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Abstract

Research publication is one of the threshold concepts of research practice, and therefore of teaching research. The notion of publishing one's research is constantly shifting in response to technological and philosophical debates. From the Medieval studia generalia, in which prospective applicants had to orally defend themselves against vocal members of the audience, through to the current REF processes that puts impact value on individual research publications, research publication is in constant flux. The OECD redefinition of research in 2002 to include performative work was just another critical incident in a constantly changing notion of what counts as research publication. As with other educational practice, the hegemony associated with research and research publication often inhibits creativity. Students may need to be encouraged to constantly question the unchallenged assumptions associated with both research and research publication.

This presentation, in a performative mode of a 40 minute cabaret, models one of the creative ways in which research and in fact any topic can be disseminated or taught. 'My idea of academic cabaret involves a spoken monologue around a specific topic interspersed with songs chosen to advance the central theme of the cabaret topic through their lyrics' (Hill, 2015, 153).
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Geof has been presenting one-man cabarets as academic presentations throughout his academic career. He has a background in the performative arts and training as an opera and musical theatre singer which he draws on lecturing in Communication, Management, Education and Research. His first one-man cabaret was written in 1995 on 'Being a Reflective Practitioner'. Following his cabaret on ‘Doing a Doctorate’ he wrote and performed a subsequent one-man cabaret on ‘Research Supervision’ which was performed at the International Conference on Quality Postgraduate Research in Adelaide, Australia in 2006.

Geof is the principal author and instigator of ‘the research supervisor’s friend’ – a Wordpress blog. http://supervisorsfriend.wordpress.com/ .
Provenance of this cabaret

This cabaret was written for the Inaugural Global Storytelling Conference, Prague: Chezk Republick (May, 2012) under the title of ‘What happens when a student wants to do something different in their dissertation? – Cabaret as academic writing’. It was subsequently presented at Europa University, Berlin (May, 2012) and Wolverhampton University, U.K. (June, 2012). At the Wolverhampton HEA conference it was invited for presentation the following year at Birmingham City University. In 2013, the cabaret toured under the title ‘What happens when a researcher wants to publish differently?’ to Brighton University and Birmingham City University and Coventry University: U.K.


In 2015 the cabaret again toured through three universities to Birmingham City University, Dublin City University and Oxford Brookes University: U.K. as ‘What happens when a researcher wants to publish differently? : A vision of the possibilities – Cabaret as academic discourse’. In 2017/8, revised versions of the cabaret were presented at University of Brighton (March 2017) and Nottingham University Festival of Learning (June, 2017), Coventry University, Disrupting Research practices conference (January, 2018) and Oxford Brookes University (April, 2018).

The style of writing in this paper

The style adopted for publishing the text of the cabaret originated with my doctoral dissertation (Hill, 2002) in which I published a different cabaret on ‘Doing a Doctorate’. That style is recognisable by:

- Centred italics to indicate the text of the paper which is sung.
- Endnotes to provide the authentication or additional references for the points I have made in presenting the argument within this paper.

It is an effort to demonstrate the systematic basis on which the creative work has been developed in line with the Excellence in Research for Australia submission guidelines (2010, 10) and the Standards for Creative Research (OECD, 2002).
Overture

\textsuperscript{1}Someday, somewhere, somehow.

A vision’s just a vision if it’s only in your head

If no-one gets to hear it its as good as dead

It has to come to life.

Bit by bit putting it together

Piece by piece, only way to make a ‘work of art’

Every moment makes a contribution

Every little detail plays a part

Having just the vision’s no solution

Everything depends on execution

Putting it together, word by word.

Art isn’t easy

Overnight you’re a trend,

You’re the right combination

Then the trend’s at an end. Suddenly you’re last year’s sensation

All they ever want is repetition

All they really like is what they know

You’ve got to understand (what is) their tradition

Got to learn to trust your intuition

While you reinvent your own position

And you get your work on exhibition

Putting it together, bit by bit,

Phrase by phrase

Word by word, thought by thought, dot by dot,

song by song, spat by spat,

and that is the state of the art.

\textsuperscript{1} ‘Putting it together’ from ‘Sunday in the Park with George’ (Sondheim, 1984)
Welcome

Thank you.

It wonderful to be associated with a Management and Organisation conference that aligns itself with Performance: Performance both through inquiry and as a tool for disseminating inquiry findings. The clandestine or perhaps not so clandestine way in which AoMO broke from the ranks and traditions of the Organisation and Management conference circuit also aligns this conference with a form of revolutionary activity that with each conference grows in stature. This conference is thus one of several conferences pushing the boundaries both of what constitutes a conference and more importantly (to take a lead from Stenhouse’s (1981) writing), what counts as research and research dissemination.

Since I embarked on my own revolutionary journey in 1994, to present firstly academic work in cabaret and from 2002 to research the notion of performative inquiry, it has become a mission and a passion to explore these questions through my lived experiences.

Introduction

I am currently a Reader in Education at Birmingham City University and I also practice as a Management Consultant in Australia. The inquiry addressed in this cabaret has been undertaken predominantly as practice-led inquiry (Gray, 1996) and draws on several previous and parallel strands of my professional status.

- My training as a work-study analyst in the 1980s that initiated an interest in practice-led inquiry;
- My Higher Education lecturing, which since my first years as a university lecturer in the late 1980s embraced performative modes of delivering research findings.
- My engagement in university based research with action inquiry into my management consultancy and a subsequent doctoral inquiry into undertaking doctoral degrees. These formed the theoretical platforms for my current practice-led inquiries;
- My musical theatre background;

In this cabaret I want to look at two things.

Firstly, I want to encourage my peers to advance an agenda about publishing research differently by drawing attention to the long and revolutionary history in research publishing. Different research publication might simply represent variance from what is being encouraged through the dominant literature and what is encouraged in specific universities, business schools and research centres. It might also represent something vastly different in the realm of research practice that no-one has ever tried before.

Secondly I want to look at emergence of new ideas and new ways of disseminating research within a contemporary research agenda that aligns with publication impact and research evaluation framework (REF) processes.

All practice is complex and informed by multiple factors. As we are learning (at least in the

---

2 Ward, Linstead, Taylor and Guy (2017)
UK as we head for the next iteration of the REF), impact is a key player in evaluating research. Alongside the esoteric value of performative modes of research we must make sure that there are clear contributions to knowledge. This agenda is often asked or raised using the ‘so what’ question\(^3\). The ‘so what’ of this cabaret rests in the heart of what research is and the role played by publication within research. As the OECD research guidelines suggest, ‘research and experimental development (R&D) comprise creative work undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of people (man), culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications’\(^4\). Research publication is therefore essential for communicating the outcomes of research and, as I believe that there are many different ways to communicate, when we talk about communicating how we have undertaken a study and the results of our research, it is important to look to a variety of methods. This can ensure that we communicate to a variety of people.

Starkey and Madden’s writing drew attention to different modes of business and management knowledge\(^5\): Mode 1 knowledge is knowledge arising from traditional research practices and Mode 2 knowledge is knowledge arising from practitioners, or what some refer to as practice-led knowledge\(^6\). My own practice-led inquiries have explored alternative ways to communicate the knowledge, to make it more accessible and thus usable for other practitioners.

The term hegemony\(^7\) is often used in the study of practice. This is the dominant way of doing anything. We can deepen an understanding of the hegemonic practices associated with research and research publication by looking to the edges in the form of marginal practices. Presenting academic material in cabaret represents a form of marginality.

**Provenance\(^8\)**

For the past six years, my colleague Cathryn Lloyd and I have explored and expounded a notion of Provenance\(^8\), within which we maintain that every practice has a history and each practitioner has a history with the practice. If I think about my personal provenance for my research publication practices it includes

- my early academic publications describing experiential learning methods I had developed in my early university teaching years\(^9\).

---

\(^3\) Selwyn (2014).
\(^4\) Frascati definition of research
\(^5\) Starkey and Madan (2001)
\(^6\) Gray (1996)
\(^7\) Ives (2004)
\(^9\) Hill (1991)
Later it more formally included my master’s research on my management consultancy\textsuperscript{10} and my doctoral inquiries firstly into higher education practices\textsuperscript{11} and later into reflective practice for business professionals\textsuperscript{12}.

but since 2002, my research practice provenance has drawn on my singing training and exposure to musical theatre.

Personal provenance includes publications written by the practitioners themselves about their practice\textsuperscript{13}, or in my case, cabarets performed\textsuperscript{14}.

The Provenance of Research Publication

When we look at the general provenance or the literature about the practice of research publication, there is a strong and dominant theme aligned with the written word as far back as the early philosophers’ whose spoken thoughts were often recorded on scrolls and tablets.

\textsuperscript{15}You can open doors and take from the shelves all the books you’ve longed to hold.

\textit{You can ask all the questions the whys and the wheres as the mysteries of life unfold.}

\textit{As you walk through the forests of the trees of knowledge}
\textit{and listen to the lessons of the leaves.}

\textit{You enter a space to discover debates}
\textit{wrapped in the shawl that learning weaves.}

\textit{I remember, everything they taught me}
\textit{What they gave me look at what it’s brought me.}

\textit{You can travel the past and take what you need to see you through your years.}

\textit{What philosophers have learned and scientists as well}
\textit{That was there for their eyes and ears.}

\textit{Like a link in a chain from the past to the present that joins me with my future yet to see.}

\textit{I can now be a part of this ongoing stream that has always been a part of me.}

\textit{I remember, everything you taught me}
\textit{What you gave me, look at where it’s brought me.}

\textsuperscript{10}Hill (1997)
\textsuperscript{11}Hill (2002)
\textsuperscript{12}Hill (2018)
\textsuperscript{13}Hill (2014); Hill and Lloyd (2015); Hill (2015).
\textsuperscript{14}Hill (2014)
\textsuperscript{15}The lyrics of this song have been adapted from the musical Yentl (1983); Music by Michel Legrand and Lyrics by Alan and Marilyn Bergman. The song refers to the Talmudic scholars and their reference to the many old texts which inform the way in which people understand and make choices in contemporary life.
There is literature that once you’ve read no-one can take away,
    No wave can wash away, No wind can blow away
    No tide can turn away, No fire can burn away
    No time can tear away
And now they’re about to be mine

There are things to remember all your life
Those thoughts that fuel your dreams until the fall of your life.
Find meaning in those moments!

One way to explore or analyse general provenance of a practice – I often refer to this as interrogating a provenance - is by examining it chronologically, and that framework applied to literature about research publication brings into focus two key agendas or influences: the philosophical debates and technological advances that have changed the fabric of research publication.

If we think of research publication in the early Ancient Greek schools, the philosophical ideas were often spoken and presented/disseminated in a particular speaking style of rhetoric16. Sometimes, as we found with Plato’s recording or scribing Socrates’ speeches17, these ideas were documented. Copies of these early manuscripts were saved in Persian libraries and used much later to educate others18, for example in the administrator colleges established by Belshazzar the Persian King19 and later Charlemagne, the French emperor. To gain admission to Charlemagne’s studia generalia20, the forerunner to the modern day university21, aspiring students were required to present an argument in Latin and/or verse22.

Technology advanced research publication. The development of paper in 100BC, and the invention of the printing press in 123421 both supported the dominance of a written form of publication for research. Knowledge in books and pamphlets became more common, such that in 1662, when Boyle published his invention of a pneumatic pump, new ideas were being disseminated this way. Boyle’s (1662) publication was intended to enable readers to ‘witness’ his experiment, previously only possible by direct observation22. His experiment was undertaken using a process describes as ‘scientific methodiv’ which influenced the writing style in his pamphlet. When in 1848, coinciding with a shift in the role of universities from

17 http://www.spaceandmotion.com/Philosophy-Socrates-Philosopher.htm – accessed January 16th 2018
19 In the Ketuvin, one of the books of the Koran, the book of Daniel refers to administrator or satrap education.
places of teaching to centres of research, the philosopher Compte coined the term ‘positivism’ and he suggested that it was the only true knowledge, and thus established hegemony of research practice and a dominance of a writing style for research publication.

Practices of research and research publication have similarly been challenged/changed by contemporary (our lives) new philosophical and technological revolutions.

In 1962, Thomas Kuhn’s (1962) notion of paradigm underpinned the paradigm wars and led to a variety of research methods and ways of writing about research. The Chicago school initiated a similar challenge. The style of writing about research changed. A good example, notably in action inquiry, is the way in which writing about research in the third person to suggest objectivity changed to writing in the first person to represent the voice of the researcher.

For me, another critical incident in terms of research publication was OECD’s (2002) redefinition of creative works as research and research publications. This definitional shift saw some writers align the creative approaches to research publication with researchers expressing their own voice. Acknowledging creative works as research also shifted what counted as literature evidenced in Bob Dylan’s being awarded the Nobel Prize for literature for this songs.

Even the invention of Powerpoint in 1987 changed the way in which people/academics presented at conferences and disseminated their research.

When AoMO was established its agenda was to reaffirm a long held relationship between art and science, within business and management research. This conference has been a celebration of that relationship.

The technological revolution gave rise to new electronic technology which led to different ways of publishing research. As Blogs became sites for research publication it solved a problem that had been identified with the traditional print publications of delays in written publications of journals or book chapters. A notable change in the look of research published electronically was that it was no longer restricted to the linear argument of the printed text and electronic portals in the text could jump/transport the reader to different parts of the argument. Doctoral dissertations changed. The late Lesley Jarmon was credited as being the first person to submit a digital doctoral dissertation. As these modes of research dissemination became more popular they also embraced double blind peer review which had become one of the featured of academic writing.

Each new researcher is faced with a history of research practice and the history of challenges to the hegemony of practice. Each new researcher in an effort to address the uniqueness of their inquiry, may come up with new ways for both undertaking research and for publishing.

23 Noble (1994, 6).
24 Guba and Lincoln (1982); Denzin and Lincoln (1994)
29 https://www.britannica.com/technology/Microsoft-PowerPoint accessed August 2018
30 Topracc (2011).
it. The path for most researchers is arduous at best, but when a researcher chooses to do something different there can be barriers placed in the way. Their research might be described as marginal in that it is positioned on the edges of what is accepted practice. It might be described as aberrant, meaning that the example is so different that pursuit of this direction might even be discouraged. Those sort of people might be told to ‘not rock the boat!’ At an extreme, those people who consider themselves gatekeepers of research practice may describe certain research as not even research.

I am speaking for the people who may wonder what would happen if they chose to publish research somewhat differently. Will they be overawed by the rules and regulations, or see it as their chance to speak authentically?

Make just a ripple.
Come on be brave.
This time a ripple,
Next time a wave

Sometimes you have to start small,
Climbing the tiniest wall,
Maybe you’re going to fall-
But it is better than not starting at all!

Everybody says no,
Everybody says stop.
Everybody says mustn’t rock the boat,
Mustn’t touch a thing!

Everybody says don’t,
Everybody says wait,
Everybody says can’t fight city hall,
Can’t upset the cart,
Can’t laugh at the king!

Well, I Say Try!
I Say Laugh at the kings or they’ll make you cry.
Lose Your Poise!
Fall if you have to,

31 The blog that established my first thoughts on this paper – The (Research) Supervisor’s friend [September 7th 2011] recognized that when a student chooses to work differently with their dissertation it often requires a lot more work. That sense of the general discourse is picked up in the song ‘Everybody says don’t’ in Stephen Sondheim’s (1964) Anyone Can Whistle.
But( lady), make a noise!

Everybody says don’t,
Everybody says don’t,
Everybody says don’t-
It isn’t right,
Don’t—it isn’t nice!

Everybody says don’t,
Everybody says don’t,
Everybody says don’t walk on the grass,
Don’t disturb the peace,
Don’t skate on the ice.

Well, I Say Do,
I say, ‘Walk on the grass, it was meant to feel!’
I Say Sail!
Tilt at the windmill,
And if you fail, you fail.

and if I say ‘don’t’ I say ‘Don’t be afraid’

Clearly, when you look at the provenance of academic writing and particularly research publication, there is evidence of a genre being consistently challenged and reformed as a result of philosophical and technological innovations.

Alternatives to the traditions

In the light of this provenance, it becomes evident that although there is hegemony around what counts as a research publication, it is possible to challenge that hegemony and therefore an individual researcher can present an argument for something alternative. In adopting such an argument we are reminded of the threshold concepts of academic writing of recognising that any publication of research is an extended argument which can include the way of writing or publishing. This takes us back to the way in which prospective students in the Medieval monasteries and the studia generalia would present their cases for admission32. They argued a position against all comers.

When you are not doing anything different you are often adhering to the standard rules or the hegemony. Here there is no need to argue because what you have done is exactly what is expected. When there is a variance from hegemony then I can see there are a number of ways to proceed33.

33 This argument was initially elaborated on the Research Supervisor’s Friend blog on September 20th 2013 supervisorsfriend.wordpress.com/2013/09/20/arguing-philosophically-for-something-different-in-the-dissertation/
1. Precedent.

2. Paradigm

3. The Precipice or edge (often referred to as the Gap) and

4. Practice.

Precedent is perhaps the most common form of argument for a research study. We identify how others have investigated a similar topic and suggest that we are going to do the same as what they have done. The argument rests in the ability to be able to show that your study is similar to the one you want to mimic. While this is predominantly done in the same discipline, there are examples of taking an investigative approach from one discipline and suggesting it be carried over to another because of the similarity in the topic being investigated. In the light of a precedent argument there are strong reasons for developing and maintaining a repository of exemplars of creative research publications, both dissertations and other forms of research publications, such as exhibitional and conference work.

Arguing from the point of view of an inquiry paradigm is another way to put forward a case for difference. The idea of paradigm is attributed to Thomas Kuhn, and while Kuhn did not explicitly define it, subsequent use of the term in a range of arguments has generated a variety of meanings. The notion of paradigm activated around research practices, often referred to as the ‘paradigm wars’, focussed on belief systems underpinning the practices. Guba and Lincoln and Denzin and Lincoln, the main proponents of the debate, argued against the use of a traditional paradigm for undertaking what they described as human inquiry – research with or involving people. Others in the debate named the elements of the inquiry paradigm to include ontology and epistemology. Haseman argued for recognition of performance in research – both as subject and process. In many ways this involved recognising performance as epistemology. These terms also have various definitions and I tend to think of ontology as relating to issue of truth or reality and epistemology related to issues of knowledge. In light of the performatve paradigm, epistemology could also include ways in which knowledge is published.

Gray’s argument for practice-led inquiry is a good example of a paradigm driven methodology. Drawing on Guba and Lincoln (1982), she argued for practice-led inquiry based on an explicit ontology and epistemology. Schön’s argument for reflective practitioner methodology similarly identified ‘constructionism’ as his ontology and argued for knowledge arising out of reflection on practice presenting reflective practice as an epistemology.

In my first doctoral dissertation, which examined the process of undertaking my doctoral

---

34 Kuhn (1962).
35 Klaes, (2012, 13)
36 Guba and Lincoln (1982)
37 Denzin and Lincoln (1994)
39 Haseman (1996)
40 Gray (1996)
41 Schön (1983)
42 Schön (1987, 322)
43 Hill (2002).
degree, I described my inquiry paradigm as ontologically being based on Kelly’s (1970) notion of constructivism – there is no single truth; and Schon’s (1983) notion that knowledge arises from reflection on practice. I did not at that time argue for a way of disseminating the research but published some of my doctoral dissertation in the form of a cabaret titled ‘Doing a Doctorate’ and in that I described my paradigm this way

44“I am what I am

My world’s my own social construction.

I know my own truth

Some would say- ‘truth, that’s an obstruction.

But my world is my own unique ontology

It’s my world

It’s the only place I want to be.

For life’s tough for a man

Till he can say

Hey world, I am what I am.

I am what I am

And what I know comes from my practice.

I’ve learned what I’ve learned

Yes it’s been tough but there’s the praxis.

I know that when I think about the things I see

I start to build my own unique epistemology

As you can see

This makes up me, and my inquiry paradigm

The gap

The gap in knowledge is another common way for arguing for or rationalising a research approach. By undertaking a literature review to ascertain what is known about a topic, a researcher can argue for a gap in the knowledge into which their own research serves to make a contribution. This same approach has been used when people are undertaking practice led inquiry to argue that there appears to be a gap between what practitioners think about a

practice and what academics write about the same practice\textsuperscript{46}. The gap argument has also been used to suggest that the research literature associated with a practice or issue is predominantly quantitative but lacks exploring the issues from a qualitative approach\textsuperscript{47}. Sometimes the gap is indicated with the suggestion that the practice is so new that very little has been written and much of what is known about a practice is based on anecdotal information.- That is becoming the case with multi modal research publication\textsuperscript{48}.

The gap argument can also apply to the ways in which the research is disseminated. An apparent gap in ways of communicating could provide a proposition for publishing the research differently. That is essentially what La Pum et al (2012) did in their iconic journal article arguing for exhibitional publication of their open heart surgery narratives.

A second gap in the ways research is disseminated is evident in identification of ‘the Performance Turn’\textsuperscript{49} in Narrative inquiry. This takes the idea of using narratives as data to presenting the knowledge in spoken and performed narrative or as found poetry – such as some of the people at this conference have been doing.

Sometimes an argument for an alternative way of publishing one’s research is also a political statement about empowering people or giving voice to research participants by using communicative modes that are more aligned with certain cultural practices. That is often the case with practice-led inquiry that voice is given to practitioners whose knowledge and experience has traditionally been ignored or sidelined in research, making the inquiry emancipatory\textsuperscript{50}.

\begin{quote}
31 I wish I knew how
It would feel to be free
I wish I could break
All the chains holding me
I wish I could say
All the things that I should say
Say 'em loud say 'em clear
For the whole round world to hear

I wish I could share
All the love that’s in my heart
Remove all the bars
That keep us apart
I wish you could know
What it means to be me
Then you’d see and agree
That every man should be free

I wish I could give
All I’m longin' to give
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{46} Baden and Higgs (2015)
\textsuperscript{47} Fielding and Schrier (2001)
\textsuperscript{48} Van Leeuwen (2015)
\textsuperscript{49} Peterson and Langlier (2006)
\textsuperscript{50} Boog (2003)
\textsuperscript{51} ‘I wish I knew how it would feel to be free’. Lyrics Bill Taylor and Dick Dallas (1963). Music by Billy Taylor
I wish I could live
Like I'm longin' to live
I wish I could do
All the things that I can do
Though I'm way overdue
I'd be starting anew.

Well I wish I could be like a bird in the sky
How sweet it would be
If I found I could fly
I'd soar to the sun
And look down at the sea
And I sing 'cause I know
How it feels to be free

A fourth possibility for arguing for difference sits within the **practice-based approaches** to inquiry, wherein the study begins often with the practitioner's own practice\(^52\). As the inquirer becomes more empowered by studying their own practice they can also see the value of continuing the research using the model of communication embodied in that practice – such as a study on art therapy using arts based communication modes like exhibitional work. In this conference we will see multiple examples of that as practitioners have used creative modes to investigate a range of business practices and will present/publish their work in performative mode.

The other important point, having identified a form of argument to argue for difference or marginality in either the way you are undertaking your research or publishing your research, is to take that step of faith and go and do it. This not only establishes the case for you, but lays the ground work for others who might follow in your footsteps. If you have created a new way forward, they can argue from a position of your precedent. This is the way new methodologies are created, particularly those that are relevant for investigating practice and in many cases performative modes.

\[^{53}\text{This is the moment!}\]

\[^{52}\text{I have described these investigative processes using the term 'inquiry' in line with Reason's (1988) signifier of post positivist approaches to investigation.}\]

\[^{53}\text{This is the moment from Wildhorn and Bricusse (1997) Jeckyl and Hyde}\]

52 I have described these investigative processes using the term ‘inquiry’ in line with Reason’s (1988) signifier of post positivist approaches to investigation.

53 This is the moment from Wildhorn and Bricusse (1997) Jeckyl and Hyde
This is the time,
When the momentum and the moment
Are in rhyme!

Give me this moment -
This precious chance -
I'll gather up my past
And make some sense at last!

This is the moment,
When all I've done -
All of the dreaming,
Scheming and screaming,
Become one!

This is the day -
See it sparkle and shine,
When all I've lived for
Becomes mine!

For all these years,
I've faced the world alone,
And now the time has come
To prove to them
I've made it on my own!

This is the moment -
My final test -
Destiny beckoned,
I never reckoned,
Second Best!

I won't look down,
I must not fall!
This is the moment,
The sweetest moment of them all!

This is the moment!
Damn all the odds!
This day, or never,
I'll sit forever
With the gods!

When I look back,
I will always recall,
Moment for moment,
This was the moment,
The greatest moment
Of them all!

Change in a contemporary context

Looking at the current discussions or discourses that frame a practice is another way to explore that practice.

Currently, discussion around the Research Excellence Framework (otherwise known as the REF) dominates discussion about research. The REF is a U.K. process undertaken over blocks of years inviting researchers in each university to submit their research work for external evaluation. It is paralleled by similar processes in other countries. In the UK it is initiated by the four higher education funding bodies to ensure continuation of high class, dynamic and responsive research base across the full academic spectrum. If you are a researcher who is choosing to adopt creative modes of dissemination you will see the REF influence in determining what counts as research. In many ways, it is generating a discourse that extends the Laurence Stenhouse question – what counts as research? – into the new realm of impact measurement.

The REF process makes each researcher investigate the impact of their personal research. There are some schools of thought that suggest that a choice for more creative modes of dissemination make for stronger impact, but those thoughts may be conversational rather than hard evidence. As Performative Inquiry, such as you have experienced in this presentation, and will experience over and over again in this conference, becomes more popular it will be important to develop stores of exemplars to be able to evidence and support researchers as they venture into these new territories so that they can see how others have looked for evidence to make claims about the impact of their performative works

54 You've got to accentuate the positive
    Eliminate the negative
    Latch on to the affirmative
    Don't mess with Mister In-Between

You've got to spread joy up to the maximum
    Bring gloom down to the minimum
    Have faith or pandemonium
    Liable to walk upon the scene

You know if you take time to contemplate life
    You can learn more or less how to live
    It's easy in theory but hard to apply
    It takes time and that's just what you give

So you can accentuate the positive
    Investigate the negative
    Latch on to the affirmative
    Don't mess with Mister In-Between

54 Adaption of ‘Accentuate the Positive’ written in 1944 by Harold Arlen with lyrics by Johnny Mercer.
I know from Mr Dewey that the world is rather guey and that not every experience should count.
So take what is affirming and sometimes what’s disturbing to make the most of what my life can mount
So I can accentuate the positive investigate the negative
Latch on to the affirmative and don’t mess with my in between.

Conclusion

Now it’s time to draw this cabaret to a close. I hope you have enjoyed it. I hope that it has provided some insights for you. Most importantly, if you were one of the people who have secretly thought ‘I want to do something different’ I hope that this has encouraged you. We talked earlier about provenance. When we think about the provenance of people trying to do something different from the mainstream, we have Boyle (1772), and the theorists in the Chicago school, and Guba and Lincoln (1982). It is a provenance which provides evidence for constant change, so someone who wants to try something different is part of a long stream of revolutionaries who have been changing the genre. Finally Be brave!

Something is stirring
shifting ground
It’s just begun
Edges are blurring all around
and yesterday is done

Feel the flow. Hear what’s happening
We’re what’s happening.
Don’t you know We’re the movers and we’re the shapers We’re the names in tomorrow’s papers Up to us now to show ‘em

In our hands there is light to see the future
In our hands there are gifts to give the world
In our hands lies a way to make a difference
In our hands in our hands

55 This arrangement of two songs, Sondheim’s (1981) ‘Our Time’ from Merrily we Roll Along and Lindley’s (1999) ‘Our Hands’ was undertaken by Catherine Solomon.
In our hands is the future
In our hands is the outcome
In our hands is responsibility
There will be joy and sorrow
There will be tears and laughter
There will be a better world
in our hands in our hands

With our hands we will work to find solutions
With our hands we’ll give help along the way
With our hands we will surely make a difference
With our hands with our hands

It’s our heads on the block
Give us room now and start the clock
Our time coming through
Me and you now me and you, me and you, me and you
You and you and you and you and you and you and me and you.

Reprise

Let me wrap up this presentation with one final encouragement!

56Open a new window,
Open a new door,
Travel a new highway,

56 Open a new window from Mame (Herman, 1966)
That's never been tried before;
Before you find you're a dull fellow,
   Punching the same clock,
   Walking the same tight rope
   As everyone on the block.
The fellow you ought to be is three dimensional,
   Soaking up life down to your toes,
Whenever they say you're slightly unconventional,
   Just put your thumb up to your nose.
And show 'em how to dance to a new rhythm,
   Whistle a new song,
   Toast with a new vintage,
   The fizz doesn't fizz too long.
There's only one way to make the bubbles stay,
   Simply travel a new high way,
   Dance to a new rhythm,
   Open a new window every day!
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1 The term provenance, taken from the French provenir, “to come from”, is drawn from discourse about art and antiques. Provenance signifies the life story of an item or collection and a record of its ultimate derivation and its passage through the hands of its various owners. Since introducing the term into my practice-led inquiry discourse, I have found the term similarly used to describe the exploration of the literature informing research and writing about reflexive practice (Finlay, 2002). I am also cognizant of the traction this term has gained in other disciplines, such as agriculture, in which it is used to identify where produce originates. The act of provenance has been explored under different descriptors by other research practitioners. Dillon (2008), for instance, refers to ‘personal reconnaissance’ and Hauw (2009, 342) refers to ‘reflection on the pre-reflexive consciousness of past experience [which provides] learning from past performance experience and offered possibilities for modifying future experience’. Maxwell (1996, 48) also suggests that ‘every researcher begins with a substantial base of experience and theoretical knowledge, and these inevitably generate certain questions about the phenomena studied’. Provenance also resonates with Richardson’s (1994, 103) suggestion that when knowledge is tapped it accesses ‘biographical, historical, and particularized social locations’ about their (the investigator’s) practice as well as ideological preferences’

2 The studia generalia were instituted during the reign of the Christian emperor Charlemagne (742-814) to educate men to take on administrative responsibilities in the empire. Those established in Paris and Bologna,
the *studia generalia* to which those aspiring to become teachers in these institutes attended, grew in popularity and their students formed guilds. The term *universitas*, first appeared in pre twelfth century documents describing these guilds of students. By the 15th century, the term *universitas* had begun to apply to the academic community specialising in higher education rather than to the guild of students (Minogue, 1973, 12; Madsen, 1983, 7; Dunbabin, 1999, 30).

iii The *studia generalia* were instituted during the reign of the Christian emperor Charlemagne (742-814) to educate men to take on administrative responsibilities in the empire. Those established in Paris and Bologna, the *studia generalia* to which those aspiring to become teachers in these institutes attended, grew in popularity and their students formed guilds. The term *universitas*, first appeared in pre twelfth century documents describing these guilds of students. By the 15th century, the term *universitas* had begun to apply to the academic community specialising in higher education rather than to the guild of students (Minogue, 1973, 12; Madsen, 1983, 7; Dunbabin, 1999, 30).

iv The *Oxford Dictionaries* on-line define the scientific method as "a method or procedure that has characterized natural science since the 17th century, consisting in systematic observation, measurement, and experiment, and the formulation, testing, and modification of hypotheses."