Chapter 5

Representing My Knowing Through My Knowledge

5. 0 In the previous chapters I outlined the teachings of my Buddhist order and engaged with critical research and enquiry into the structure, history and thinking pertaining to Shingon Shu Japanese Buddhism, while comparing and contrasting these with the ideas of Skolimowski (1994), and Freire and Macedo (1994). In my Integrated Conceptual Theory Model (see Figure 5, p. 49), I outlined the methodological approaches, rationale and layering of the dynamics of how the different models interact.

In this chapter I ask and seek answers to the complex question of: *How do I know what I know?* I ask this question so as to bring order and meaning to my heuristic living educational theory as I analyse my critical thinking and praxis. In this chapter I clarify, through narrative, the meanings of my relationally dynamic standards of discernment and critical judgement of:

Inclusional respect

Inclusional originality

Inclusional caution

Inclusional tolerance

and my practice as an inclusional educator and educational practitioner-researcher which reveals to me how I create my pedagogy of the unique.

My educative originality is clarified, through my narrative, as I show that the meanings of these living standards of discernment/critical judgement can be clarified in the course of their emergence in practice. In other words, through the process I present in this chapter, I am communicating the meanings of my ontological values. I show how this comes about in the processes of my knowing and discerning my values of inclusional respect, originality, caution and tolerance. I clarify my meanings, through my narrative, in a way that produces publicly sharable meanings of my epistemological standards of critical judgment. Standards of judgement and standards of discernment are presented. It is my understanding that a standard is an external value placed on a set of criteria by a power-holder with the ability to police it. This power-holder may be a social establishment or a social group or an individual in a position of power. Discernment is the ability to distinguish one thing from another but it does not imply a value or benchmark expectation. I identify my values as they have emerged and solidified into standards of discernment. Each is defined from its causal context, which provides the reader with clear insights into what I am using as a value. The issue around standards and discernment is discussed but not resolved.

[When asked the question: "How do I judge?", I usually answer that I try not to. In my teaching, the cognitive curriculum content with its learning outcomes is grounded in factual knowledge, for example: label the anatomy of the heart, describe the functions of the heart, list the contents of plasma. The answers are all cognitive-factual outcomes. The students either know them or not, because they have studied the subject matter or not. The judgement call is made by the social formation that the pass level for this standard is this…, grades equal this…. I do not see this as my judgement.

When I focus on the students' other forms of learning, I am assessing effort, ability, motivation, needs. I ask of myself, am I making judgements? I believe that I am being discerning in that I am not attached to the students' process, although I am aware of their needs and do all that I can to assist them to achieve the learning they are required to do by statute, the social formation and the social learning about themselves. But I am not attached to the process. No matter how I try to place this idea into text it will not read as I want it to read. Non-attachment is not about not caring, for I care passionately. In the final event, it is the students who must do the learning, as it is their lives and their learning. If a student is disruptive I do not judge them as bad or a lost cause. I seek to find out why the behaviour of the student is as it is. When I look at my own values of how I want to live my life as an individual and a citizen, I use my values to discern the events, boundaries and actions of others. In my values, love, compassion and tolerance are unconditional, they do not judge; as these are the core values for how I aspire to live my life, how can I judge? I believe I cannot. My supervisor and I often exchange banter over the issues of mistakes. My supervisor believes he can be mistaken and that I am mistaken. I believe that if I did something, at the moment of its doing it was correct. The consequences of my giving rise to such an action or thought are my learning. So I do not make mistakes, rather I discover learning from situations where I would act differently when the consequences are represented to me. I accept the responsibility for the outcomes of my actions and seek to apologise for any hurt or misunderstandings my actions may have caused others.]

I examine the question through critical dialogue with myself, using autobiographical data and writings in order to bring to the surface how I construct my reality and thus make sense of my living educational theory. I am deeply passionate to understand my knowing, and use Moustakas's (1990) previously described heuristic model to frame my enquiry, thus involving my reader with my exploration of the question.

[My approach to narrating this chapter is: first, I establish my engagement with the method; next I critique knowing and knowledge in relationship to my experience of knowing; then, I explore the nature of the question as a heuristic; and finally I address the issue of how to bring my knowing to knowledge. This process clarifies my values through their emergence, which are then used as standards of discernment. I continue to use bracketing and italic text in a different font to show my engagement with my writing. Such writing is a continual reflective process of researching, exploring and modifying my engagement with understanding, and knowing not only myself as a salient being, but also knowledge itself, its generation and limitations, from the heuristic viewpoint of being consciously immersed in the reflective process.]

5.1 Engaging with the method/ inclusional respect

Because of the complexity of answering what on the surface seems to be a simple question: *How do I know what I know?,* I feel it is first necessary to outline the context within which I place my enquiry and thinking. I do this in order to create a perceptual focus, a congruent framework to guide my thesis's discussion. As my methodological process is that of a heuristic action researcher (Moustakas 1990), my response to the question is bounded by its relevance to my actual context of life practice. Through praxis and the creation of my heuristic living educational theory with its emerging values, I use these values as standards of discernment in a Japanese culture as I show my process of adapting to cultural, individual and organisational events and issues.

Setting such boundaries creates a particular bias, and the heuristic paradigm provides for ways of recognizing and regulating the biases as part of the research process. As I presented in the previous chapter, heuristic methodology requires the practitioner to become one with the focus of the enquiry. In this case, the focus of enquiry is my process of knowing that leads to knowledge. I enter into a dialogue with the phenomenon, my knowing process, thereby allowing, in effect, my knowing process to speak directly to me.

Although I understood this, *Why did talking to my process of knowing engender such anxiety? What was it that I was afraid to hear?* I had spent years engaged in meditative spiritual contemplation and actions to seek the boundaries of my knowing. *Why now was I having such tension around surfacing this knowledge?* Surprisingly, the answer lay where I had least expected it to be, and that was buried deep within my past. In other words, a potent context that was relevant to my living educational theory was my own experiential interior.

I was experiencing difficulty with writing this chapter. The difficulties were not related to data or content, for I had more data than I needed. Academic engagement was not an issue, but there was however a deep resistance, one that I had come to recognise as an issue that lay unresolved.

My childhood was difficult, as described in (Adler-Collins 1998). I truly thought that I had dealt with the issues it contained, yet as I revisited that text many times I could see deeper layers of meaning and understanding emerging. I am conscious of my own awareness and actively seek to engage with my feelings, thoughts, beliefs and judgements. I believed I had dealt openly with enquiring into myself, which at times required from me the

acceptance of levels of vulnerability that would have been unthinkable ten years ago. I asked my supervisor for a response to a draft of this chapter, and he replied:

> *Hi Je Kan - good to chat. Let's see if my response is any help to you. Do keep your drafts in separate files so that they are retained. In other words, as you redraft save the redrafts under another name. The reason I'm asking you to do this is that your original drafts for a chapter and your final drafts show dramatic evidence of improvements in your educational influence in your own learning. Here's what I notice in your first creative drafts - I see that they usually contain in embryonic form the themes in your final version. They are always understandably inchoate because chaos seems part of any creative phase of an enquiry. What then happens is that you revisit this first creative draft and start to exercise your disciplined critical judgement as you craft it into a coherent, meaningful and significant contribution to your thesis as a whole. What I've noticed about my responses is that if I approach your creative writing with a mind-set that is looking for coherence and the feeling that you, the writer, [are] attending to my needs, as a reader, I get angry. But then I see that this is an inappropriate way of responding to your creative writing. By changing my response to one which is looking for themes that could emerge clearly in your next draft, I find that I enjoy your writing and hopefully make some useful responses.*
>
> (Personal communication email June 30th 2005)

In a way his response startled me. He was honest in his critique, but more than that it was his openness about his personal feelings, his re-evaluation of his process and his non-

defensive response to my writing that ultimately created a sense of safety for me. He was acknowledging my creativity and my presence. For the first time in our long educational relationship he was not asking me to conform. I believe he was acting along lines suggested by Fader and McNeil (1996), who suggested that teachers should not correct errors but should respond meaningfully to what the student has written. Such an approach stimulates the creative desire to write and to read and then to enquire, without fear becoming more important than the emergence of ideas that had paralysed my creativity in the past (Stewart 1987). Issues relating to grammar and syntax can be addressed once the flow of ideas has been established.

His response was causal in opening a memory of my schooling, one that shocked me as I was transported back in time to a place where I did not want to be. I was raised in an English orphanage from the age of three. I wistfully remembered being a young boy who was eager to read. In the orphanage I was often in trouble for being caught reading under the bedcovers at night. My young mind was full of the adventures of the *Famous Five* (Blyton 2001) as they solved all sorts of skulduggery. Reading took me away from the pain and misery of my life, and opened fantasy worlds where people were good and kind and the bad guys always lost. When I was caught, I was beaten and thrown into what became my second home, the coal bunker. I soon learned to hide a battery, some wire and a torch bulb in a tin can in my secret place in the coal bunker where I would read stories to the other children who often shared the coal bunker with me. Later, I was moved to a school that believed in strong discipline. The English teacher set spelling tests every Wednesday, and if we achieved less than 15 out of 20 we were caned in front of the class. So every Wednesday in the English class I was duly caned and stood facing the corner for being *Stupid*. I was never taught basic English grammar, syntax and sentence construction.

I was tested and told that I was dyslexic and placed in the special needs class. All that was good about this move was that the caning stopped. My love and passion for reading never stopped, but my ability to articulate in textual representation became a life-long problem.

This experience laid the firm foundation for my feelings and thoughts that I was not good enough or clever enough. I have struggled for years to teach myself. I understand now that the basic lessons that most people take for granted, and upon which they can build their academic writing, were missing in me. I still feel that shame when I write. I write quickly and creatively. My ideas flow and my passion fills the words. My mind expands in a dance of joyous enquiry as I surf the waves of my knowing, dipping into troughs of the unknown and cresting them with a new consciousness, only to be crushed and reminded of my inability to construct sentences and place full stops in the correct places. I spent so many lonely hours seeking to understand what it is I am missing in a sentence. How does the full stop or a badly placed comma change the meaning? Here I am writing up a PhD, the top academic award in our education system, and my guilt still reaches out as the chatterbox of chaos whispers in my soul, *You are a fraud!* I found that O'Reilly's (1998, p. 38) words reached out from my past and haunted me: *Personal pain is connected to ancient insult, the wounds of history - racism, war, homophobia, cruelty of all kinds - fester unhealed.* A spectre from my past had arisen and this was the cause of the struggle to write this chapter.

Despite the plethora of literature on the connections between writing and healing, and between silence and toxicity, I hesitate to generalize that writing is curative. I hesitate because I am split between two things: firstly, my desire and commitment to know and to tell the evolving truth of a thing and to compose a text as a way of making meaning out of

the chaos of life; and secondly, my awareness that much is unknowable, indescribable, unspeakable, and that words are an insult to the pain of much experience, or the complexity of it. O'Reilly (1998, p. 28) also stated: *Sometimes, what is essential cannot be seen or described but can only be felt with the heart. Meeting loss or other traumatic memory, our own or its trajectory through our lives and writing, requires courage and mindfulness*.

It has taken me more than ten years to reach mindfulness and to have the courage to read the work of others critically, engage with complex educational issues, and argue in philosophical debate grounded in my reading. I can be creative in my thinking and I love writing. However, for a long time feelings of worthlessness returned as I stood before my peers being chastised for my inability to place the full stop in the correct place or that my syntax did not work well. A deep, deep rage filled my soul: *Will I ever be good enough, and will I ever be accepted as an equal with my peers? Will I ever be able to transcend my past? Or is it the case that indeed I am a product of my life's path?* Those who had the opportunity to be well educated under easier circumstances than mine will always be able to fall back on their skill of placing punctuation in the correct places.

[Does my need for approval run so deep that it fractures the very fabric of my being? Is this really my deepest fear? Is this what blocks out my ability to recognise the creative expression, love and vision that produced the curriculum on which this thesis is based?]

In answering some of the above questions I believe that, through inclusional thinking as I/we witness the past and as I/we serve as witnesses for others, I/we may begin to see how the cords of one narrative link to the cords of another. This recognition of how our

histories are woven together enables a reconnection between people in the present. As we become witnesses to our past, we open the possibility of allowing ourselves to be healed from the past through a healing relationship with another in the present. It is with this understanding that I wish to look at knowing.

My evidence for my understanding and learning is this thesis for which, even up to its final draft stage, I was learning the rules of grammar and how to place a full stop correctly. An important learning process whilst writing this thesis was my changing from being a defensive writer, grounded in the boy in the classroom being called "stupid", to being inclusive in accepting editorial criticism about my writing style and being positively responsive to criticism. In the early stages of this thesis I had responded with rejection or anger to criticism about my lack of formal grammar. As my efficiency and competency with grammar increased under the influence of critical colleagues, my writing became a pleasure. At last I felt an equal with my peers. A value and discernment that I use in my teaching is grounded in the learning of the process described above.

Another I hold value is that of *inclusional respect* by which I engage with every student in every situation with open respect for them as individuals. I choose to see the potential of the student as the positive. I seek to offer different forms of knowing as just that - a different way of looking at something and, where possible, allowing the student to realise their own path to their knowing The issues students present me with concerning the limits of their learning are just starting positions towards new learning filled with promise rather than being fixed limits. I understand the damage and scarification that the non-aware sender of words such as the thrown-away comment can cause a student. I understand the power of words to open spaces or to close them. I understand the importance of words and

what is said in terms of their delivery: open engaged responses that are invitational, or closed scarifying comments that are patronising or filled with innuendos. Having gained a deeper insight into why my engagement with my writing and reflecting was creating such havoc, I could then move on to discuss the process and issues of knowing.

5. 2 Experiencing knowing and my "I"/inclusional originality

Knowing could be described as a process, a deliberate activity different from knowledge, which is an engaged construct of a commodity or concept. I hold the stance that different types of knowing exist at different levels of consciousness at the same time. No level is more correct, better or enlightened that any other, just different. Knowing is insight that arises in the moment of doing and is therefore part of a process. Knowing is more than a deliberate activity. Some knowing, while still part of an engagement or activity, can be spontaneous and not necessarily germane to the activity.

When I articulate the action of the knowing experience, I am moving the known through the filters of my own knowledge, from which I analyse, categorise and attach values such as meanings and words. I therefore contend that knowledge is a construct or matrix of the emergence of knowing set against our own understandings. Knowledge may therefore bear no resemblance to the knowing from which it claims its causation.

Moving into seeking an answer to: *What is knowledge and how do I know?* was to me akin to entering an abyss (McClure 1996). I used the term abyss for I was plunging into the

consciousness of unexplored depths. An online dictionary definition of abyss is: *A bottomless or unfathomed depth, gulf, or chasm; hence, any deep, immeasurable, and, specifically, hell, or the bottomless pit* (Wiktionary 2006). This definition fails to describe to my satisfaction where I was in time and space. Some would describe this abyss as a place of darkness, for me it was anything but dark. Without any term of reference or a framework on which to hold the constructs of reality, my mind - in its uncertainty - activated the emotion of fear. Understanding that this fear was both an inhibition to enquiry and/or a solvent for dissolving old barriers of thinking was a balancing act. It was my experience that the more I was exposed to dealing with fear, the less debilitating fear was. At the particular time when I was empowered and gave myself permission to enter a state of abandonment, many of the constructs of who and what I supposed "I" was, ceased to exist. Yet at the same time there seemed to be an inner core of me that continued and was exposed by this very process of abandonment. Being open to such an experience proceeded in the way that Polanyi (1964, p. 34) described as: … *a process of spontaneous mental reorganisation uncontrolled by conscious effort.* In my paper called *The Faceting of the Diamond of Self*, a module of my 1999 Masters Degree in Education at Bath University, I wrote:

> *I feel it is necessary to try and enquire further in order to explain and examine this point of abandonment because it was pivotal in a shift of consciousness which changed the whole course and direction of my life. A realisation started to take root in my consciousness in the form of an awareness which was very subtle, almost tickling at my subconscious, and this posed a new question to me, "Where am I in my essence of humanness?" (Adler-Collins, 1999, p. 7)*

This intrigued me and forced me to re-examine my understanding of self. Perhaps in my previous enquiries I was being self-limiting in trying to find a medium to meaningfully and lovingly represent my core values. At the same time I explored the essence of me in relationship to the journey of my learning and my ability to convey this learning to my students and peers.

I asked myself: *Could I show that each aspect of self has a different way of knowing?* These forms of knowing are different from analytical knowing. In whatever form my knowing presents itself to me, each aspect appears to give me a distinct and different way of knowing. For example, Vygotsky (1978, p.72) spoke of social knowing, which is related to the context from within which the knowing evolves and is directly influenced by one's environment. He stated that:

> *Every function in the child's cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and, later, on the individual level; first, between people (interpsychological) and then inside the child (intrapsychological). This applies equally to voluntary attention, to logical memory, and to the formation of concepts. All the higher functions originate as actual relationships between individuals.*

Bandura (1977, p. 22) is in accord with Vygotsky's ideas about the importance of interpsychological learning. Bandura says of learning:

> *Learning would be exceedingly laborious, not to mention hazardous, if people had to rely solely on the effects of their own actions to inform them what to do. Fortunately, most human behaviour is learned observationally through modelling: from observing others one forms an idea of how new behaviours are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action.*

While I can see the logic of what both Bandura and Vygotsky say, the tone of certainty with which they speak leaves me with a sense of dis-ease; both Bandura and Vygotsky are social scientists who assume that all human beings will act as their models and thinking predict. Such thinking, I believe, is flawed in that it does not allow for original concepts and thinking, and subscribes to the notion that we are all pre-conditioned or hard-wired because of genetic predispositions.

My values and standards of judgement, which are embedded in my learning from the process described above, are those of *inclusional originality*. This means that I see myself and each student as a unique individual in our journey of learning. As such, the individual will respond to his/her own learning in his/her own way. Recognising the uniqueness of the individual places a responsibility on me, the teacher, to assist in finding ways of helping the students to their knowing while at the same time keeping the process focused on the learning objectives required by the social establishment. At the same time, the students reflect back to me challenges, confirmations or enquiries as to how effective I am being as a teacher. Every teaching situation is unique at the time of its construction as both I and my students will be different people when we next meet in terms of our lived

experiences of knowing. Inclusional knowing understands and allows for this sense of difference which is not a comfort zone for the teacher; indeed it is rather the opposite, for I feel that each time I meet the students they also meet me. We are in reality meeting for the first time, guided or informed by our memories, images and filters of our last meeting, which can prevent us from even seeing the new individual.

5. 2. 1 Learning: Coming to know

Another part of my thinking and knowing appears to be a contradiction to my Buddhist thinking, because all things exist and arise from the causal plane of consciousness. This causal plane is impermanent mental energy and not real. Buddhist abstraction is all well and good but it has yet to explain the *everyday*. I am thinking of my everydayness as the phenomenon of the everyday, as Heidegger suggests within the structure of being-in-the-world. Heidegger suggests that the everyday is not theory or an abstraction. We repeat the everyday through praxis and such repetitions bring about the creation of certainty. For example: The sun set yesterday and today, it will set tomorrow.

Using Heidegger's ideas makes sense if I am having a conversation within a Western paradigm of reality, for I view my everyday living through the aspects of the active filters I am using in that moment of knowing through doing. By this I mean, for example: As I teach I am using the aspect of me that is the teacher, grounded in my practice and supported and informed both by my practice and the theory I attribute to be necessary for my role as a teacher. When I change my role to that of Nurse, I change aspects of myself and the dominant aspect becomes that which is associated with my nursing practice. At the

same time another process is taking place, namely that of engaging with moving into and out of my consciousness by adding to or modifying the database of my nursing knowledge.

I would therefore argue that multiple elements of different aspects of relativity can be functioning at the same moment in an inclusional sense. This is inclusional from the stance that all the aspects of self inform the dominant aspect but are not necessarily acted on by the dominant aspect. The dominant aspect of self is situational and relative to the events of the moment. Rayner (2003) refers to this as the complex self. Buddhism calls it the casual duality of self and not-self. Heidegger points out: "… *everything we talk about, everything we have in view, everything towards which we comport ourselves in any way, is being; what we are is being, and so is how we are*" (p. 6). This everyday understanding of being is vague and indefinite, yet it is a positive phenomenon through which Heidegger seeks to make explicit *where I am,* which he refers to as dasein.

5. 2. 1. 1 A question of certainty within the constructs of knowing by doing/ inclusional caution

If Heidegger's *where I am* in the everyday or *being there* is my world, arguably I create a *being in the world* through my senses, and then make sense of my sensory world through enquiry into and experience of that world. This gives rise to some intriguing questions: *How certain is my certainty? How real is my world?* Heidegger's understanding of *everydayness* provides a base on which to build a degree of certainty about my world and

aspects of my living, and in the sense that I act. By repeatable acts of making or doing each commitment to my aspect of everydayness, I am treating action as a phenomenon. Such a phenomenon in turn becomes concrete in some way, perhaps influenced by the realness of the repeatability, and thus it soon becomes an accepted absolute for and to me at that moment. Sensory abstracts become certainties of my constructed realities.

This applies equally to knowledge. I commit to what I know or believe when I make what I know or believe part of my everyday living. Sometimes I commit *to the best of my knowledge*, sometimes *for all practical purposes*, and so on, but I commit. It is not my knowledge that has the quality of being absolute, but my ability to commit which brings about actions that build the certainty and the trust ability of everydayness. Through actions I experience and create certainty. I would argue the position that the real basis of Western certainty is therefore statistics and reason, perhaps even repeatability, but certainty comes only when I make the commitment. All that statistics and reason can do is to point me in the direction of certainty. Therefore our grounds for certainty are based in our situational learning.

Lave (1988) argues that learning normally occurs as a function of the activity, context and culture in which it occurs (i.e., it is situated). This contrasts with most classroom learning activities which involve knowledge that is abstract and out of context; as was the case with my curriculum of the healing nurse. My curriculum, before it was adjusted through responses from my own and my students' experiences of it, was abstract in the sense that it focused on healing and healing touch as opposed to the evidence-based medical model, and out of context in that the educational philosophy was at first Western in its focus and

structures (Hisama, 2000). Social interaction is a critical component of situated learning. Learners become involved in a community of practice (nursing) that embodies certain beliefs and behaviours that are to be acquired. As the beginner or newcomer moves from the periphery of this community to its centre, they become more active and engaged within the culture, and hence assume the role of expert or old-timer (Brenner, et al,1999; Bassett, 2002) or, in the case of Japan, that of the sensei (Hisama, 2000). Other researchers have further developed the theory of situated learning. Brown et al. (1989, p. 33) emphasize the idea of cognitive apprenticeship: . . . *cognitive apprenticeship supports learning in a domain by enabling students to acquire, develop and use cognitive tools in authentic domain activity. Learning, both outside and inside school, advances through collaborative social interaction and the social construction of knowledge.* Brown *et al*. also emphasize the need for a new epistemology of learning, one that emphasizes active perception over concepts and representation.

My values and standards of discernment, which have arisen from the learning described in the above section, have taught me *inclusional caution*. By this I mean that I understand that the very act of judgement is contrary to my Buddhist teachings. I am ontologically more comfortable with discernment. I understand that in a values judgement there is an attachment to the outcome of that judgment. Such a judgement may be externally enforced, in the nature of a standard of achievement embedded in a learning outcome or competency. I have therefore learned to use extreme caution when placed in a position where a judgement has to be made and, where possible, seek to understand the implications of such a judgement.

[I have to acknowledge that in my curriculum design I placed a set of values together in an educative framework that I believed were useful to assist the raising of nursing standards. I mean 'useful' in the sense that they offered a framework of standardisation to which contextual knowledge could be added. Such standardisation in terms of values could then be used as public values which, in turn, we (in nursing) could be held accountable for and to by the client, patient, public and our profession. These values appear to have an ethical/moral element which is informed by my beliefs. I am mindful that many people may not subscribe to my beliefs, so I have focused on values that could be seen as values for humanity that would not be constrained by culture or creed. The complexity of the problem is shown, for example, in the word compassion. Compassion, most would agree, is a requirement for the caring nurse, but what compassion actually is and the shape it takes as a lived cultural value is highly dependent on context. One culture's compassion is another's abuse. I therefore know that there is no one solution for all, and such knowing brings to my curriculum the essential element of becoming critical in terms of interrogation of knowing and knowledge for cultural relevance by the student, the teacher and the social formation, and being mindful of the pedagogic codes of power as implied by Bernstein (2000). This narrative, in its telling of my developing an inclusional pedagogy of the unique, focuses attention on finding the middle way of balancing the desire to know with the power of controlling what is known.]

5. 2. 2 Multi-aspectual knowing and intuition

Two interesting themes for exploration in this section are the different types of knowing and different aspects of knowing. Our knowing, in everyday living, is integrated as one whole in a matrix of constructed images processed from our sensory data; yet that very

wholeness has aspects within aspects. By 'aspects' I am thinking of the multi-aspectual form of knowing. For example, a pen is an inanimate object, but it has the potential to be used not only as a tool for making marks on paper but to formulate the written word. Such symbols (words) are more than the object (pen), rather they are abstract extensions into concrete form via the object. Not only are they abstract expressions but they have a purpose, and that is to convey meaning. They in a sense are contained in the potential of the pen. Such thinking can be applied to any form of concrete expression in any medium, a pen, a brush, a word processor. Therefore to call a 'pen' a 'pen' is to include the higher aspects of knowing the potential properties associated with the praxis of a 'pen'. The boundaries of understanding the form and function of the object are restricted to the cognitive and psychomotor skills of the user and the ability to write and read in the language of the context.

In Buddhism we are taught form, function, purpose. The pen has form, the form's function is to hold ink and enable a mark to be made, its purpose is open to the individual's intuition but the pen holds the potential to be used for writing, and writing has the potential to convey and praxis meaning when read in the social and cultural context from within which it is written. Another element is that the skill of writing needs to have been mastered and also that the context within which the writing is used is socially understood.

Early human cultures had no written tradition and even today, in our Westernised high-tech world, some indigenous cultures still do not possess formal written languages, relying instead on centuries of *oral knowing* and intuition that have served them well. This moves "intuition" out of the realm of complete mystery into something rich and tangible and yet ultimately beyond our full understanding. Let's take for example an Amazon Indian

shaman whose memory and knowledge of the medicinal properties of plants is extraordinary, and his immersion in the rhythm and harmony of his environment gives rise to a different form of knowing that we as Westerners, should we go into his domain, could never achieve or understand.

[I recognise that I can never completely know the context of another. By this I mean that I will never understand completely the full experience of being Japanese. This suggests that culturally bounded forms of knowing exclude all who are outside that culture from a shared wholeness of knowing. I can, for example, have a deeper communication with another soldier about fear only if that soldier has experienced the same fear. If this is so, the situational knowing is stronger than that of any cultural boundaries that might otherwise come between us. I suggest that a bond exists in knowing, especially if shared at the same time. In advanced Buddhist teachings such a problem is overcome by mind-to-mind contact where it is claimed that an instant and total form of knowing occurs. Such contact is not mind-reading or telepathy but a complete union of minds.]

The same thinking can be taken into my understanding of my domains of praxis, those of nurse, teacher and priest. Each requires an engagement with different forms of knowing, and each has a body of theory that has to be learned as the accepted benchmark of what is correct or acceptable knowing and practice in context. Some cameos of my own intuition can be seen, for example, in my nursing: when I come on shift and greet the patients, I use a form of intuitive knowing that is like radar, scanning the patients' vital signs and taking on board their spoken and unspoken signals - assessing the words used, the voice stress, the silences, and tone delivery. In my classroom I am using the same process, but this time I am looking at and paying more attention to my students' eyes as they speak to me of their confusion, enquiry, understanding and sometimes shining with comprehension. The class

or lesson dynamics has a feel about it. All these inputs are continually assessed against the database of my knowing, my experience, my learning. Sometimes a sense of unease flags my attention as I intuitively sense that something is wrong but actually do not fully know what it is that is bothering me. Heeding such intuition requires me to look deeper and investigate further.

As I write I am conscious of the problem that my thinking may cause my profession in terms of the current trend towards evidence-based practice. However, considerable evidence indicates that much professional decision-making is not based on the best evidence but instead on an individual's subjective intuitive judgements concerning the appropriate actions to take for a given clinical challenge. This intuitive approach has resulted in wide variations in clinical practice and the outcomes associated with it (Tinkler *et al*. 1999). Nursing has embraced this stance positively and has used intuition as the mark of an expert in the field (Benner 1984; Benner *et al*. 1999).

How such intuitive decisions are made is an area of concern for health care professionals, policymakers, and the recipients of these decisions. I believe that embracing intuitive judgements is a positive strategy of being *professional*. However, this has to be balanced with scientific praxis. In my curriculum I highlight the use of intuition and professional scientific judgement based on practice and experience. I advocate that these two stances need not be exclusionary; rather, each informs the other, giving a broader sense of knowing and thereby a more informed sense of praxis.

5. 2. 2. 1 Ways of knowing our self can be described as aspects

If each aspect provides a meaningful way of knowing, and is thus a meaningful part of what it is to know, in what way does each aspect make its contribution? Bateson (1979) says of knowledge:

> *We can continue to discuss the relationship between knowledge [multi-aspectual] and reality. . . . I take the stance that it is not possible to perceive [aesthetic] reality directly. . . Thought [formative] can be about pigs or coconuts, but there are no pigs or coconuts in the brain; and in the mind, there are no neurons, only ideas [analytic] of pigs and coconuts. . . . The name [lingual] is not the thing named, and the idea of pig is not the pig* (p. 205).

Bateson's thinking, with which I partly agree, reflects my Buddhist thinking. I cannot actually see the object as it is. Rather, the object becomes subjective as it is constructed by the reflections of my knowledge. By such thinking, my knowing may not actually be present in my knowledge as my knowledge, therefore I may not be able to find adequate ways of representing that which I know.

To give my reader further insights into this conundrum, an object of my Buddhism is to reveal the mind as it actually is. However, I can only use the subjectivity of my knowledge to reveal to me the mind as it really is. Inside me my mind knows the reality of itself but cannot reveal itself to me because of what I know. Sometimes, however, and this is where I disagree with Bateson, such moments when the aesthetic reality of the mind does reveal itself are deeply profound and without words.

5. 2. 3 Critical and analytical (theoretical) knowing/ inclusional tolerance

Since the early Greek thinkers, analytical or theoretical knowing has been given a special place, to the point of being elevated as the "only true" way of knowing, so that everyday knowing was seen as a deficient form. For Cottrell (1999, p. 88), critical thinking means: … *weighing up the arguments and evidence for and against.* It involves:

> *Considering an issue carefully and more than once*
> *Evaluating the evidence put forward in support of the belief or viewpoint*
> *Considering where the belief or viewpoint leads*
> *Considering what conclusions would follow; are these suitable and rational?*
> *and if not, should the belief or viewpoint be reconsidered?*

Critical thinking goes hand in hand with analytical thinking. For Cottrell (1999, p. 88) analytical thinking involves the following additional processes:

> *Standing back from the information given*
> *Examining it in detail from many angles*
> *Checking closely whether it is completely accurate*
> *Checking whether a statement follows logically from what went before*
> *Looking for possible flaws in the reasoning, the evidence, or the way that*
> *conclusions are drawn*
> *Comparing the same issue from the point of view of other theorists or writers*
> *Being able to see and explain why different people arrived at different*
> *conclusions*
> *Being able to argue why one set of opinions, results or conclusions is*

preferable to another

Being on guard for literary or statistical devices that encourage the reader to take questionable statements at face value

Checking for hidden assumptions

Checking for attempts to lure the reader into agreement

What appears to be missing from Cottrell's lists is the passion of the enquiry; passion and rigour are not necessarily mutually exclusive. I believe that heuristic action research can give me that engagement of my "I" as central to the phenomena of my process. Heuristic action research would *identify* the phenomena and seek to *immerse* the *"*I*"* in conversation or communication with the phenomena. Such immersion can bring about insights to the known that lie embedded in the knowledge. Similarly, the process of reflection is both analytical knowing and heuristic process. Each requires different types of reflection, one the reflection of immersion, the other of detachment. Standing back from the information given, as Cottrell would advocate, suggests a form of detachment. Standing back does not negate passion. For example, I am passionate about taking multiple perspectives, and I am passionate about the topic at hand and always looking at people's ability to move around and see the issue in other ways. To do that moving around one must step out of one's current view and into a new place. In that case the passion is at the meta-cognition level (Anderson 2005).

My values and standards of judgement that emerge from the learning of the above are those of *inclusional tolerance*. By this I mean that there are so many possible explanations of a phenomenon that by being tolerant to the views of others I am creating space to listen.

This creation of a listening space allows the life-affirming flow (Vasilyuk, 1991). I have mentioned before to be heard in the gaps of silence. Such listening moves beyond the mere biological and physiological aspects of hearing. It brings the listener into the "flow" of hearing, the very heartbeat of creation. If I listen to the views of others they can inform my learning. If I inform my learning I can modify my understanding and praxis. Inclusional tolerance is for me a space creator for engaged learning. To further understand the process of knowing through my knowledge I need to explore and clarify my understandings and meanings by asking a series of questions. The rest of this chapter is part of this process starting with the question: *What are intuition and synchronicity? As I believe that each plays an important role in the praxis of Inclusionality.*

5. 2. 4 What are intuition and synchronicity?

5. 2. 4. 1 Intuition

How do I intuitively know that a patient is sick, in pain or even dying? Why do I sense when something is not right with my patients? Such feelings are often placed within the realm of what is called intuition (Brennan 1993, 1988; Benner, 1984; Benner et al., 1999). I believe that intuition is a gift innate in each of us. It is at once ancient and futuristic, ordinary and magical. Intuition fills the tiny gaps between thoughts and sometimes spans the huge gaps that occur in linear problem-solving. Intuition knows immediately, without thinking, a direct conduit to information that cannot be forced, but will go into hibernation if ignored. Like a muscle, intuition needs exercise and training.

[*One way to learn the difference between thinking and knowing is to practice the art of intentional listening. A common thread amongst almost every exceptional intuitive thinker*

is the practice of meditation or essential listening. Meditation allows the space of non-space between thoughts to grow larger. It is a discipline that creates the opportunity for knowing. One where the heart thinks and the mind feels. One where the separation and exclusion of self from the "flow" is remedied as the illusionary self sinks back into collective wholeness.]

Intuition speaks through the symbols in dreams. Dreams are portals to intuition to which some famous people have attributed discoveries that changed the Western world. For example, Niels Bohr (1885-1962), for quantum physics theory, Dmitri Mendeleev (1834-1907), for the prediction of silicone, and Thomas Edison (1847-1931), inventor of the world's first integrated circuitry, all used the symbolism of their dreams to stimulate intuitive scientific breakthroughs. Weintraub's (1988) *The Hidden Intelligence* is a book of accounts of how intuition has played an important role in business. One story is of a physician who was the head of dermatology at a teaching hospital and who for two years had unsuccessfully sought a cure for the bite of a specific poisonous spider. One night he had a vivid dream about leprosy. When he awoke and began thinking about his dream he had a strong intuition that a medicine used for leprosy could also be effective in treating the spider bite. The physician proceeded with laboratory testing and human trials that eventually confirmed his intuition. I dream a lot and my dreams are often vivid. I have learned to pay attention to my dreams and to question the phenomena with which they present me. It was through following my dreams that I came to Japan, found my land and built my temple.

I have an *intuitive* feeling that my curriculum will, if sustained over time, enhance the ability of nurses in Japan to think critically and touch in a therapeutic and mindful way. I know it will take time and meet with resistance, but I feel that it will succeed and, when that time arrives, it will be a Japanese model, one that has emerged over time and is embedded with cultural relevance.

In my classroom I often sense intuitively: … *that lesson went well, or something did not quite work there?* Such intuitions, when acted upon, usually turn up some problem or other that needs to be addressed. My values gained from learning, as explained in this section, are harder to write down in words. Yet they are fundamental to my being. I believe in intuition and I value its influence on my life world. Being highly intuitive is, in my case, a developed skill that arose out of the need to understand without understanding the spoken language or the cultural codes. I have learned to trust my intuition as another sense and, as such, it rates highly on and in my discernment process. For example, I can look at a portfolio and *feel* its expression. I can also *feel* the lack of expression if the portfolio *feels* empty. Trying to place such feelings into logic is highly problematic and subjective. I can imagine losing other senses such as sight or hearing as being a terrible loss. However, the loss of my ability to use intuition would devastate me and I would feel less than human.

5. 2. 4. 2 Synchronicity

Sometimes seemingly random, disconnected events coalesce in profoundly meaningful ways. Carl Jung called this synchronicity. Intuition and synchronicity are symbiotic

processes. Recognizing interconnectedness is an exercise in intuition, and enhanced intuition increases the awareness and likelihood of frequent synchronistic experiences. In his book *Synchronicity: The Inner Path of Leadership*, Jaworski (1988) described a special state he calls flow. During the flow state, events, people and resources come together effortlessly. It is as if they are communicating with one another, giving birth to a shared vision. Jaworski sees the experience of flow as one that is so rare and so enjoyable that people will seek to replicate it at great cost, even at the risk of life itself, just for the sake of having it again. In my understanding of my praxis I have been in that flow, experiencing it in and on my life, and agree with Jawaorski's comments to the extent of knowing when my life or my praxis have moved outside the flow, and knowing the narcotic nature of such an experience whilst immersed.

In the East this flow has been known for centuries as the Way of the Tao. Looking for interconnectedness is the first step towards experiencing synchronicities where events and people are connected in meaningful ways. Working with such connections and understandings of intuition often leads those who believe in such ways of knowing to ignore it at their peril. As powerful as intuition is, it can be overruled by emotions and/or logical rational thinking. Learning to differentiate between intuition and reactionary emotions is essential in making the sixth sense a reliable decision-making tool.

My Buddhist thinking encourages me to look outside the envelope of consciousness. By this I mean that the boundaries of my consciousness are delineated by the limits of my knowing and the start of my ignorance. I seek patterns in actions and thoughts. It is this

nonlinear intelligence that enables me to expand perception and access information through subtle influences, symbols and patterns. Nonlinear intelligence is, for me, a new way of viewing the world, one of seeing and *hearing* what might otherwise escape attention. It is equally a new way of interacting with the world. Nonlinear intelligence ultimately alters my notions of how reality operates, and of the interconnectedness of external and internal worlds. This ability to shape and interact with reality in a new way is the ultimate innovation.

5. 2. 5 Coming to know as learning : Inclusional respect.

What of the process of coming to know, i.e., learning? My understanding is that my learning is akin to a pot of white paint and that everything I learn has a colour, vibration and value-added content. Everything I have learned is a sensation constructed from my five senses and each one has passed through my pot of white paint, leaving the image of its passing in colour, vibration or memory. Learning, for me, appears to be an irreversible or at least time-directed process in that I learn and I cannot unlearn (though I might forget or change my mind). If I think of what I include within learning, I am soon presented with its complexity. I find that my learning includes: experiencing, understanding, practicing, storing away of information, and memorising. Learning involves the taking in of new information and linking it meaningfully with what I had there before. The opportunity for transformation is presented and, if acted upon, takes place in various ways, such as changing my habits, changing my attitudes, changing my world views, and many other things. Respect for the position of the other is an important part of this process as \i subscribe to the Buddhist ideas that every one is my teacher, the differences they present me inform my learning by giving me choices and opportunity to engage in differing ideas

that can bring about change. The solvent for bringing about change and dissolving the barriers of my ignorance, I believe, is consciousness. When I apply consciousness to enquiry I start to know - such knowing begins with the ability to ask a question. All these processes are evidenced in my narrative of life-long learning in this thesis.

5. 3 Is it a good question? I examine the meanings of a question

For years I have pondered on the Buddhist teaching that the answer to any question is contained within its asking. *"What did such a saying mean?"* I have yet to find the complete answer, however I feel that its meaning could be along the following lines. Our database of knowledge as discussed in the previous section may not be a true form of representation of our knowing. As we engage critically with a question by considering the context through which the question arose from our knowledge base, then the question can be seen as the solvent that dissolves the rigid boundaries of knowledge and reveals to us the synthesis of our knowing.

In my formulation of the question which encapsulates the essence of my thesis, I entered into just such an internal journey of exploration. Such a journey required that I surf my knowledge bases of knowing, seeking or feeling my concerns, doubts or intuitions about both my inner world and my outer world. The passion I hold in my heart allows me to see the different pieces of knowledge as parts of a puzzle.

The actual formulation of my question is almost an awakening to my desire to communicate my process of learning by questioning that very process. Polanyi (1969, p. 118) stated that: ... *all true scientific research starts with hitting on a deep and promising problem, and this is half of the discovery.* Polanyi further stated: … *to see a problem is to*

see something hidden that may yet be accessible… It is an engrossing procession of incipient knowledge which passionately strives to validate itself. Such is the heuristic power of the problem (pp. 131-132). Having my embryonic question tease itself into my conscious thought was only part of my process.

Finding the correct wording for the question was problematic. Not all questions were worthy in Western academic terms or contained a PhD thesis in them. Language plays a crucial role in questioning as does the structuring of the question. By this I mean that the location of certain elements in the construction of the text of the question plays an important part in understanding the question and could change the meaning completely if placed differently. Field (1976, p. 18) highlights my frustration: … *now, after years of training, I could feel the question in me, but for the life of me I could not get it into the right words."*

After a good deal of time, contemplation and extensive rewriting, my own question emerged Developing an inclusional pedagogy of the unique: How do I clarify, live and explain my educational influences in my learning as I pedagogise my healing nurse curriculum in a Japanese University.

[The above question and its partial answer encapsulated my heuristic action research enquiry and, as such, became in every sense of the word my constant companion over the years that we have walked together. My question evolved itself and became a living body of knowledge, almost in a sense another form of being, one that I could and do engage with as though I am talking to a friend.

I have learned to love the question, as it created a thirst in me to discover and clarify my public and private meanings and values. As such, the question is not only an academic one, but a living one as well, as it is infused with the very essence of my understanding of me. Yet, on the flip side of this is

my concern at being attached to the question in terms of enquiry. Perhaps that is the essence of my humanness in terms of curiosity that will not allow my mind to stop asking questions. Perhaps existence is just an eternal question?]

In the writing of this thesis I am required to deconstruct my integrated holistic understanding of my multi-dimensional mirror of self/non-self, and present *fragments* of the mirror to the academy on the assumption that each fragment is important for understanding the whole. The danger with this is that the overview can be lost in analysing the fragments, and individual fragments may be seen as being more important than the whole, depending on bias, philosophy and training. When reconstructed back into the original, the mirror may no longer reflect the whole from which it came. Craig (1978, p. 57), in his doctoral thesis, eases my tensions concerning deconstructing my holistic wholeness when he talks about coming: … *from the individual to the general and back again, from the feeling to the word and back again to the feeling, from the experience of the concept and back to the experience.* This same thinking is reflected by Donald Macedo in his foreword to Freire's (1998, p.6.) *Pedagogy of Freedom* where he states:

> *…Paulo Freire was very concerned that institutions like [the] Harvard Graduate School of Education were preponderantly supportive of specialists of this sort who hide their ideology behind the facile call for "scientific rigor" and "absolute objectivity". These "scientific" educators have often contributed to a further fragmentation of knowledge because of their reductionist views of the act of knowing (p. 6).*

I share Freire's concern, and this keeps bringing me back to look at knowledge and repeatedly ask the question: *What is Knowledge, What is it I am seeing?* Bernstein (2000) reminds me of the unresolved tension around what are or are not acceptable forms of knowing. Bernstein (2000) distinguishes between two different classes of knowledge, believing that it is the very nature of language that makes these two classes of knowledge possible. He terms them the *thinkable class* and the *unthinkable class* (p. 30). He believes that there is a potential discourse gap between these two classes and stresses that it is not a dislocation of meaning, but it is a gap. I keep revisiting this tension, and as my understanding deepens new ideas emerge. My narrative comes back time and time again to this concept of the gap and the ideas of space. The thinkable class of knowledge appears to be that which is under the control of the elite of a society, be they political, military, philosophical or religious.

[*I am rewriting this section in Tibet where, as I look out of the window, I am struck by the living truth of Bernstein's gap. The social context here is highly complex, like oils of different colours and densities all flowing and intermingling but each in a flow of different life worlds that never really mix. It reminds me of Jaworski's (1988) "flow". For example, there is the flow of power that is China's control over the whole social structure of Tibet. I can see the flow of the nomadic poor - their poverty is clearly recognisable, the squalor of their physical condition apparent to anyone who looks. I can see the flow of the Chinese merchant class with their much better clothes and health. I can see the frantic flow of tourists pushing their invasive cameras and videos into the faces of the locals and having their tour guides milk every last possible dollar out of them. I can see, every 25 metres from where I am, the police stands which control the flow of the locals, as nothing can interfere with the flow of hard currency that tourism is bring to China. I can see the*

flow of monks, destitute and leaderless. I can see professional beggars from China aggressively plying their trade to the tourists. I see a society in and under tension. The flow of money is all that connects these systems, different yet totally reliant on each other. It is by no means an equal flow. Yet I can also see new buildings, new constructions, commercial sectors, and vendor stores selling a selection of imported goods from Nepal, China, and India. There appears to be more than one kind of gap. If three Tibetans come together in public the police move them on quickly. The rules of Bernstein's gap are very clear here. For example, I am allowed to walk around the temples but not allowed to pray in public - to do so would immediately bring in the police, as I have experienced when I have been asked for healing by local Tibetan people.

In Japan the gap is still present in the context of my university, but not in so clear form of control as is displayed in Tibet. Pedagogic control is exercised more through the voices of senior faculty in the many committees of my university. The power to block, censor or attempt to control is equally powerful and has the potential to be equally destructive. In the case of my curriculum and thesis, the pedagogic battle lines were drawn on the science of the curriculum, purely because one of the senior faculty was a medical doctor and scientist and no pedagogic challenges were going to be tolerated. The need to prove that my curriculum had any positive relevance to nursing was often the point at issue. However I have to be clear about the other forms of pedagogic power, namely those of my Dean who took an educative risk in bring a foreigner into a new faculty and the MEXT who passed the curriculum for teaching in a Japanese university. These were positive uses of the gap. what I was experiencing was a local example of Bernstein's discourse gap.]

Freire (1970), in his work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed,* first opened my eyes to the possibility that I as an educator could be contributing to the oppression of my students, a thought that has caused me considerable distress. I say 'distress', for it is my claim that I live my life in Buddhist service with the values and standards of discernment that hold that I will never violate the integrity of another. Yet, as I research my practice, I find that the very system in which I operate is in fact re-enforcing what could be described as oppressive policies of knowing. I ask myself: *What do I mean?* Well, for example, phrases like *being a team player* or *on board with the programme* could suggest or imply that I teach the content the way the system wants it taught. In that case I would, in fact, be re-enforcing the values of the system through my compliance as a banking educator.

[My comfort zone as a Buddhist teacher of nursing was fast being shattered as I found and isolated the bias in myself and my cosmology and questioned the systems under which I worked from a perspective of critical pedagogy. Such questioning revealed to me ways in which I negated my claim to know myself and highlighted the tensions of becoming a living contradiction (Whitehead 1989), one where my actual practices negated my values. I understood these insights and that led to my awakening, so to speak, in educational and human terms. There was the possibility of a real moral issue here, which actually presented itself when I was called into a faculty meeting of senior professors and told that it was not my job to teach but to lecture. I took the stand then, as I do now, that it is my job to teach as long as I meet the requirements and learning outcomes of the curriculum; which, thanks to the audit trail built into the design of my curriculum, I could readily demonstrate that I did. However, the difference between the words 'teacher' and 'lecturer' is significant, as were the misunderstandings that arose on both sides. Teachers in Japan are individuals who teach in schools, while lecturers work in universities. They are not required to be qualified teachers. The

Japanese usage is related to social position - my usage and praxis was that of an educational methodology.]

I have learned much by engaging with the concepts encapsulated in critical pedagogy, which I understand in the Giroux (1983) sense as being the progressive educational process, and learning to read the formal and informal power relationships within educational formations (Bernstein, 2000). I was able to see where I had room for internally improving my practice and my humanity at the same time. I say 'internally' as I believe that I have both an internal and external world of practice. However, my internal world is directly affected by the context of my external world. For example, if in my external world I experience a situation which causes me anger, in my internal world I have the choice to act on that anger or seek its teachings. If I respond in anger then I am a living contradiction (Whitehead, 1989), for I have negated my inner world values of peacefulness in my external praxis. My internal world is where I can live my ontological values completely and fully.

What was not so clear was how I was going to bring my new insights to my external practice, or even if I would be permitted to do so by the local stakeholders of the politics of power. What was also emerging into clearer focus was the fact that I had undergone some form of ontological transformation, the roots of which lay in my past and were added to, nurtured and grew stronger as I progressed through my academic journey of reflective enquiry. The body of the journey has been the years I have been immersed in my learning, engaging with one conceptual framework after another. As I accepted some knowledge, I critically rejected other knowledge, and modified my *knowing* in the moment. My Buddhist values of respect, sensitivity, openness, flexibility, love, non-judgementalism,

non-violence, the capacity to forgive, and compassion have started to solidify into living standards of discernment. I embraced Buddhism as a scaffolding to give me structure and compassion in my life, not realising that the key to my freedom lay not within the framework of any one system of understanding; rather, it lay in my own inner consciousness. I understood that it was my fear that both drove me and blocked me. I understood that the answers to my questions were not external; rather they lay in my own heart. It was that unrelenting force of a compassionate heart that needed to claim its space in my consciousness and show me that I could, in Eisner's (1997) sense, truly fly.

Over these years of incubation of the seeds of my ideas and concerns about healing touch, the inner tacit dimension of my knowing was enabled to move slowly and shape the body of understanding that I was building. I used this very intuitive process consciously when writing this chapter, for in its writing I struggled with all the threads and different ideas and experiences that danced around in my consciousness and thinking (Streubert-Speziale and Carpenter, 2003). I was determined to get it right and therefore focused my concentration on the writing. The harder I concentrated, the more confused and diffuse my writing became. I needed to step back, *walk my talk,* and allow the real voice of what I wanted to say to present itself.

I was stuck in the process of negating my immersion in heuristic methodology by not allowing the osmotic process of knowing and the flow to take place. By trying to force the process I came out of the flow of the process. Being out of the flow brings great stress to me now. One day, in my office, I hit a mental brick wall. I just could not synthesise this chapter correctly. I had reached the stage where if I was not writing and rewriting my thesis and/or reading or preparing papers for conferences, I had great feelings of guilt.

Freire (1970) talked about narrative sickness as being where the writing is passionless - what I was suffering from was narrative addiction.

Jaworski's (1988) "flow" was my lifeline, one where I only felt alive when engaged in the creative flow of ideas and energies within this thesis. My life was colonised by books, knowledge, paradigms. I needed more and more time on the computer to feel the flow of things. Perhaps this is another learning process, for I was becoming a sick individual. I had no life, for my thesis was my life. As with all addictions, the first step in breaking the addiction is recognising the problem.

The answer to my problems came in the shape of a traditional Japanese martial art, a form of archery (Kyudo) that requires a tremendous amount of mental discipline. The form or action one takes is clearly reflected in the shooting. Kyudo became my safety valve. I spent hours early each morning, just before sunrise, in the training school (dojyo). As with most things in traditional Japanese thinking, the obvious is not always the correct way or meaning. I had an extremely high hit rate of 95%. After one session of practice, when I was very pleased with myself, my teacher said to me:

> *What is your inner anger? Yes, you can hit the target, but the purpose of Kyudo is not just hitting the target but the form and dance of the harmony of actions that links head with heart, courage with compassion. With every arrow you release we can see your anger, your suffering, your loss of centre. Such sights in turn cause us pain*. (personal communication, Nakaiama sensei, June 2005)

For a Japanese person to speak so directly is unusual and reflects the high level of insight my teacher has and the love he has shown to me through his teaching, for I completely understood his words.

I went back to basics and studied *form consciousness;* as I concentrated on breathing and posture I found I could not hit the target. The more I tried to hit, the more I missed (just like writing my thesis). However, the faces of my Kyudo colleagues were full of smiles as their warmth reached out to me. My military training had been to locate the target quickly and fire. I had found a layer of my military training that was clouding my thinking, constricting everything at a deep level to that of confrontation with a mindset of my military indoctrination that said *we are the Good Guys and the Enemy are the bad guys.* It had been ten years since I had fired a weapon. I was so surprised by this realisation. My thesis had in one very real sense become my enemy that had to be overcome. This made me realise that my thesis is an extension of me; if I claim to be inclusional and compassionate to others, why was I unable to be loving and compassionate to myself? How could my thesis be the enemy?

Kyudo teachings say that when the form becomes perfect the action leads to a good release, and you hit the target as part of meditation rather than hitting the target aggressively with ego. I trained every day for five hours and slowly my form and my actions improved as peacefulness was restored to my heart and my mind became calm. Often, during my early morning and late evening practice sessions, the words or a chapter of a book or my thesis would surface, sometimes gently and in harmony with a new understanding, at other times like angry bees swarming and demanding my consciousness,

and my shooting would reflect my inner state. Kyudo taught me that the only battle I was fighting was within me.

I clearly had the wrong attitude to writing my thesis. It was time to stop fighting and being afraid of the words and to write the thesis as it wanted to be written, in a creative synthesis. I am reminded of some words I wrote in a previous paper (Adler-Collins 1998), where I stated:

> *The warrior in me no longer feels the tiredness of combat and conflict but feels it is a safe time to sheath the sword of anger. For after the battle has been won on one level another challenge commences, but this time the weapon used will be the sword of understanding, the shield will be compassion and the cause will be love (p. 4).*

Perhaps the most important learning to come out of this experience was the insight it gave me into Japanese thinking. The issues with my faculty that had caused so much heartache and placed me in warrior mode could be seen in a different way.

I was in Japan with a Western attitude, and while real problems existed that were nothing to do with culture, I came to realise that in the very real sense of Buddhist understanding, I was part of the problem and part of the solution. My whiteness was blinding me and a Japanese saying came to mind: *do not seek to find the blame for the problem, seek to find the answer to the problem.*

[It seems that there is a spiral of consciousness that requires us to revisit old issues and patterns of thinking to see if we have really integrated these new ideas and thoughts as praxis. When I mentally look back at the battles I have fought, I feel deeply the sadness and the loss that battling has caused me and others. Why is it that with all I know and understand about peace and harmony, I can still draw the sword of anger? - even though I admit that it takes a lot these days to push me to do so. Injustice and blind abuse of others in lesser positions is probably the one area that I still need to look at.]

This awakening was not one moment of insight where all was revealed, but it occurred over time as I sustained my enquiry and dealt with the issues it brought to the surface. Small but frequent moments of insight occurred as I questioned myself and went through a process of what could only be described as heuristic immersion where I:

Interrogated texts as a critical reader,
Re-read the same texts by suspending judgement,
Felt the same texts by asking the question "How or what is this text speaking to me from my filter of intuition?"
Allowed the knowledge to emerge intuitively into consciousness and then into expression according to Freire (2004) and Freire and Macedo's (1987) understanding of the word.

My intuitive heuristic knowing became my praxis for motivating my learning. By this I mean that each stage produced different understandings and a more complex framing of what the text was trying to convey. Reading and re-reading the same texts at different times with different understandings showed me how much my actual filters of

consciousness were applying boundaries and limitations to my knowing. As my consciousness shifted so did my understanding of certain texts. Such illumination takes place naturally when the researcher gives up trying to force an issue.

[I have vivid recollections of a visit to Japan by my supervisor when we videoed a conversation that took place at a time when I was just about to undergo an operation to test for cancer of the pancreas and my supervisor was telling me about the value of Bernstein's work to my thesis. My engagement with his ideas was not positive; later, under different circumstances, I revisited his session with me and could see why Bernstein and his explanation of coding and knowledge was so important to me. This was a complete reversal of my understanding.]

This process brought me to question the validity of what I knew. Such understanding caused profound changes in my life. I felt that I had been drugged or had had a long illness. A disturbing question bubbled up to my consciousness: *In my search for educational enlightenment had I been infected with some sickness or had I found my cure?* Freire (1997) talks of Education suffering from narrative sickness*:*

> *...careful analysis of the teacher-student relationship at any level, inside or outside the school, reveals its fundamentally narrative character. This relationship involves a narrating subject (the teacher) and the patient, listening objectives (the students). The content, whether values or empirical dimensions of reality, tends in the process of being narrated to become lifeless and petrified. Education is suffering from narrative sickness. (p. 70)*

Was I suffering from or acting with Freire's understanding of narrative sickness at the individual level? It was a difficult question to ask of myself but I believe a fair one. Holding up the mirror of truth is akin, I believe, to Plato's Cave analogy where the light of new consciousness shows the dark and dirty places of ignorance which, when viewed in the dark, remain hidden or are the accepted normality. When placed into focus, the glare makes the new insights stark in their clarity. Such times have the potential to transform, in the sense that we are presented with choices and praxis is required. No action or no choice is in fact a choice, and consciousness can slip back down into the comfort zone of habit, ignorance or fear. Praxis includes discomfort and fearfulness as you move into new waters with their uncharted hazards. Usually the transformation cannot be achieved in its totality; at first you are blinded by the light of your realisation and need to create your own shadow so as to see partially. When you become more accustomed to the light you begin to see more until, finally, you can see clearly in the light of new consciousness, and so it was with me.

[What is not so clear from Plato's writings is what happens to the "enlightened" individual after he/she has been rejected by the very people he/she once identified with?]

I would like to show an example of the above as it relates to my real world of practice and not the rarefied world of theory. Here, then, is my understanding and tension of the textual representation required of me by the academy, from the stance of being in my cave in the sense of Plato's "*Republic*". In my thesis I am required to present the deconstruction of my process to show my claims to know. Not only am I required to move from my positional awareness of integrated inter-connectedness, but I have to do so in a scholarly manner. In so doing, I am in fact a living contradiction, for my means of

representing my forms of knowing are limited to textual representation. The written word is not my way of seeing or knowing as represented in this thesis. Hence there is the possible risk that in the constrained representation of my thinking I could be seen as exclusional, non-holistic and flat. By saying 'flat' I am thinking that the construction of my account cannot offer the full image I wish to present as my forms of knowing. I am in a sense *conforming* to the requirement of the Western academy at this time in its choice of the format, in this case the textual representation of my thesis.

Here is what I believe is a more enlightened and inclusional view of engaging and understanding the use of *the word*. In Chapter 3 of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire and Macedo (1997) offer a solution to my looking at the problem in darkness. They suggest that the essence of dialogue is itself *the word* and that the word is more than just an instrument that makes dialogue possible. Freire and Macedo offer two explanations as to the contents of words or their structure. These are (1) reflection and (2) action. Interestingly, they imply that the interactions of these are radically and closely linked. If one is sacrificed - even in part - the other suffers:

> *...there is no true word that is not at the same time a praxis ... An unauthentic word, one which is unable to transform reality, results when dichotomy is imposed upon its constitutive elements. When a word is deprived of its dimensions of action, reflection automatically suffers as well; and the word is changed into idle chatter, into verbalism, into an alienated and alienating "Blah". It becomes an empty word, one which cannot denounce the world, for denunciation is impossible without the commitment to transform, and there is no transformation without action. (p. 87)*

[I believe my facts are grounded my in my praxis, that I have done what I said I would do in developing the curriculum of the healing nurse, teaching it and assessing it, then I can use my words in the authentic meaning of praxis. Through the process of critical pedagogic analysis, my words will be of authentic critical reflection and my thesis will sing its own song of words, alive in the vibrancy of the doing as I accept and joyously engage in the teacher-student /student-teacher relationship as we co-create through our mutual discovery of each other and a form of knowing that will influence the future each of us takes.]

5. 4 Reflecting on scholarship

Freire and Macedo's (1987) writings about oppression and how the oppressed become the oppressors, the use and power of words and the need for praxis, caused me to hesitate and ponder for a moment. Praxis calls for change, but praxis without planning, focus and direction would be the same as words without action. Inspired by Freire's passionate writings (Freire 2004; 1970; Freire and Macedo 1987), I searched for a means to evolve my values as they emerged in my curriculum.

Embracing the ideas of Freire reminded of me of Schön's (1995) paper where he responded to Boyers work on *Scholarship,* which was an equally compelling call for a new epistemology. Schön's paper was important to me as he cited (p. 16) Boyer's (1992) listings of scholarship, which are: *The scholarship of discovery,* Schön suggests that this is the first and most essential form of scholarship; *the scholarship of integration,* which gives meaning to isolated facts that make connections across disciplines; *the scholarship of application,* the scholar asks questions of the nature: "How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?"; *the scholarship of teaching,* which

begins with what the teacher knows, and means not only transmitting knowledge but also transforming and extending it as well. Schön suggested that: … *if integration, application and teaching are to be taken as forms of scholarship ... new scholars must produce knowledge that is testably valid, according to criteria of appropriate rigor (p. 27*).

Schön's engagement enabled me to make my connection by linking Boyer's (1992) scholarships to the disciplines of education. The idea had not previously occurred to me as I had been researching within methodological boxes. Suddenly I could see how to link with and across the disciplines and to do so within a framework of scholarship. Schön further stated:

> *...when we go about the spontaneous, intuitive performance of the actions of everyday life, we show ourselves to be knowledgeable in a special way. When we try to describe it, we find ourselves at a loss, or we produce descriptions that are inappropriate." (p. 29)*

Schön had highlighted an issue that caused me great concern. Here in Japan, in my work context, I found the pedagogy of the power-holders confusing. I sensed that I had failed to discover the coding within the cultural context of my social formation; or what I had discovered was incompatible with my cultural beliefs and expectations. On the one hand I can identify with Boyer's idea that in the scholarship of discovery: . . . *no tenets in the academy are held in higher regard than the commitment to knowledge for its own sake, to freedom of inquiry and to following, in a disciplined fashion, an investigation wherever it may lead.* (p. 17). Yet, on the other hand, the reality of the power issues in play were at times bewildering. My experience of the taught master's programme in education at the

University of Bath (UK) gave me the confidence to question what I was being taught about appropriate forms of representation.

Here in Japan I still experienced the problems outlined by Eisner (1997) when he wrote about the problems and perils of alternative forms of data representation. My social establishment was just not ready for the changes of curriculum that I presented to them. I suspect that it came as just as much of a shock to my superiors as their initial rejection of my ideas was to me. Lyotard (1984, p. 63) speaks of terror and arrogance: … *countless scientists have seen their "move" ignored or repressed, sometimes for decades, because it too abruptly de-stabilised accepted positions, not only in the university and scientific hierarchy but also in the problematic.* Lyotard suggested that, when an institution of knowledge functions in this manner, it is acting like an ordinary power centre whose behaviour is governed by a principle of homeostasis. Lyotard's words could almost mirror my lived experience. He describes such behaviour from the established institution as equivalent to that of the terrorist. He qualifies terror to mean the efficiency gained by eliminating or threatening to eliminate a player from the language game one shares with him. The player is silenced or consents, not because he has been refuted, but because his ability to participate has been threatened. In Japan such actions can be subtly applied by marginalizing the individual (Furuta and Petrini 2003) and this was my own personal experience. To marginalize an individual is a form of horizontal violence which is so easy to do. If senior faculty act in such a manner, the group will follow. The individual who is being marginalized has no defence other than to work twice as hard to make certain that others are aware of what is going on, to attend meetings, and actively push people for information. I adopted a plan of using memos to ask about meetings and what was

happening in the committees that I had to serve on. By so doing I could and did provide a clear paper evidence trail where I could point out that I had had no replies to my emails, had not been told of meetings and no one had informed me of the content of meetings. It does, however, require tremendous energy to battle marginalization and it is a miserable way to be forced to live.

[My purpose in seeking a doctoral degree in education is to help in the legitimisation of my work that would come from obtaining such a degree. The only way I can extend my influence so as to change nursing in Japan is to have the same academic approval as my peers. The field of nurse education is based firmly on the medical model, which is a hierarchical peer system based on evidence and outcomes in relationship to the delivery of care. Other forms of knowing, such as non-clinical medical models, are seen to detract from the scholarship of nursing (Adler-Collins 2004). The science of nursing has dominant control over nursing knowledge.

Freire's (1970) point that those who have experienced abuse can themselves become abusers is a salient point here and now in Japan. For Japanese nurses, such a system will only change when future scholars open up nurse education to be an inclusional process embracing different learning needs and methodologies. My passion is for teaching. According to Boyer (1999), teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well. This being the case, such a process of teaching pushes the teacher, the student and the faculty to new levels of understanding. In the end, inspired teaching keeps the flame of scholarship alive. Boyer implies that his second scholarship, that of integration, requires serious disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insights to bear on original research. The distinction between

discovery and integration is that those engaged in discovery ask: What is to be known, what is yet to be found? Those engaged in integration ask: What do the findings mean? These are all good questions, yet at different stages of the researcher's enquiry.]

Jenson (2004) sheds some insights on my dilemma and concerns in relationship to the application of power referred to in Bernstein's discursive gap analogy. He writes about non-Western states as follows:

> *The state - which represents the interests of a particular set of elites - governs through a combination of coercion and violence that is typically quite brutal, and propaganda that typically is heavy-handed. In that formula intellects have a clear role: Serve the state by articulating values and describing social, political and economical forces in a fashion consistent with state power and its ideology (p. 1).*

Jenson (2004) suggests that in Western liberal capitalist democracy, the state that represents the same groups of elites as the non-Western states both maintains a monopoly on violence and uses it when it is necessary to maintain control. [*I have personal experience of this during my service in the British army where I saw civil power transferred to military control. In the United Kingdom a very clear chain of events has to be followed in the escalation process leading to the military and/or police resorting to 'crowd control' techniques of tear gas, water cannon and snatch squads. On several occasions when serving in the military on peacekeeping duties in different countries I could see that the chain of escalation was much shorter and the response more violent.*]

Jenson (2004) suggests that, because of advances made in educating the population to think, the Western state cannot rule simply by force or crude propaganda. Those who rule from positions of power recognise that one advantage of a seemingly more open society is that it fosters dynamic creative intellectualism that produces innovation. To elites, that innovation is desirable in the realms of sciences both pure and applied, but presents a clear and tangible threat to its control when encouraged in the humanities and social sciences.

I therefore believe that I am articulating a control paradox, that being: *How to encourage innovation in one arena but discourage it in others?* This control paradox is at the very heart of the politics of power. Scholarship in the form of critical pedagogy tackles this by challenging the ethics of the power-holders and laying down a challenge to critical theorists and critical educators to join, in solidarity, a living praxis; one that is willing to break with the politics of competition and internalised notions of superiority, or that buys into the process of demonizing difference. But, most importantly, I believe that the power issues of power itself can only be broken when scholarly critical thinkers, educators and practitioners break free from the desire to be recognized and approved, and hence legitimated by those who hold official power. What I am describing is for me the implementation of the Buddhist teachings of the Noble Truths that would remove the desire, the suffering and the attachment. I seek to live in compassion and service. My scholarship and service has to be transparent in terms of bias, which I hold either on a conscious or unconscious level. In the next section I address another area of complexity related to representing my knowing into knowledge, and take my reader to the problematic area of race.

5. 4. 1 Challenges to my ontological positioning: My lens of whiteness

I am mindful that I live and work in areas that are a mix of different teachings and cultures, and at times the differences become blurred as to what is influencing what when new knowledge emerges from the synergy and integration of the different knowledge and power bases. The potential to offend or to have misunderstandings is increased when an individual is working outside the normal circles and influences of their race. I reluctantly had to move my focus to the impact of politics, gender and race issues on my thinking. I was deeply shocked by the ignorance and naivety of many of the traditional beliefs I held. My naivety was revealed to me when one mixed-race colleague in England told me, in a heated debate, that I was: . . . *Secure in the blindness of my white gaze, confident in its superiority, arrogant to the history of suffering and oppression on which it was built. (Murray, 2000, personal communication, 22 April).* Someone else's truth can sometimes wound and scarify. My colleague was in fact partially correct and had opened my eyes to another aspect of viewing insider/outsider dynamics. This challenge to my ontological values sent me into a tailspin of sorts, as I was not aware of the race values that were embodied in my psyche. I had never questioned my culture with the critical gaze of enquiry.

My non-engagement was due to my life's journey. As I have written about before in my autobiography (Adler-Collins 1996), because of the abuse and pain of my childhood I had never thought of myself as being privileged in any way, either by birth or circumstances. My having a white skin, or how some non-white people would see my whiteness, had just never occurred to me. However, I am thankful for my colleague's insights. I also recognised that his hurt and pain were his issues to which I could only respond with love and inclusional compassion. I also believe that I have moved beyond the same pain, caused by my own wounds of life and birth, and transformed those wounds into an

understanding that my issues are not about a bad attitude to race but just about being a misinformed and often wounded individual. I believe now that I have faced these issues honestly and openly in seeking to understand who I am and the universal values of love, compassion, non-judgementalism and discernment that I hold. My colleague's challenge came from a space that I had no wish to be in, and it showed me how far I had moved in my desire not to wound others or reinforce the negativity of values that I did not share. Spiritually, I was able to discern when it is correct to look for the learning that I needed and own what is mine, and to gently but firmly let the other have back that which is not mine.

[Reflecting on: Where do I start in trying to articulate the process that was both painful and a release? Carey (1998, p18) stated: ... The twentieth century has been characterised by three developments of great political importance: the growth of democracy, the growth of corporate power, and the growth of corporate propaganda as a means of protecting corporate power against democracy. When I started this doctoral enquiry, I naively thought it would be about values, education and healing in relationship to nursing. Yet, as my research continues and the writing up of that research culminates in this thesis, Carey's words take on a new significance. I find that as my political awareness has broadened and my knowing increased, I am less certain of the rightness of my whiteness (Howard 1999). At the start of my research my whiteness was not an issue to me as I was colour-blind towards my colleague. I believe that I see with a colourless gaze that embodies my spiritual values of love and compassion. As a Buddhist I do not see just colour, rather I see the values and filters of colour as being just an aspect that informs the contextual identity of self. Howard points out the stance my colleagues could take about me: " a colour-blind middle-class White person, unable to see his own privilege ... to a

state of intercultural competence and a commitment to eliminating injustice and racism". (p. 91).

The discussion of white identity development that ends Howard's book suggests that others who consider themselves white might move through a series of stages when confronted with the legacy of whiteness. Howard presented the stages as follows:

> *... In the first stage – Contact – a person may discover his or her Whiteness, often through experiencing some type of "wake-up call," personally or vicariously (perhaps through literature). This stage is followed by Disintegration, a period of questioning (and often feeling guilty about) one's Whiteness. Finally, after a period of discomfort and probably a number of failed attempts at intercultural competence, one may reach the stage of Autonomy by developing a thoroughly transformed, diversity-affirming identity. Here, the person is able and motivated to work deliberately to challenge oppression in both self and others. However, what is of particular relevance in classrooms is that not everyone who enters the Contact stage reaches the Autonomy stage. Some resolve the uncomfortable feelings stirred up by the initial confrontation with Whiteness by entering the Reintegration stage. Reintegration is characterized by ... regression to previously held prejudices and the reassertion of racist beliefs (p. 91).*

Contextually, I am the face of the minority here in Japan; I am the only white teacher in a faculty of 68 teachers, of whom only two speak English. One is the English teacher, who has little understanding of the field, educational enquiry or nursing; and the other studied

for her PhD in the USA and opposes my research because she firmly believes that action research is not real research. I've experienced isolation in ways I never thought possible.

Living as I do in the countryside, where few people have ever seen or spoken to a foreigner, still brings about frank open stares, pointed fingers and giggles from children. I have become used to being stared at in public, approached in restaurants and, on odd occasions, abused at night-time, usually by drunken individuals.

I have also become used to the racial issues that affect foreigners living in Japan. I can clearly understand how somebody with a skin colour that is not white feels living in England. Here in Japan I struggle with the language, the culture and the strangeness of everything. Even the simplest things, like ordering stationery, making a telephone call, using the computer system, library, public transport, toilets and the everyday mundane things I take for granted, are different and often problematic for me. This has been the context of my research situation.

My whiteness was and is a barrier to some but not many. I had poor but improving linguistic skills that created a dependency and reliance on translators. This was highly problematic as third party conversations are so difficult when it comes to understanding the true meanings of what is said.

In a society that appears to the outside world as so orderly and group orientated, why, I ask myself, is the sharing and co-operation of ideas and knowledge (in my opinion) so poor? Could I be contributing to the problem by the way in which I am asking questions? Perhaps I could be asking better questions of myself.

I have lived the scenario that Howard describes, from the wake-up call of my colleague to researching and studying my whiteness and colour-blindness with a Buddhist filter of non-judgementalism. I believe I have moved into the stage of Autonomy described by Howard, and this I refer to as a colourless gaze.

Japan has had a colonial past and there are strong nationalist tendencies still present, so being the only white person in the faculty has on occasions brought about racist remarks from both faculty and students directed at me. From faculty, these usually come about in relationship to a discussion that will end with: This is Japan; you must do it the Japanese way. This was a statement that often left me confused, for when I asked what the Japanese way was no-one knew or could agree upon a consistent answer. Yet in my day-to-day living I experience the Japanese way.

In public situations the Japanese are usually very friendly and superficial. Much is done to avoid confrontation, which could just be based on shyness or cultural influences. There are many other small racial points where I believe I have the choice to be offended or inclusional, the latter in the sense that I do not engage with the individual's racism and see the person as they are.

In terms of racist remarks and comments from my students in the classroom, there have been remarkably few of them, and when they have occurred I just choose to gently make the student aware that their opinions could be construed to be racist, even when they were obviously so, and ask them to be more mindful in the future. I attempt to be lovingly honest with my own attitude towards race issues and my praxis as a global teacher.]

This thesis is being written in a political climate of change which reflects all of the above tensions. Some current issues at the time of writing this thesis are: My thesis is about touch, in particular safe therapeutic touch for healing and bringing comfort. What one culture or individual deems as appropriate touch can be seen as inappropriate and abusive by another. The issue of touch is complex and deeply grounded in the norms of the society where it is practised. Questioning those accepted norms is in itself, problematic, and strong emotions are raised.

I have to deal with incidents from my own faculty, such as staff projecting on to me their own issues concerning touch and the role of male nurses. The complex issues of sex and sexuality have emerged again in a culture that has very strong gender-based rules concerning behaviour, and power issues between the sexes.

By tradition, nursing is seen as a female occupation. In Japan, nursing is an area where female researchers can reach positions of leadership that would be harder to achieve outside the field of nursing (Takemura and Kanda, 2003; Hisama, 2000). By 'harder to achieve', I mean that Japan is a patriarchal society with very large gaps between the opportunities that exist for men and for women, and certain jobs are highly biased towards men. Arguing logically or professionally, using academic critical analysis to show the inappropriate thinking such individuals have, is problematic as these people engage in limited debate and such engagement is through their own biases and filters. The debate is therefore often illogical and irrational but none the less destructive.

Educational debates of the critical nature that I was used to and thrived upon in the Western academy were absent from my academic life in Japan; for, as already mentioned, academic discourse is not a normative practice within the Japanese educational setting. Japanese scholars do not sit down and discuss different teaching methodologies just for the joy of exploring various educational stances. The norm, as I have seen in the context of my working situation, is for the hierarchical system and the direction of the professor to set the tone and the expected responses. Cross-methodological seeding of ideas, such as the values of healing massage and touch in midwifery (Richardson 2001; Magee 2005), or terminal care (Kottow 2001), or confined bed rest, are not encouraged by the compartmentalisation of knowledge and the assigning of power to the authority, personality and experience of the individual sitting in the professor's chair. Such academic blindness is not just an issue of race; it is far more complex than that, embracing how Japanese educators see themselves, on what they build their self image, and where their power base resides.

I have developed the role of a bridge between my two cultures through the positive means of bringing and sharing merged forms of understanding from both platforms, the academy of the West where I will be validated and the academy of the East where I practice.

World events and changes in the Japanese society in which I live and work, and to which I am deeply committed both as a citizen and as a foreigner, have, I suspect, been reflected in my thesis. I have maintained my focus on what has been a sustained enquiry into the development and testing of my curriculum and its development. Such development does not, nor can it, take place in an educational or social vacuum. Political will to innovate is often driven by the necessity to change, which is driven in turn by external sociological

forces such as employment, health, education, and of course personal complex power relationships. Such forces are not logical nor even as predictable as one might think or hope. However, they impact very directly on the environment and in the context relating to the carrying out of this research.

[It seems that there is a mismatch between political moves and industry. Japan is such a conservative culture that changes are talked about in terms of decades. The educational elite within the universities face changes that they have not been trained for, including those of being commercially aware and having short-term job contracts. This causes insecurity and doubts about the future, pensions and lifestyles that many will find hard to rise above. These tensions are very present in my faculty at this time, compounded with recent events such as the North Korean testing of a nuclear device that have polarised attitudes towards foreigners.]

To the external critical observer, the above could seem like chaos, doubting or being negative. I am a great believer in chaos and doubt as part of the natural order of change. As I challenge old conditioned patterns and thinking, I wobble a bit as I reform the matrix of reality and my new truths. Doubt is not a negative state of mind but rather one of positive enquiry. Having doubt frees my mind from the constraints of being told something is something. It gives me space to come to my own conclusions and enables me to have the freedom to formulate my own enquires and surf the *potential discursive gap* (Bernstein 2000) between thinkable and unthinkable forms of knowledge.

As I bring my consciousness to focus on a perceived boundary to my understanding, I do so from my understanding of Rayner's (2003) notion of boundaries being dynamic, fluid and permeable. My consciousness actively seeks the dissolving of boundaries in myself, my classroom, my students and my faculty through self-study enquiry. Engaging such boundaries that have become solidified, impermeable or just in need of refreshing is my purpose in my efforts to communicate and clarify my values as emergent standards of judgement. By 'engagement' I mean that I seek to reform them as fluid dynamic boundaries, open and inclusive to new forms of knowing and knowledge as my students, my colleagues and I co-create new understandings.

There is a process of mystery at work within this thesis (Thorne 2000), one that I acknowledge and respect. I am aware that words such as 'mystery' are uncomfortable to the Western academy. I feel a sense of tension within me as I am writing. This tension revolves around the presumed divide between 'East' and 'West'. I am yet to be convinced that there is a divide other than the one that is created in terms of self-serving power relationships by a powerful minority, a relic of the colonial history of humanity. It is part of my stated purpose in this thesis to show how I transcend/reconcile the reciprocal orthodoxies of 'West and East' in terms of bridge building and inclusional thinking. I do believe that for me there are very different philosophical approaches to knowledge and knowledge generation. These represent different parts of the whole, grounded in the cultural understanding from which such knowledge arises.

In the writing of this thesis I am acutely conscious of the debate that rages around issues of colonialism and post-colonialism (Loomba 1998; Murray 2005). It is not part of this thesis to try to resolve these tensions or offer solutions other than where the tensions impact

directly on my field of practice and understanding. Nor should it be, for I believe that the West (I am using West in the context of any country using colonial Western values that have been introduced from a Western paradigm) fixates on factual knowledge, empirical forms of knowing, closure, finding clear answers, and defining clear and solid bodies of empirical knowledge. Such a methodology is very uneasy with open amorphous bodies of knowledge that it cannot control and that offer no clear answers.

While I felt it was next to impossible to highlight all my learning, I did experience critical events leading to my ontological changes. I explored these events, and what they taught me, and, as a result, I modified my thinking and my practice. I explored my understanding of my own racial teachings, and the embodied values of my *whiteness* (Adler-Collins, 2005; Adler-Collins and Ohmi, 2005) that proved to be inappropriate for teaching in another culture. I extended my understanding of Japanese culture as I analysed my students' data sets from their reflective journals, portfolios and evaluations of my teaching. I did this by heuristically immersing myself (Moustakas 1990) in the writings of Dr Takeo Doi, a Japanese psychiatrist, and Lebra Sugiyama's (1976) understandings of how Japanese people think. In Japanese, culturally embedded words such as *omote* (public, front) and *ura* (private, inside) are paired with opposing concepts such as *tatemae* (public truth and fiction) and *honne* (private truth). *Tatemae* and *honne* refer to one's feelings about something, while *ura* and *omote* are used more in terms of how something looks. One famous Japanese proverb goes: a man has three hearts—the one in his mouth he shows to the world; the one in his throat he shows to his friends; the one in his chest he keeps only to himself.

I have moved away from the embedded *rightness of my whiteness.* What appeared was a filter of my being that shocked me deeply by its emergence. I analysed this in depth, using a critical incident of a moment of my own realisation, that despite my claim to have the Buddhist gaze of *colourlessness*, I was, in fact, teaching from a position of whiteness. In this thesis I show my moving from the stance of a Euro-centric teacher to that of one who can see the strengths and problems of both Eastern and Western thinking. Each filter of understanding, each framework, offers different positions and insights that inform and challenge my own epistemology and ontology.

5. 5 Summary

At the beginning of this chapter I wrote I would clarify my meanings of inclusional respect, originality, caution and tolerance. Through this process other values have emerged and are embedded in my knowing these are those of love, compassion, passion, non-judgementalisim, patience, discernment, intuition and enquiry. I believe that I have made these clear to my reader. I have identified how they have emerged in the context of my enquiry and how they can impact on my thinking. It is these values that will be used for the remainder of this thesis as my living standards of discernment.

In the next chapter I examine the pedagogy of my claims to know and explore the process, turning theory into fact in my classroom and my social formation. I use the methodology of self-reflection as a means of asking and answering questions to myself around the core or focus of my enquiry (McCarthy 1994; Jones 1998). I move from knowing to pedagogising my knowing within the new curriculum of the healing nurse. I ask the question and show the process of: *How do I turn theory into practice*? I refer to and engage with text to support or clarify my question. I show the educational issues and politics that shaped the original curriculum. I address the issues of educational standards

and the framing of the curriculum. I show how a values base unit for the curriculum was developed for the healing curriculum.