PART 8

CREATIVE DISSEMINATION

VICKY DUCKWORTH AND ROB SMITH

18. CREATIVE, CRITICAL AND DEMOCRATIC RESEARCH DISSEMINATION

Learners' Lives and Further Education

INTRODUCTION

Further Education (FE) is an umbrella term that describes mainly formal learning taking place mainly outside of school environments and largely shaped by historical, industrial and social factors closely related to the local socio-economic circumstances in different towns and cities across the UK. This chapter presents findings from a collaborative research project into how, against a challenging landscape constrained by the pressures of marketization and funding, FE continues to offer a 'differential space' (Lefebvre, 1991) in which learners who have often had negative experiences of schooling, supported by critical pedagogy, are able to experience education as transformative (Mezirow, 2000; Duckworth, 2013; Duckworth & Ade-Ojo, 2016; Duckworth & Smith, 2017, 2018b).

The churn of post compulsory educational policy over the last quarter century provides a vital frame for any discussion about knowledge production practices in this field. As a point of departure, the Further and Higher Education Act (1992) removed colleges from local authority control and introduced marketization to this heterogeneous and locally orientated form of educational provision. At the heart of this episode of marketization was an approach to funding that, in effect, centralized the curriculum control and allowed for on-going annual policy and curriculum intervention by successive government departments (Keep, 2006; Lucas & Crowther, 2016). This has led to an intensification of an instrumentalist view of FE closely linked to the emergence of neoliberal policy with its emphasis on 'skills' rather than broader conceptualizations of education (Duckworth & Smith, 2019). The ideological effect of the Further and Higher Education Act was to conjure into being and consolidate what has become known as 'the Further Education Sector' – a generalized and 'abstract' space (Lefebvre, 1991) that has facilitated policy making at a distance and systematically superimposed a centralized drive to address economic and skills concerns over local 'ecologies' of teaching and learning.

As marketization requires colleges to generate performance data, these 'metrics' – measurable phenomena – have come to dominate the knowledge production activities of colleges and tend to shape their cultures. These pressures have resulted in a sectoral habitus, a way of doing and seeing things in colleges/providers that values

and promotes the production by teachers and managers of a veneer of favourable performance data that presents only a distorted and distant reflection of the lived experiences of teaching and learning.

Colleges' performance is currently dominated by the grading system used by the market regulator, the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted), that inspects schools and colleges and assesses them against a four-point grading scale: Outstanding, Good, Requires Improvement, Inadequate. This involves colleges being subjected to a cycle of 'inspection' that intensifies if performance is judged not to be Outstanding or Good. The consequences of this supposedly authoritative judgement are very serious and can result in the closure of courses and even of whole areas of provision. In this high stakes context then, our research project aimed to work outside and beyond these performative knowledge production practices, to engage in knowledge production as a reflexive and collaborative rather than a competitive activity governed by 'gaming'. Instead, our research project chose to foreground voices of students, teachers and others to provide a qualitative, textured and more critical picture: a nuanced picture we would argue that creatively represents perspectives that are typically blocked out within marketized settings. As a project that sought methodologically to bring values and practices from critical pedagogy (Freire, 1995) to research practice, we viewed the cycle of research as enhancing the agency of the participants by foregrounding their stories and offering an alternative set of narratives that crossed institutional boundaries and challenged reductive discourses that permeate discourse about the FE 'sector'.

In contrast to the highly constrained and performative knowledge production practices that incorporation has brought into being within colleges, this project has collected counter-metric narratives: stories that fall outside of what is deemed to be measurable. The project provided a collaborative and democratic space for the sharing and celebration of participants' stories; their voices were validated. The digital platform was a key facilitating factor in this. We will focus in particular on the project's creative use of digital tools to: (i) extend engagement with and dissemination of the project findings and (ii) enrich the research through the establishment of discursive *fora* and a virtual space in which ideas and narratives related to transformative teaching and learning could be shared. The chapter concludes by theorizing the connection between a digital research methodology and critical pedagogy in an attempt to model a democratic and dialogical approach to knowledge production that that acts as a counterforce to work against the grain of current neo-liberal hegemonic discourses.

THE RESEARCH PROJECT: TRANSFORMING LIVES

The research project: *FE in England: Transforming lives and communities*, sponsored by the University and Colleges' Union, utilized a digitally embedded research methodology to gather, explore and share project data. The data comprised a series of rich narratives from learners, teachers, employers and learners' family members.

These were collected through video recorded interviews which were then shared via a project website.¹ A YouTube channel² and twitter account (@FEtransforms) were further features of an inter-related and multi-faceted digital platform that were used to build a project audience and an interactive critical space which garnered further contributions in the form of written narratives, photographs and artefacts. This digital platform was used to grow a wider project audience to participate in a collaborative way by contributing to the data. The aim here was to catalyze what we describe as *virtually enhanced engagement* in order to constitute a ‘thirdspace’ (Soja, 1998), i.e. a space in which FE could effectively be reimagined, through a collective dialogical interaction of practitioners and students as *more than* the quantitatively-defined abstract space that current FE policy discourse reifies. This interactive dimension extended the influence of the project and constructed new and alternative meanings in the public domain. It also facilitated engagement with policy makers and led to additional opportunities for public dissemination and speaking back and to the development of policy.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research methodology brought together aspects from a range of different approaches. For us, life history and biography provided important entry points into our research (Goodson & Sikes, 2004; Duckworth, 2013). The life stories of the researchers are closely bound up with FE and this provided a crucial frame of authenticity when meeting and speaking with participants. Reciprocity in telling our stories while asking participants to share their own was an important principle in the collaborative practice of gathering the data. Goodley et al. (2004, p. 167) comment that:

Researching life stories offers opportunities for drawing on our own and others’ narratives in ways that can illuminate key theoretical, policy and practice considerations.

Listening to participants’ life stories provided insights into the transformative impact of FE for them and on their lives; it also illuminated the ripple impact on family and community. This often also involved us listening to participants recounting negative experiences of schooling. These research conversations were collaborative in the sense that not only were stories shared, but new understandings were generated for everyone involved. For the research team, participants’ stories provided important insights into the factors that facilitated transformative teaching and learning. For participants, these dialogical research conversations involved a re-telling that culminated in a shedding of spoilt identities (for example through the symbolic violence of being labelled) and an affirmation of the new learner identities based on agency and self-respect. The discussions also, more broadly, fostered a growing awareness of social and historical factors that had shaped their experience of education to date (Duckworth & Smith, 2018a). Participants’ sense that they belonged to a dispersed community that they could connect with through the project

made possible a broadening of individual horizons. There was also a sharing of stories between the participants which developed the process of what Clough (2002) describes as “focused conversations”, the value of which he outlines in the following way:

Through ‘talking-for-writing’ new ideas can be born, new knowledge can be created, views can be shaped and re-shaped. The richness in the approach lies in the openness of those participants and their ideas to be shaped by those of others, and to examine their own experiences in the light of what they hear others say. (p. 81)

The dialogical approach not only fed into a methodological position that sees research as a social practice (Duckworth & Smith, 2019) rather than as a separate, technical exercise in extracting information while remaining neutral and distant. As we explain below, we felt the nature of the narratives we were gathering demanded that we step outside of the rush and tumult of ‘the present’ and into a space of reflection in which we aimed to summon up a greater level of ‘presence’ (Lefebvre, 2004). Lefebvre (2004) uses the term ‘presence’ –counterposed against ‘the present’ – to critique ‘everyday life which he sees as ideologically imbued with marketized relations. In contrast with the present which for him is “a fact and an effect of commerce”:

(W)ith presence there is dialogue, the use of time, speech and action ... presence situates itself in the poetic: value, creation, situation in the world and not only in the relations of exchange. (Lefebvre, 2004, p. 47)

In this way, the research was reflexive as it recognized its own potential impact as social interaction. That consciousness made it important for us to draw on our understanding of critical pedagogy and to attempt to produce an egalitarian space for research conversations to take place in. Creating an atmosphere of informality, sharing our own stories, helped to rupture hierarchical relations; we aimed to position participants on an equal footing with us as researchers. Our narratives were woven into the research conversations as a way of de-mystifying research and ourselves as researchers.

Life history has the sensitizing potential “to enable voices to be heard that are usually silent” (Plummer, 2001, p. 248). This allowed the researchers not just to view the respondents’ world picture but enables a mutual engagement with each other’s narratives to open them up for discussion and meaning making. Throughout, we remained highly sensitive to the importance of the language we used as we wanted to explore the issues without labelling and stigmatizing the participants. That said, the experiences they have are not neutral, they are lived experiences which demonstrate the inequalities which impact on their lives.

PARTICIPATION IN THE PROJECT

The project paid particular attention to the ethical issues associated with using a digital platform which included video. Anonymization was offered to all participants but, as the focus was on the transformative qualities of their educational experiences, most were happy for their real names to be used. Recruiting participants to the project happened organically: starting with the existing professional networks and contacts of the researchers, it gradually spanned out across the UK and beyond. This momentum grew through an ongoing programme of virtual and actual dissemination. The researchers began presenting data from the project to audiences at local, national and international conferences within six months of it starting. These audiences included HE researchers, further education teachers but also policymakers and members of the public. This fed into participation naturally; those listening to presentations about the project were invited to contribute to the project website. We distributed postcards with images of participants and links to the website asking audiences to share their stories of transformative teaching and learning. This often then led to audience members contributing directly to the website. Once these new accounts had been written into the website under a tab labelled: *Share your story*, we were able to tweet the link out to the growing digital audience for the project.

Figure 18.1. Project postcard

In this way, the collection of project data was punctuated by specific social events that sought to promote a shared understanding of transformative teaching and learning and that generated further data gathering opportunities. At the same time, the research was digitally live and publically accessible as it developed.

The retelling of the participants' narratives was not without difficulties. To offer validity to the narratives, it was important to include our own life histories and to write ourselves into the knowledge (Stanley & Wise 1993). This approach came with emotional challenges. The difficulty for us was feeling at times impotent as details surfaced within participants' narratives that spoke of deprivation, poverty and struggle. As comparatively privileged academics, we were sharing experiences with people who had often come from (or were still in) very different circumstances.

Maintaining the dignity of participants who talked about freeing themselves from drug dependency, abusive relationships, spending time in prison, episodes of clinical depression and similar experiences was paramount. This required a careful and judicious editing of the data that we thought it appropriate to include. Very personal and sensitive information (e.g. details of drug dependency or of family trauma) while often very significant were omitted to preserve participants' dignity and where there was a potential for impact on other family members.

Using Video

The project positioned the use of video centrally as a medium for presenting participants' narrative voices. The immediacy of video and its ability to communicate participants' stories as told by them was one reason for this choice of medium. Also, we were keen to avoid or at least limit the kind of imposition of meanings onto their stories that is rendered largely invisible when snippets of transcript are presented on a page. A key finding of the research related to participants' experience of symbolic violence in their educational histories (Duckworth & Smith, 2018b, 2019) in which some were positioned in deficit terms as learners and labelled as 'thick'.

The critical and reflexive research methodology that we sought to utilize was conscious of the potential for our research interactions to embody symbolic violence in the same way. We asked ourselves what meanings we were reinforcing and imposing. By bringing a collaborative dimension to the research we sought to avoid transforming the project participants into passive research subjects. In the context of using video as part of ethnographic research, Pink (2007) suggests that visual knowledge should be presented in a contextualized way as forming part of a broader picture rather than simply being translated into written, knowledge during analysis.

By directing a critical gaze at the participant/researcher relationship, we repositioned ourselves as co-producers of meaning. While it is true that we were still responsible for the editing process, each video was shown first to the participant for approval. Additional edits were made at the participants' request. This was not surprising as many of the narratives were of an intensely personal nature and, indeed,

the lens provided learners, teachers, family members and their communities with the opportunity to tell their stories through voicing their experiences and trajectories in education and the impact of this in the personal and public domains of their lives; each narrative exposed the distinctiveness and power of FE. The narratives also expose how transformation and the construction of positive educational identities allow for the reclaiming of spoilt identities based on agency and hope.

We converted video data to a format that could be embedded into visual or multi-media presentations while also uploading videos to YouTube. Digitization facilitated posting and sharing across the public domain and disciplines. The emphasis throughout was on maintaining the dignity of participants as people who are able to tell their own stories.

The research allowed us to understand participants' life-worlds and their situated practices and lived local realities. Some of our participants have gone on to develop their technical skills into digital literacies.

In a digital age, learners need to practice and experiment with different ways of enacting their identities, and adopt subject positions thorough different social technologies and media. These opportunities can only be supported by academic staff who are themselves engaged in digital practices and questioning their own relationships with knowledge (Beetham & Oliver, 2010, p. 167).

The digitalization of data does not necessarily make it more comprehensive or more 'accurate'. An example of this comes from our experience of video recording research conversations with participants. It is important to acknowledge that however hard we tried as researchers to create an informal setting, the switching on and off the video camera somehow changed the atmosphere. While many participants were comfortable with the use of videoing on phones and with the notion of a lens capturing images, still the camera sometimes seemed to interpose itself between us and participants. A consequence of this was that often, the moment the interview ended and the camera was switched off, some participants would then seem to relax and the sense of suspended formality would trigger new comments and rich, important insights. A number of participants at this point related an experience or perspective that we wished we had captured as data. On at least one occasion, we switched the camera back on and asked for the story to be repeated. On other occasions, the data was off the record and while relevant, was judged to be too personal to be included. It was vital that the conversations captured were organic and followed the participants' flow of thoughts; they controlled what they wanted to disclose or not. The aim was to retain sensitivity and remain mindful of not exploiting their conversations in a voyeuristic way.

The Project Website

The use of a digital platform to present and disseminate the research responds to the rapid development of new and emerging technologies which impact on people's

experiences of space and time. Within this context, the project utilized a research methodology with the reach and power to engage, inspire, entertain, enrich and connect. This meant taking account of a non-linear approach to accessing and navigating information sources; constant and instant online communication and connectivity sharing information culture (see for example, Prensky, 2001).

The project participants spanned different generations: the youngest being 16 years, the oldest in her fifties. It embraced then the so-called 'Net Generation' (Tapscott, 2008) for whom education and social interaction have always been infused with technology, and digital media a part of their learning and social experience. On the other hand, a number of participants in our study lacked digital literacy skills and the project became a platform for them to develop these. For example, some learners set up accounts in order to watch their videos, or set up twitter accounts and engaged with an online community for the first time as a result of involvement in the project. In this case, digitally mediated research, drawing on technologies such as laptops, tablet computers and smartphones, provided access to and engagement with research across social media networks and at times and locations that were convenient to the social media users.

Our use of digital tools was geared towards the facilitating the expression of stories of individual caught up in 'the present' and hidden by the corporate narratives engendered by marketization. We would argue that these project narratives, free from the distortion of the funding and market-driven cultures that have come to dominate FE settings, instead present a human picture of lived experience and social reality. In addition, they are orientated towards future development for the individuals concerned but also for FE itself.

The website produces a 'thirdspace' (Soja, 1996) in the sense that it actively seeks to represent aspects of transformative teaching and learning in particular ways through featuring narratives about different aspects of FE. While it is curated by the researchers, both students and teachers of FE are free to contribute their narratives. The website thus becomes an attempt to assert what is relevant and what is meaningful in the work carried out in FE settings. These are not just 'stories from below' that only present lived experience of practitioners, learners and others; instead they include commentaries about wider policy, funding and artefacts focusing on specific perspectives (e.g. women and transformative learning or employers' perspectives). In that sense then, the website is an attempt to create a space that makes dialogue possible between sometimes conflicting views on the purposes, meanings, achievements and problems of FE.

We were excited to see how some videos became stimulus materials for teachers that generated further narratives for an online project audience. One example of this was Adam's video. Adam was a student who had been excluded from school for anger management issues that seemed rooted in a frustration at being labelled. At college, he (re)discovered a positive learning identity. Another project participant, a teacher who ran classes similar to those Adam attended, used his video as stimulus material. The students in her class recognized different aspects of Adam's account

and were able to relate this to their own educational experiences in a constructive way. One of the students produced a piece of writing that illustrates this empathy and the beginnings of reflection. This was shared on the project website.

Figure 18.2. The use of stories of transformative teaching and learning in classroom settings

Broadly, the project-dedicated website was driven by dissemination and public engagement. However, it was more than this; it provided a platform to validate and celebrate the narratives of learners. The research approach itself became a part of the affirmative practice that aided the creation of conditions for the transformative learning that participants had often experienced. In that sense, taking part in the research reinforced the positive learning identities that the participants talk about having achieved.

Twitter

The project made extensive use of Twitter (@FEtransforms). Linked to website content in the form of videos but also text-based participant contributions, tweets helped us develop the sense of a new space of communication in which participants' experiences could be shared and affirmed. The use of Twitter helped establish and build an audience for the research and required an investment of time: at least half an hour or an hour every evening and weekend. This took account of participants and communities more widely going online at various times and in various spaces, e.g. on trains, in meeting rooms, at conferences *inter alia*.

The 140 character limit (for the first eighteen months of the project) of the Twitter format led to additional developments in our creative use of media. We established

a standard format of providing a headline about a new participant with a link to the video underneath. But we felt more variety was needed so we also produced collages of photos of participants from stills exported from the video data. These were used to link to the reports produced at different stages of the project. In addition, we used free websites to make GIFs that functioned in the same way as the collages: providing an artefact to attract a larger audience.

Finally, we also organized the video data in different ways. While the majority of videos present individual narratives, we developed a number that drew snippets from across the dataset to create themed videos. For example, a video was produced that focused on the transformative educational experience of women; another video focused on adult literacy. These were essentially a re-framing of the data. Sometimes they included new segments from the research discussions, sometimes, they were a montage of extracts from videos that had already been published. The targeting of specific events, like International Women's day made a real difference to the impact of these tweets that magnified the interactive potential of the data.

CONCLUSION

The project website acted as the digital core of the project. Emanating from it, in addition to the twitter feed and the Youtube channel, themed blog posts were produced for different organizations and websites; eighteen months into the project a conference was convened, bringing together many of the participants as well as HE academics and FE practitioners, policy-makers and others. The focus of the conference was to reimagine FE through the lens of transformative teaching and learning. In this way, all the different aspects of the project acted together to assert a heterogeneous picture of FE. The intention was to disrupt the 'abstract' and dominated space crafted by neoliberal policy-making and displace this with a 'differential' space (Lefebvre, 1991). In this space, the individual transformative narratives are sovereign. They are not narratives that tell the story of the inner workings of a 'sector', rather they are stories about how people's lives have been changed by a social (and often political) process in which they have shrugged off their spoilt learner identities and rediscovered an ability to learn, harnessing this to agency and hope for the future.

The research has an ethic of respect for the individual and their communities. In this, it is working against the grain of the marketized cultures that have taken root in FE that, typically, objectify students (Duckworth & Smith, 2018b). This is perhaps the key difference between research which can claim to be socially just and research undertaken within other frameworks and paradigms where although there may be a focus on social justice, the research itself falls into the deficit-reinforcing position of using approaches and processes which reify participants' passivity. We would argue that digital technologies are not neutral tools – they can produce spaces where stories can be reclaimed that unsettle the hegemony of inequality and objectification.

Our research has illustrated how digital technologies can be used in socially just research incorporating the development of a dynamic digital research participating audience which breaches the boundaries that divide scholarly and local communities. The website to date has had 10,648 users and almost 70,000 page views. The virtual platform has developed an energy locally, nationally and globally. Traditional research cultures may have resistant attitudes to digital technologies, however, we would argue that digital literacy and practices are a necessary part of research training to meet the needs of participants in the 21st century. Certainly, failing to use them amounts to missing an important opportunity to share data and involve the research audience in meaning-making and knowledge production. Marketization and the current funding regime have resulted in an ideological reimagining of a ‘sector’ that has had a significantly negative impact on the local agency of teachers and learners – whose voices within the corporate, competitive institutions have been silenced as well. The *Transforming Lives* project, through harnessing critical digital platforms, has sought to create a new shared understanding of FE that offers an exciting and hope-filled alternative; an alternative that can contribute to the resources of hope that are vital in this age of austerity.

NOTES

¹ <http://transforminglives.web.ucu.org.uk/>

² <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCkDeirtGCmeBs361BgibXnA>

REFERENCES

- Beetham, H., & Oliver, M. (2010). The changing practices of knowledge and learning. In R. Sharpe & H. Beetham (Eds.), *Rethinking learning for a digital age* (pp. 155–169). London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Coffield, F. (2008). *Just suppose teaching and learning became the first priority*. Learning and Skills Network. Retrieved January 25, 2018, from http://weaeducation.typepad.co.uk/wea_education_blog/files/frank_coffield_on_teach_and_learning.pdf
- Duckworth, V. (2013). *Learning trajectories, violence and empowerment amongst adult basic skills learners*. London: Routledge.
- Duckworth, V., & Ade-Ojo, G. (2016). Journeys through transformation: A case study of two adult literacy learners. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 14(4), 285–304.
- Duckworth, V., & Smith, R. (2017). *Further education in England – Transforming lives and communities: Interim Report* (Project report). UCU.
- Duckworth, V., & Smith, R. (2018a). Transformative learning in english further education. In C. Borg, P. Mayo, & R. Sultana (Eds.), *Skills for sustainable human development of the international handbook on vocational education and training for changing the world of work*. London: Springer.
- Duckworth, V., & Smith, R. (2018b). Breaking the triple lock: Further education and transformative teaching and learning. *Education & Training*, 60(6), 529–543.
- Duckworth, V., & Smith, R. (2019). Research, criticality & adult and further education: Catalysing hope and dialogic caring. In M. Hamilton & L. Tett (Eds.), *Resisting the neo-liberal discourse in education: Local, national and transnational perspectives*. London: Policy Press.
- Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., Clough, P., & Moore, M. (2004). *Researching life stories: Method, theory and analyses in a biographical Age*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Goodson, I., & Sikes, P. (2001). *Life history research in educational settings*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

- Freire, P. (1995). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Keep, E. (2006). State control of the English education and training system—playing with the biggest train set in the world. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 58(1), 47–64.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, H. (2004). *Rhythmanalysis*. London: Continuum.
- Lucas, N., & Crowther, N. (2016). The logic of the Incorporation of further education colleges in England 1993–2015: Towards an understanding of marketization, change and instability. *Journal of Education Policy*, 31(5), 583–597.
- Mezirow, J., & Associates. (2000). *Fostering critical reflection: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Jossey-Bass.
- Pink, S. (2007). *Doing visual ethnography: Images, media, and representation in research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Plummer, K. (2001). *Documents of life 2: An invitation to a critical humanism*, London/Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1–6.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424816>
- Soja, E. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined spaces*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smith, R. (2017). Area reviews and the end of incorporation: A Machiavellian moment. In M. Daley, K. Orr, & J. Petrie (Eds.), *The principal*. London: UCL IoE Press.
- Stanley, L., & Wise, S. (1993). *Breaking out again: Feminist ontology and epistemology*. London: Routledge.
- Tapscott, D. (2008). *Grown up digital: How the net generation is changing your world*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill.