN-UK) Annual Conference and the 5th Ethics and Human Resource Management Conference.

²⁴ See Appendix 1.

the opportunity provided by learning ‘in diversity’ that the challenges of the new university sector bring.²⁵ It is in this context that I hope to make a continuing contribution to academia as an educational action researcher committed to the improvement of my practice and to education and change of the social order.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have described how my living theory inquiry has sought to influence and educate the social formation. I have explored this from the perspectives of the three key stakeholders in the personal process of research, ‘me, us and them’. In other words:

- For me: I have explored the influence that my own inquiry has had on improving my practice, developing the skills of reflective practice and facilitating strategic action, in order that I might realise my values more fully in my practice.
- For us: I have described the influence that my inquiry has had for my students, in particular the facilitation of critical action learning and how that has enabled some students to make a real difference in their professional and organisational spheres through their intervention, a critique of practice and the process of organising reflection.
- For them: I have reflected on how educational judgment is threatened by the separation of teaching and research, and I have discussed the challenge of educating the wider political sphere. Furthermore, I have considered how my inquiry has enabled me to take the first steps, by taking my inquiry into the public domain and, in the process, showing what the new scholarship of teacher research can contribute.

²⁵ This paper is currently being peer reviewed for a special issue of the *Teaching Business Ethics* journal.