

From Dialectics to Inclusionality

A naturally inclusive logic for environmental and educational accountability

By Jack Whitehead and Alan Rayner

6th November 2009

Summary

The last 2,500 years have seen an unresolved conflict between propositional and dialectical logicians. Here, whilst acknowledging the *partial* validity of their views, we trace the confrontation between these logicians to an unrealistic premise that both paradoxically share: the supposition that nature is completely definable into discrete, mutually exclusive categories of subject and object. This *exclusion of the middle ground* is deeply embedded in orthodox theories and practices of science, theology, education and governance as well as in our mathematics and language. Whereas it leads propositional logicians, following Aristotle, to accept one statement about or perceived entity in reality as necessarily 'true' or 'present' and to reject the other as 'false' or 'absent', it leads dialectical thinkers to accept contradictory statements as the nucleus of an inherently ambiguous and pluralistic Nature. In this paper we illustrate the reciprocity of an educational conversation in which we are seeking to clarify and communicate our meanings, through the natural logic of inclusionality, where each flows responsively in the others' receptive influence.

Introduction

This paper includes conversation because we find that this form of communication permits us to acknowledge how the intransigent definitions of propositional and dialectical thinking can be transformed into the fluid, reciprocal distinctions of inclusionality. It is a form of communication within which we can show how Rayner influenced Whitehead's transfiguration of the nucleus of dialectics (Ilyenkov, 1977) into the nucleus of reciprocity in his educational accountability. Rayner's research

programme between 2000 and 2009 has focused on the nature of inclusionality. Whitehead's research programme between 1973-2009 at the University of Bath has focussed on the nature of educational theory, educational knowledge and educational research. The conversation below is preceded by a shared 'framing' of meanings of inclusionality, space, boundaries and the fixed roots of conflicting logics.

Inclusionality

Inclusionality is an understanding of all natural form as 'flow-form' – an energetic configuration of space in figure and figure in space. The inherently static logic of mutual exclusion is thereby subsumed by a fluid logic of '*the including middle*', where the latter is the seat of dynamic relational correspondence, not dichotomy, between local informational ('figural') and non-local spatial ('transfigural') presences. These presences combine in dynamically distinct but not isolated bodily identities as natural inclusions of 'everywhere' in 'somewhere'.

This understanding hence offers a way of including within a 'nucleus of reciprocity', i.e. *the reciprocal influence of each in the other*, what is rejected by propositional logicians as 'not present' but accepted by dialectical thinkers as 'contradictory'. At its root is the simple acknowledgement of space as a continuous, infinite depth throughout the cosmos, *which does not stop at boundaries*.

Space, Boundaries and the Fixed Roots of Conflicting Logics

Propositional thinkers can reject dialectical claims to knowledge as, '*without the slightest foundation. Indeed, they are based on nothing better than a loose and woolly way of speaking*' (Popper 1963, p. 316). Dialectical thinkers claim that propositional thinking, with its elimination of contradictions, masks the dialectical nature of reality (Marcuse, 1964).

How is it that such uncompromisingly opposed views of reality could have been held – and continue to be held – with such faith in their validity by their proponents throughout 2,500 years of the history of human thought? Could both be partly valid? Is there a way in which they could be reconciled, and what would such reconciliation imply for our understanding of nature and human nature? Would such reconciliation necessitate the development of a new system of logic that transcends or transfigures both? These are the questions we intend to address in this paper.

We begin by acknowledging the influence that perceptions of space and boundaries have upon the way we think about natural form and processes. As terrestrial, bipedal, omnivorous primates with binocular vision, huge frontal brain hemispheres and opposable thumbs that equip us to discriminate between and grasp whatever we need to feed, protect and make our way in the world, we are great natural categorizers. It comes easily to us to discriminate between visible, tangible ‘things’ and the apparent ‘gaps’ or ‘discontinuities’ of ‘empty space’ that appear to come between them.

Correspondingly, it is very easy for us to develop a hard-line logic of discontinuity between ‘something’ and ‘nothing’, to reinforce this in our language and mathematics, and thence to embed it deep in the foundations of our theories and practices of science, theology, education and governance. We come to assume that every distinguishable form must have a boundary limit where it stops and something or somewhere else begins. By the same token, we are forced to assume that everything must originate from some kind of ‘start point’ and either continue indefinitely or disappear into some ‘end point’.

Convenient, communicable and incontrovertible as the resultant hard-line separation and quantification of material objects from their spatial context may appear to be, it is the source of profound paradox and conflict – including that which

obtains between propositional and dialectic thinkers. A moment's insight reveals its inherent inconsistency. If natural form was purely material, it could consist of no more than a dimensionless point with no shape or size. If natural form was purely spatial, it would be featureless. If nature consisted purely of solid, massy particles and space wasn't a natural presence, nothing could move. If space was just an infinite emptiness surrounding discrete objects, there would be no place to situate an external source of force to move these objects around. If space wasn't within and throughout as well as around natural form, it wouldn't be possible for form to be distinguishable or to flow as liquid or gas or to have variable qualities of density, bounciness, flexibility and conductivity.

Inclusionality – Natural Energy Flow As The Dynamic Inclusion of Space in Form and Form in Space

The inescapable conclusion is that the natural world of movement and mobility that we sense and inhabit cannot be defined completely into hard and fast categories. There is no absolutely closed form that we know of or can know of. Space is dynamically included in form and form in space. Space is an immovable, irremovable, indivisible, indefinable presence of openness everywhere, of infinite depth at all scales. It is not an empty absence of definable presence within or outside the finite bounds of discrete, active and reactive material objects. In relationship with dynamical form, space has a receptive influence that *induces* flow. In relationship with omnipresent space, dynamical form has a responsive quality that enables it to flow into place. Within this place, receptive space and responsive form combine reflectively and protectively to co-create a dynamic, local-in-non-local 'nucleus of reciprocity' of each within the reciprocal influence of the other. This nucleus comprises the 'inner core' or 'bodily' identity of a natural 'flow-form', which is locally distinct but spatially and dynamically continuous with the 'outer environment' or 'natural neighbourhood' that it both feeds from and feeds into as an inclusion of an endless circulation. In other words, this nucleus comprises what might be called a 'breathing point', fundamentally different from the abstract,

dimensionless, purely local points of rationalistic logic and mathematics. Indeed, it corresponds with what has been called the 'zeroid' or '*zero identity*' by the founder of 'Transfigural Mathematics', Lere Shakunle (Shakunle & Rayner, 2008, p. 33)

This is the understanding of the evolutionary essence of natural energy flow that has been called 'inclusionality', to distinguish it from the objective rationality that underpins both propositional and dialectic thinking (e.g. Rayner, 2003, 2004, 2006a,b). It accords with the *transfigural* mathematical logic, first developed by Shakunle in 1985, in that flow occurs *through* naturally *continuous* numerical and geometrical figures as dynamic local-in-non-local embodiments of space, *not* as the result of enforced movement of discontinuous figures *through space*.

Vasilyuk (1991) has pointed out that relationships between energy and values are only weakly understood in the social sciences. We wish to enhance this understanding. To communicate meanings of natural energy flow in the explanations produced by individuals for their influences in the world we believe that multi-media representations can help. For example, in the following video-clip Rayner is communicating the significance of dynamic boundaries in inclusionality. Responders to the video often comment on the flow of energy expressed by Rayner in his communication. We believe that such flows of energy are vital to inclusionality and can be used to distinguish the living standards of judgment of inclusionality from those used by propositional and dialectical thinkers.



<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yVa7FUIA3W8>

Having shared our 'framing' of meanings of inclusionality, space, boundaries and the fixed roots of conflicting logics we now move into a conversation to share, clarify and evolve our meanings, starting with the inclusional 'self' in life, love and learning.

The Inclusional 'Self' in Life, Love and Learning

Rayner: The implications of this natural understanding for the way we view our human place in nature are enormous. They represent a radical upheaval in the logic that we have been teaching ourselves to accept without question for millennia. From this rationalistic logic, which enforces propositional thinkers to regard 'self' as 'autonomous' and dialectic thinkers to regard it as a nucleus of 'living contradiction' (Ilyenkov, 1977), we arrive into the natural logic of inclusionality that enables us to regard self as 'living neighbourhood', a 'nucleus of reciprocity' or *reciprocal influence of each in the other*.

Whitehead: I like the idea of a natural logic of inclusionality that enables us to regard self as a reciprocal influence of each in the other. In her doctorate, Karen Riding explains her inclusional way of being and researching with a natural logic:

In this account I explain the shared life that I lead with my husband Simon transforms itself into a loving energy that emerges in our educational practice. This loving way of being emerges as the energy that drives me to transform the social formation of the school to work alongside student researchers in an intergenerational and sustainable way.

These living and loving standards of judgment are shared between us, asking the other to be the best that s/he can be and valuing the contribution that s/he makes. I live out an inclusional way of being that extends across the professional and personal domain, asking me to be responsive to the others with whom I share this life. (Riding, 2008)

Rayner: I can see that Karen is a person, a 'self' who is aware of her inclusional nature. She is approaching life with a very different *attitude* from the 'imperious one' that holds itself apart from all else as an independent entity. Unlike the latter, this natural, 'inclusional self' doesn't confront its environmental surroundings or 'wild side' as a contestant that must be subjugated and exploited in order to sustain order and survive. Indeed, the very nature of its 'self-interest' expands from 'one' that excludes or contradicts 'other', to one that dynamically includes other in itself and itself in other. It correspondingly views its dynamic bodily locality as a fluid inclusion of all it beholds, not as a voyeuristic excluded observer peering out at an 'objective world out there' as if through a window in its soul. It feels the space in its heart that makes room for the inclusion of others, just as others make room for its flow to enter their hearts. This gives rise to the feeling called *empathy*, which associates with love and compassion.

Whitehead: I like the way Marian Naidoo expresses empathy in her inclusional meanings of love and a passion for compassion through a 1min. 3 sec. video-clip of a husband who is caring for his wife with Alzheimer's disease.



<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rxJluUVE0qA>

Rayner: I see Marian expressing the natural foundations of her 'inclusional self' in the world with the pride of humility that finds pleasure in learning and work well done, not the Pride of arrogance that claims sovereign superiority over others. It does not seek to compete, though it may well compare its competence with others in its neighbourhood as a healthy way of identifying possibilities for enhancement and creative innovation. It recognises its vulnerability, along with others', not as

'weakness' or 'failure' but as vital to the possibility of living, learning and passing on co-creatively in its continually evolving neighbourhood of natural energy flow.

Whitehead: This is what I am seeing in the video-clip above taken by Marian Naidoo (2005) and included in her thesis on:

I am because we are (a never ending story). The emergence of a living theory of inclusional and responsive practice.

This is how Marian describes her living, inclusional and responsive theory of her practice:

I believe that this original account of my emerging practice demonstrates how I have been able to turn my ontological commitment to a passion for compassion into a living epistemological standard of judgement by which my inclusional and responsive practice may be held accountable.

I am a story teller and the focus of this narrative is on my learning and the development of my living educational theory as I have engaged with others in a creative and critical practice over a sustained period of time. This narrative self-study demonstrates how I have encouraged people to work creatively and critically in order to improve the way we relate and communicate in a multi-professional and multi-agency healthcare setting in order to improve both the quality of care provided and the well being of the system.

In telling the story of the unique development of my inclusional and responsive practice I will show how I have been influenced by the work of theatre practitioners such as Augusto Boal, educational theorists such as Paulo Freire and drawn on, incorporated and developed ideas from complexity theory and living theory action research. I will also describe how my engagement with the thinking of others has enabled my own practice to develop and from that to develop a living, inclusional and

responsive theory of my practice. Through this research and the writing of this thesis, I now also understand that my ontological commitment to a passion for compassion has its roots in significant events in my past.

<http://www.actionresearch.net/naidoo.shtml>

Rayner: The Inclusional Self In Practice – The Mind-and-Soul-Full Educator of Self and Other.

Marian is showing what an inclusional self looks like in practice Does an inclusional self have an inclusional practice, a way of behaving, which can be learned? What kind of theory might underlie this practice?

From what we have already said, it is clear that inclusional ways of living, loving and learning **emerge** from an attitude of mind and heart, not from following a set procedure or from applying generalizations from written texts whose words cannot in themselves convey the depths of feeling and intuition involved. This attitude is intellectually justifiable in terms of an understanding of natural energy flow as the dynamic inclusion of space in form and form in space, which contrasts with the fixed, definable form assumed by objective rationality to be the primary, default condition of Nature.

But this doesn't mean inclusionality can only be practiced by an elite class of people with esoteric knowledge and understanding. Indeed, if anything, inclusional behaviour comes most naturally to anyone whose attitude has not been restricted by the exclusive theories and practices that we have been teaching ourselves for millennia.

Inclusional ways of relating are correspondingly most evident when we feel relaxed in surroundings and company that we love – especially beyond the confines of what many of us regard as our *workplace*. And therein may lie a lesson in itself – that we experience most difficulty in living a life of 'self as neighbourhood' – 'self as an including middle' – in settings that we have come to associate with *work*. For it is

just for such settings that we have used fixed assumptions of objective rationality to *entrain* and control ourselves as unthinking robotic followers of instruction in restrictive practices – not *educate* us into a wider awareness of our human creative potential as for example shown by Andrew Henon (2009) in [Creativity|Works](#).

It is as though we regard work not as a source of mutual sustenance and pleasure, but rather as a stern obligation of what we must do to survive in the harsh reality of life as a battleground, not the adventure of life as a playground. This is most painfully obvious when the workplace really *is* a battleground. Here is how John Keegan (2004) describes military training:-

'...the deliberate injection of emotion...will seriously hinder, if not altogether defeat, the aim of officer-training. That aim...is to reduce the conduct of war to a set of rules and a system of procedures – and thereby make orderly and rational what is essentially chaotic and instinctive. It is an aim analogous to that pursued by medical schools in their fostering among students of a detached attitude to pain and distress... the rote-learning and repetitive form and the categorical, reductive quality ...has an important and intended psychological effect. Anti-militarists would call it depersonalizing and even dehumanizing. But given...that battles are going to happen, it is powerfully beneficial...one is helping him to avert the onset of fear, or, worse, of panic...'

Here it is all too clear how the assumption that conflict is inevitable becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy, which rationalistically objectifies the person by excising or confining the limitless space that brings uncertainty and vulnerability (and love) and imposes in its place a rigid frame of deadening predictability. The 'self' is sustained in a confrontational stance as an automaton or living contradiction of its natural neighbourhood through mindless and heartless routine and ritual, in which learning is reduced to rehearsal for one kind of prescriptively staged performance or another. Sense, sensibility and creativity are ruled out by rules and regulations of

pride, prejudice and habit that define what can and what cannot be accepted by the *status quo*.

The resultant addictive patterns of thought and behaviour subservient to prescriptive codes of conduct and practice are evident throughout modern human culture in the hierarchical and adversarial design of our academic, governmental, industrial, commercial, religious and sporting organizations. Everywhere, this design impedes evolutionary possibility through the imposition of megalithic structures that oppose change. It even projects itself onto instead of learning from the energy flow of non-human nature, exemplified by the Darwinian oxymoron of 'natural selection' as the 'preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life'.

Such thinking cannot, by its very nature, solve the enormous environmental, social and psychological problems of its own making that humanity sees as confronting itself at the beginning of the twenty-first century. It is its own worst enemy.

This is where the inclusional way of thinking about 'self' as an 'including middle' could help greatly. It becomes possible not to regard 'self' as a 'fixed locality', stuck forever in the same old skin, with the same old genes controlling its every move, on course for inevitable competition and conflict. Instead self is understandable as a dynamic locality of its non-local natural neighbourhood, capable both of changing and being changed by its circumstances, like a river in landscape that is never the same twice. This is essentially how inclusionality provides the kind of 'unhooked thinking' that can help us out of the helplessness (often 'learned' and culturally enforced) of assuming addictive behaviour is pre-ordained - a 'problem with us' as singular individuals, as distinct from 'a problem for us' as 'living neighbourhoods'. And in getting our selves 'off the hook' it may be possible to unleash enormous creative potential that is inherent in our capacity for 'play'. Instead of instructing our selves to conform to pre-selective standards, we truly educate our selves to become involved in an ongoing, improvisational process of 'natural inclusion' – the

fluid dynamic, co-creative transformation of all through all in receptive spatial context.

Whitehead: I like the way you have expressed educating our selves in an ongoing, improvisational process of 'natural inclusion' – the fluid dynamic, co-creative transformation of all through all in receptive spatial context.

I also like very much your questions about what the inclusional self looks like in practice:

Does it have an inclusional practice, a way of behaving, which can be learned? What kind of theory might underlie this practice?,

and your points about inclusional ways of living, loving and learning:

From what we have already said, it is clear that inclusional ways of living, loving and learning emerge from an attitude of mind and heart, not from following a set procedure or boning up on written texts whose words cannot in themselves convey the depths of feeling and intuition involved.

I particular liked your point that in the natural logic of inclusionality:

... self is understandable as a dynamic locality of its non-local natural neighbourhood, capable both of changing and being changed by its circumstances.... Instead of instructing our selves to conform to pre-selective standards, we truly educate our selves to become involved in an ongoing, improvisational process of 'natural inclusion' – the fluid dynamic, co-creative transformation of all through all in receptive spatial context.

I'm going to explore the implications of your points above, about natural inclusionality for the development of educational accountability in higher education

with living educational theories. I am thinking of a form of accountability that acknowledges the existence in living standards of judgment of the *'fluid dynamic, co-creative transformation of all through all in receptive special context'*.

Researching the inclusional development of educational accountability in higher education for improving practice and generating knowledge in living educational theories

One of the main purposes of my research is to contribute to enhancing the influence of educators and to developing a better understanding of the pressures that can sometimes constrain this influence. I also want to contribute to rechanneling the energy sustaining these pressures into the creation of conditions that support more educationally productive activities.

In exploring the implications of inclusionality for educational accountability I am agreeing with the advocacy of a form of accountability that stresses the importance of freedom, responsibility, professional autonomy and public accountability (Olliff-Cooper, J., Wind-Cowie, M. & Bartlett, J. 2009). I am thinking of educational accountability as one of the ways we account to ourselves as we reflect on what we are doing and have learnt that is worthwhile in a loving and productive life.

It is clear that able, brilliant and skilled professionals do not thrive in an environment where much of their energies are absorbed by the need to comply with a raft of detailed requirements. There is a need to shift away from the regulation of processes through statutory instruments, towards establishing accountability for the delivery of key outcomes." (House of Lords, 2009, p.15)

As I write I am also feeling the life-affirming energy and values of those educators I have tutored for their masters and doctoral degrees over the past three decades at the University of Bath. I feel their delight as they communicate their passion for education and for the learning and well-being of their pupils. I also feel their

tiredness at the end of the day in school and their frustration with some aspects of school organization and leadership. I feel their anger towards government policy on accountability because it too often exerts constraints on their freedom and sense of professional responsibility to do what they believe to be right and educational for the young people in their care.

My focus on the importance of educational accountability has emerged from my research programme on educational theory at the University of Bath between 1973-2009. Most recently I have learnt how to use multi-media visual narratives to communicate the meanings of the flows of the life-affirming energy with values that educators express in their educational relationships with their pupils. Using video with the digital technology I shall show you the evidence to justify my claim that the inclusional values that are being expressed in the embodied knowledge of educators provide explanatory principles and living standards of judgment for a form of educational accountability. They can include the values of loving recognition, respectful connectedness and educational responsibility (Huxtable, 2009). With the video-clips I shall focus attention on the importance of the relationally dynamic awareness of space and boundaries of inclusionality (Rayner, 2005, 2009) for educational accountability.

In justifying my claims about the relationally dynamic nature of explanatory principles in educational accountability I shall also use the ideas of empathetic resonance (Sardello, 2008) and empathetic validity (Dadds, 2008) to develop a shared understanding of inclusional meanings of expressions of life-affirming energy with values. I shall then explain how such communications can help to constitute a form of educational accountability that includes values of freedom, responsibility and professional autonomy with public accountability. Olliff-Cooper, et al. (2009) have advocated this combination as offering the kind of accountability that is needed to enhance professional practice.

Finally I shall address the problem of how we could research enquiries in higher education with the inclusion of risk, resilience and vulnerability in such a process of educational accountability.

I shall begin with a video-clip from my own practice to emphasise the importance of locating the individual in an inclusional living space of complex relationships. I use a second video-clip to see if the embodied values are being expressed in a way that resonate with your own.

Recognising and accounting for the existence of an individual in an inclusional living space of complex relationships.

This first video of 19 seconds is speeded up just to communicate the recognition of the individual existing in a living space of complex relationships. The space includes the banqueting room of the Guildhall in the City of Bath, UK. In this space I am leading a session on action research and living theory on the 16th July 2008. 26 years earlier I was in this space and dealing with the election result (the votes were counted in this room in 1982) that removed me as a Labour Councillor from Bath City Council. I say this just to stress the importance of both the influences of the network of relationships you can see on the video-clip and the historical influences that continue to influence what is being done. If I had been granted a second term as City Councillor the trajectory of my life would have been very different.



http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PH6DiBaZm_Y

I want to emphasise with these visual data the importance of the recognition of my existence, in an inclusional living space of complex relationships, for a valid account or explanation of my educational influence. I now want to emphasise the importance of empathetic resonance between individuals in recognizing, being receptive to and responding to the expression of embodied values.

Expressing embodied values and their empathetic resonance with those of others.

In this second video-clip I am in a supervision session with Jacqueline Delong about her doctoral thesis. The clip is 1.25 minutes and at 44 seconds you can see and hear our shared laughter. As I look at the clip again it continues to communicate to me a flow of life-affirming energy between us. I believe this flow of energy will communicate to you through your empathetic resonance in being receptive and responsive to what you are being shown.



<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w2kdOfRKfYs>

I first encountered the idea of empathetic resonance in the writings of Sardello (2008). For Sardello, *empathetic resonance*, is the resonance of the individual soul coming into resonance with the Soul of the World (p. 13). I am using *empathetic resonance* to communicate a feeling of the immediate presence of the other in communicating the living values that the other experiences as giving meaning and purpose to their life.

Living educational accountability

I believe that we might share a desire to live a meaningful, loving and productive life. You may be like me in sometimes reflecting on the life you have lived and making explicit to yourself the valuable lessons you have learnt in the course of your life. I am thinking here of learning that you recognise as guiding and informing your present practice and your intentions as you project yourself into a future that is not yet existing. I like the idea of accounting for oneself as an individual's explanation for the educational influences in their own learning, the learning of others and in the learning of social formations. I have taken to calling these explanations living educational theories to distinguish them from the explanations **derived** from the propositional relationships of other kinds of theory.

I use the idea of including democratic validation in strengthening the validity of my explanations of learning in my life. This is not to say that I subsume my sense of personal responsibility for accounting for my learning to a collective and democratic judgment. However, what I have recognized is that others can help to strengthen the validity of my accounts of educational learning. They can provide ideas that help me both to improve my practice and to generate knowledge of what I am doing and the influences I am having. I like Popper's (1975) ideas that objectivity is grounded in intersubjective criticism and that we can test the validity of our ideas through the mutual rational controls of critical discussion.

In submitting my accounts to democratic evaluation by peers I usually ask them to help me to strengthen the validity of my account and to make suggestions on how I might improve my practice and contribute further to educational knowledge. I ask for responses in terms of the comprehensibility of my account. Is it making sense to the reader, especially in relation to the meanings of the energy-flowing values that I use as explanatory principles in my account? I ask for responses in terms of the evidence in relation to my assertions. Is there sufficient evidence to justify my claims to knowledge? I ask for responses that can help me to become more aware of

the normative assumptions in my account. These are the assumptions in particular cultures that are often taken for granted and not brought into awareness. Do I show an awareness of how normative assumptions from the sociocultural context are influencing my account? I ask for responses in terms of the authenticity of my account. Do I show that I am continually sustaining a commitment to live my values as fully as I can in what I am doing? (Habermas, 1976, p.1-2)

Having emphasized the importance of seeing oneself as a dynamic inclusion of space and energy and of the importance of empathetic resonance in communicating the meanings of energy-flowing values as explanatory principles in living educational accountability, I now want to focus on the significance of these ideas for researching educational accountability in higher education.

Researching inclusionality in educational accountability in higher education with living educational theories.

Having spent most of my working life in Higher Education I want to share some of my learning about researching inclusionality in educational accountability with living educational theories. I have spent much of this life seeking to enhance professionalism in education by contributing to a knowledge-base that includes making public the embodied knowledge of professional educators in their living theories.

What each of the educators I have worked with expresses, in their stories of their professional lives, is a desire to live their values as fully as they can in enhancing the learning and well-being of their pupils and students (see <http://www.actionresearch.net/mastermod.shtml> for masters units and dissertations and <http://www.actionresearch.net/living.shtml> for masters dissertations and doctoral theses).

They express this desire in their accounts or narratives of their understandings of their educational influences in their pupils learning and in their experience of the constraints and opportunities provided in the social contexts in which they live and work. Their explanatory principles include their energy-flowing values and their recognition of the relationally dynamic influence of their social, historical, cultural and ecological contexts.

As Vasilyuk (1991) has pointed out conceptions involving energy are very current in psychology, but they have been very poorly worked out from the methodological standpoint. I agree with his points that we know how 'energetically' a person can act when motivated, we know that the meaningfulness of a project lends additional strength to the people engaged in it. (p.64).

I have found two of Marian Dadd's ideas most helpful in developing a living theory methodology (Whitehead, 2008a & 2009) for educational accountability with inclusionality that can show the significance of energy flowing values. The first, on the importance of methodological inventiveness, she developed with Susan Hart (Dadds & Hart, 2001). In the course of their research Dadds and Hart developed the insight that for some practitioner-researchers, creating their own unique way through their research, may be as important as their self-chosen research focus. They emphasise the importance of understanding that how practitioners chose to research and their sense of control over this, could be equally important to their motivation, their sense of identity within the research and their research outcomes (p. 166). As they say:

More important than adhering to any specific methodological approach, be it that of traditional social science or traditional action research, may be the willingness and courage of practitioners – and those who support them – to create enquiry approaches that enable new, valid understandings to develop; understandings that empower practitioners to improve their work for the beneficiaries in their care. Practitioner research methodologies are with us to serve professional practices. So what genuinely

matters are the purposes of practice which the research seeks to serve, and the integrity with which the practitioner researcher makes methodological choices about ways of achieving those purposes. No methodology is, or should, cast in stone, if we accept that professional intention should be informing research processes, not pre-set ideas about methods of techniques. (p. 169)

The second idea is that of empathetic validity. For Dadds this is the potential of practitioner research in its processes and outcomes to transform the emotional dispositions of people towards each other, such that greater empathy and regard are created. Dadds distinguishes between internal empathetic validity as that which changes the practitioner researcher and research beneficiaries and external empathetic validity as that which influences audiences with whom the practitioner research is shared. (Dadds, 2009, p. 279).

In researching my educational accountability in higher education I have produced explanations of my educational influences in my own learning and in the learning of others that rely for their communicability on empathetic resonance and validity. I have good reasons to believe that I have had some success in these communications (Pound, Laidlaw & Huxtable, 2009). These explanations include the educational influences of others in my own learning.

For example, Moira Laidlaw (1996) in her doctoral enquiries showed me that my standards of judgment were living standards of judgment. What I had assumed was that it was sufficient to clarify the meanings of my values, as standards of judgment, in the course of their emergence in practice. What I had not understood, until Laidlaw pointed it out, was the importance of recognizing the living and changing nature of the values themselves in the process of clarification. Another important illustration of the educational influence of others is the inclusion of love as an academic standard of judgment in educational accountability. Eleanor Lohr's (2006) doctoral research showed me 'Love at Work' as a living standard of judgment. Joan

Walton's (2008) doctoral research showed me a loving dynamic energy with spiritual resilience as a living standard of judgment.

Marie Huxtable has demonstrated how my use of video above, can be used to clarify the meanings of the energy flowing values of loving recognition, respectful connectedness and educational responsibility and to integrate these into a visual narrative:

What follows is part of a video narrative in which I try ostensibly to clarify the meanings of my educational values of, a loving recognition, a respectful connectedness, and an educational responsibility, as an example. The context is a day when children and teachers have come together for a day as co-learners, facilitated by a mathematician and an educator, to experience what it is to enquire as a mathematician. (Huxtable, 2009, p.25)

Researching inclusionality in educational accountability in higher education with living educational theories has not been without risk and has required resilience and the vulnerability of being open to the possibilities that life itself permits. It includes the willingness to state the intentions that project oneself into a future that is not yet realized in practice. It requires a commitment to reflect on one's learning and to explain how this is influencing one's practice. Here is an intention that involves an analysis of such risk and resilience. It is the Abstract of a keynote I am to give on the 27th November 2009 at the HELTASA Conference in Johannesburg.

“ 'Risk and Resilience in Higher Education in Improving Practice and Generating Knowledge' ”

Abstract

This address acknowledges the assertion of the conference organizers that we must participate fully in the knowledge explosion and a society of global interaction. It focuses on the questions that we have been asked to address:

What risks do our students face, as they embark on the trajectory of higher education? In what ways is risk-taking inherent to higher education? What risks face each of us, in our specific roles? How can we, and our students, learn to respond to risk with resilience?

Answers to these questions will be given from the accounts of improving practice and generating knowledge from students in Higher Education in different cultural contexts (Whitehead, 2008b). These accounts show how individual students in higher education can generate their own living educational theories (see <http://www.actionresearch.net/living.shtml>) as explanations of their educational influences in their own learning, the learning of others and in the learning of the social contexts in which we live and work. The answer to the question of learning to respond to risk with resilience will focus on the relational dynamics of transforming what counts as educational knowledge in Higher Education. This will include the use of multi-media visual narratives for the communication of the meanings of inclusional embodied values in new living standards of judgment.”

Living with the influences of complex ecologies in a continuously changing world in improving practice and generating knowledge means that, simultaneously with this projection into a future that is not yet realized, there are many other on-going and relationally dynamic activities that influence one’s practice.

One of the challenges in these diverse activities is to learn how to pool our energies and understandings in ways that enhance the influence of values that carry hope for the future of humanity and our own. I am thinking of activities such as those represented in the Educational Journal of Living Theories (EJOLTS) at <http://ejolts.net/>. One of the necessary conditions of distinguishing something as

research is that it is systematic enquiry made public. In researching the implications of inclusionality in educational accountability in higher education with living educational theories it is necessary to make our findings public. I am suggesting that we can do this in publishing our living educational theories in forums such as EJOLTS with a commitment to live the following values as fully as we can as outlined by the editorial board of EJOLTS:

*EJOLTS is committed to publishing the **accounts of practitioner-researchers** from a wide range of global, social, cultural and professional contexts that explain their educational influences in their own learning, in the learning of others and in the learning of social formations. The journal focuses on personal journeys and collaborative pathways that explain educational influences in learning in terms of values, skills and understandings that the researcher believes carries hope for the future of humanity and their own.*

*The values we are thinking of are ontological in the sense that they are used to give meaning and purpose to the lives of individuals. We are particularly interested in publishing explanations that connect a **flow of life-affirming energy with living values such as love, freedom, justice, compassion, courage, care and democratic evaluation.***

We invite you to submit articles for publication in Educational Journal of Living Theories, a web-based international refereed journal. Journal articles will be published three times a year. We welcome submissions from all living theorists who understand their living theories as their explanations for their educational influences in their own learning, the learning of others and the learning of social formations.

I am hopeful that forums such as EJOLTS will continue to provide a living educational space in which we can pool our life-affirming energy, values and understandings in contributing to making the world a better place to be. At the heart

of these contributions is the understanding of the natural logic of inclusionality that I think bears repetition:

... self is understandable as a dynamic locality of its non-local natural neighbourhood, capable both of changing and being changed by its circumstances.... Instead of instructing our selves to conform to pre-selective standards, we truly educate our selves to become involved in an ongoing, improvisational process of 'natural inclusion' – the fluid dynamic, co-creative transformation of all through all in receptive spatial context.

References

Dadds, M. (2008) Empathetic Validity in Practitioner-Research. Educational Action Research, 16(2), 279-290.

Dadds, M. & Hart, S. (2001) Doing Practitioner Research Differently, p. 166. London; RoutledgeFalmer.

Henon, A. (Ed.) (2009) Creativity|Works. Radstock; NESAs publications.

House of Lords (2009) The cumulative impact of statutory instruments on schools: Report with evidence. The Stationery Office Limited: London. Retrieved 8 May 2009 from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2009/mar/13/lords-report-dcsf> .

Huxtable, M. (2009) How Do We Contribute To An Educational Knowledge Base: A response to Whitehead and a challenge to BERA. Research Intelligence 107, 25-26. Retrieved 7 October 2009 from <http://www.jackwhitehead.com/huxtable/mh2009beraRI107.pdf>

Keegan, J. (2004) The Face of Battle. London: Pimlico

Ilyenkov, E. (1977) Dialectical Logic. Moscow; Progress Publishers.

Laidlaw, M. (1996) How can I create my own living educational theory as I offer you an account of my educational development? Ph.D. Thesis, University of Bath.

Retrieved 10 October 2009 from <http://www.actionresearch.net/moira2.shtml>

Lohr, E. (2006) Love at Work: What is my lived experience of love, and how may I become an instrument of love's purpose? Ph.D. Thesis, University of Bath Retrieved

10 October 2009 from <http://www.actionresearch.net/lohr.shtml>

Naidoo, M. (2005) I am because we are (A never ending story). The emergence of a living theory of inclusional and responsive practice. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Bath.

Retrieved 11 March 2009 from <http://www.actionresearch.net/naidoo.shtml>

Marcuse, H. (1964) One Dimensional Man, London; Routledge and Kegan Paul.

McNiff, J. & Whitehead, J. (2006) All You Need To Know About Action Research. London; Sage.

Olliff-Cooper, J., Wind-Cowie, M. & Bartlett, J. (2009) Leading from the Front. London; Demos. Retrieved 7 October 2009 from

<http://www.demos.co.uk/publications/leading-from-the-front>

Popper, K. (1963) Conjectures and Refutations, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Popper, K. (1975) The Logic of Scientific Discovery, London; Hutchinson & Co.

Pound, R, Laidlaw, M. & Huxtable, M. (2009) Jack Whitehead Validations. Bath; Bear Flat Publishing.

Rayner, A. (2009) Inclusionality: An Introduction. Retrieved 12 October 2009 from <http://www.inclusional-research.org/introduction.php>

Rayner, A. (2005) Space, Dust and the Co-evolutionary Context of 'His Dark Materials'. Retrieved 2 August 2006 from <http://people.bath.ac.uk/bssadmr/inclusionality/HisDarkMaterials.htm>

Rayner, A. (2004) Inclusionality and the Role of Place, Space and Dynamic Boundaries in Evolutionary Processes. *Philosophica*, Vol. 73, 2004, pp. 51-70. Retrieved 12 October 2009 from <http://www.jackwhitehead.com/rayner/arphilosophicaok.pdf>

Riding, K. (2008) Thesis, How do I come to understand my shared living educational standards of judgement in the life I lead with others? Creating the space for intergenerational student-led research. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Bath. Retrieved 11 March 2009 from <http://www.actionresearch.net/karenridingphd.shtml>

Sardello, R. (2008) Silence: The Mystery of Wholeness. Berkeley; Goldenstone Press.

Shakunle, L. O. & Rayner, A. D. M. (2008) SUPERCHANNEL Inside and Beyond Superstring The Natural Inclusion of One in All –III Journal of Transfigural Mathematics, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 9-69.

Vasilyuk, F. (1991) The Psychology of Experiencing: the Resolution of Life's Critical Situations. Hemel Hempstead; Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Walton, J. (2008) Thesis, Ways of Knowing: Can I find a way of knowing that satisfies my search for meaning? Ph.D. Thesis, University of Bath. Retrieved 10 October 2009 from <http://www.actionresearch.net/walton.shtml>

Whitehead, J. & McNiff, J. (2006) Action Research Living Theory. London; Sage.

Whitehead, J. (2008a) Using A Living Theory Methodology In Improving Practice And Generating Educational Knowledge in Living Theories. *Educational Journal of Living Theories*, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp 104-126 . Retrieved 8 December 2008 from <http://ejolts.net/node/80>

Whitehead, J. (2008b) How are living educational theories being produced and legitimated in the boundaries of cultures in resistance? Paper presented at the Cultures in Resistance Conference. The 7th Conference of the Discourse, Power, Resistance Series, 18-20 March 2008 Manchester Metropolitan University. Retrieved on 12 October 2009 from <http://www.jackwhitehead.com/jack/jwmanchester250207.htm>

Whitehead, J. (2009) How Do I Influence the Generation of Living Educational Theories for Personal and Social Accountability in Improving Practice? Using a Living Theory Methodology in Improving Educational Practice, in Tidwell, Deborah L.; Heston, Melissa L.; Fitzgerald, Linda M. (Eds.) (2009) *Research Methods for the Self-study of Practice*. Dordrecht; Springer.