

An Appreciative Inquiry: The living pedagogies of a team of counsellor educators

Janet May

**Faculty of Health and Environmental Sciences
School of Clinical Sciences**

**A thesis submitted to Auckland University of Technology in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Health
Science in 2020.**

For Mum and Dad

For modelling and instilling in me a love of education and lifelong learning – your understanding and valuing of this doctoral journey (and all my educational endeavours before this) has meant the world to me...

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which to a substantial extent has been submitted for the award of any other degree or diploma of a university or other institution of higher learning.


A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. May'.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	7
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	8
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	10
Introducing pedagogy	11
The genesis of this research	12
At sea... ..	13
Searching for pedagogical landmarks... ..	14
The programme: Paetahi Tumu Kōrero in the Aotearoa New Zealand context.....	15
The Waikato context of Paetahi Tumu Kōrero	17
Participatory research (PR) emerges.....	18
The pull to appreciative inquiry (AI)	19
Introducing my teaching team colleagues, my co-inquirers in this study	19
Chapter summaries.....	21
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	23
Literature Review Approach.....	23
A beginning conversation with literature: the call for a greater attention to pedagogy	25
The historical and contemporary context: pedagogical trends in counsellor education.....	28
Pedagogical development and reflection by educators	34
Pedagogical development as “reflective practice” in teacher education.....	34
Pedagogical development as a “personal philosophy of teaching” in counsellor education.....	36
Pedagogy as living educational theories	36
Collective consideration of pedagogy and/or curriculum	38
Concluding thoughts from the literature	41
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	43
Participatory Aspirations	43
Tenets of Participatory Research (PR).....	44
Appreciative Inquiry (AI)	45
Origins of AI	45
AI and generativity – a contemporary influence.....	46
AI and transformational change.....	47
Generative processes of relating in AI.....	48
Personal philosophical influences in this study	49
Phenomenological influences	50
Interpretive influences	51
Dialogic influences	52

Concluding thoughts...	54
CHAPTER 4: METHOD	55
Our particular AI design	55
Our participants	56
Our three-phase process	56
Phase 1: One-to-one interviews	56
Design	56
Format	57
Analysis	58
Phase two: Focus group one	59
Design	59
Format	59
Analysis	60
Phase three: Focus group two	61
Design	61
Format	61
Analysis	62
Ethical considerations for the study	62
Concluding thoughts...	62
CHAPTER 5: PEDAGOGY REVEALED	64
Stories of the interplay of teaching and learning	65
Stories of unfolding and emergent pedagogy	67
Stories of the relationship of knowledge and pedagogy	69
Relationship to propositional knowledge	72
Articulations of pedagogical approaches and frameworks	74
Stories of struggles ...and dreams	76
Concluding thoughts...	80
CHAPTER 6: SHARED MEANING AND VISION, AND PEDAGOGY	82
Part one: Discovery and finding shared meaning	83
Part two: Dreaming and building our shared vision	89
Concluding reflections	93
CHAPTER 7: DESIGNING FOR DESTINY	95
Shared pedagogies come forward	95
Higher order complexity emerging	97
Reorganising and recognising shared foundations	98
Creating the social architecture to realise our dreams - provocative propositions	100
Commitments to moving forward	106
Concluding thoughts	110
CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	112

The design of this study	112
Phase one: Revealing the constitution of pedagogy and the implications	113
Phase two: Crucial relational and co-constructional processes.....	117
Phase three: Designing bold and realistic pedagogical blueprints	121
Destiny...and beyond.....	124
Personal impacts of this research	126
Limitations of this research.....	133
Opportunities for further research.....	136
Final concluding thoughts... ..	137
REFERENCES	139
APPENDICES	148
Appendix A: Paetahi Tumu Kōrero Programme Details	148
Appendix B: Sample of Contemporary Pedagogical Publications in Counsellor Education	153
Appendix C: Participant Information Sheet.....	156
Appendix D: Preliminary Ideas for Teaching Team	160
Appendix E: Participant Consent Form	162
Appendix F: Self-reflection Guide.....	165
Appendix G: Charts I-III, Excerpts of Appreciating Dialogue, Focus Group One.....	167
Appendix H: Charts IV-VIII Excerpts of Co-constructing Dialogue, Focus Group One.	171
Appendix I: Book of Readings on Pedagogy	176
Appendix J: A Five Stage Guideline for Individual Pedagogical Reflection	178

ABSTRACT

In higher education, pedagogy has tended to be the domain of individual educators. The possibilities for engaging collectively in relation to pedagogies have been underutilised (Kahn, Goodhew, Murphy & Walsh, 2013). This study involved me and a team of three counsellor educators delivering a bicultural counselling degree programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. The research project was informed by an appreciative inquiry approach investigating pedagogical practice from an individual and collective viewpoint. A three-phase inquiry comprising one-to-one interviews and two focus groups revealed that for these participants their understanding and articulation of pedagogy was resonant with Whitehead's (1999) viewpoint of pedagogy as an educator's living educational theory. As such, pedagogy is constructed in one's lived-experiences of teaching and is the enactment of one's deeply held ontological and relational values as they translate into educational principles for teaching practice. Appreciative inquiry's focus on generative dialogical processes of relating enabled participants in this study to share their living educational theory with one another, to discover where there was shared meaning and alignment, and move seamlessly into co-creating realistic images for their future teaching together. Potential was glimpsed for the way in which considering pedagogy collectively at such depth can transform the development of curriculum and programmes. From this research a series of guidelines were produced for use in counsellor education and higher education more broadly. These guidelines are offered as a resource for teaching teams who wish to investigate their pedagogical practice as a team. They provide a way for individual educators to reflect on pedagogy and for collectives to engage in generative relational and co-constructing processes in relation to pedagogy. Similar guidelines for counsellor educators to use with student counsellors in the development of a form of living counselling theory are also offered as an outcome of this study. This is a unique study in a field that is relatively uncharted in its focus on pedagogical reflection and development as an individual *and* collective endeavour. It is particularly relevant for educators as we are teaching on programmes that are increasingly at the intersections of rich, diverse, plural and, at times competing pedagogies and where the potential to harness such diversity and plurality is vast.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I complete this doctorate with gratitude to so many people who have travelled this journey with me. Time and again I have received incredible wisdom, skills, expertise, support, and/or have been cheered on... just at the right time...this synchronicity and kindness shown by so many has touched me deeply. At the risk of missing some people...

To my three colleagues who were part of our appreciative inquiry, 'Keita, Lucia and Stewart'. It's a shame that "I couldn't have done this without you" is such an overused cliché. This study would not have been possible without your recognition of its value, and your willingness to not only take part but be such committed co-inquirers with me. You were the most experienced, skilled, insightful, gifted and generous colleagues. Because of this, you made this so much more than a research project but the journey of understanding around pedagogy (and much more) that I had been searching for. Thank you so much.

To my supervisors Tony, Brian and Liz. To undertake a study on pedagogy with three supervisors who encapsulate what it means to be authentic educators has been one of the most important aspects of this doctoral process in helping me discover who I am as an educator. Tony from our first supervision where you met my "lost self" as a teacher, you slowly supported me to reconnect to what has always been important for me in my work as a teacher. Brian you have not only brought your amazing wisdom to this process but have looked out for me time and again in terms of what this doctoral journey is all about for me. And Liz, every conversation, be it overlooking the Mahurangi East Estuary or a one-line email, has been so authentic and insightful, and has led me step by step to the finish line. I am so grateful to you all.

To my colleague Shirley, your belief in this project from the outset and your wisdom over the years has been unending. To my colleague Wendy, you have been so generous in offering me whatever support you can including editing and proofing my work. The way you have shared your level of scholarship with me has taught me so much. To Alastair and Rachael for your willingness to provide feedback on my work, thank you.

To my colleague Ange, I am so fortunate to have you walk the journey before me and know just how to support me. Your small (and not so small) acts of kindness in carrying the load so I could stay focused, has meant so much.

To the management team at Wintec, thank you for allowing me to undertake this research with my teaching team and for the different ways you have resourced this project. To my many other colleagues, including my current teaching team colleagues at Wintec that have remained so interested and supportive in what I am doing - thank you.

To my parents, Betty and Ron, my sister Gill, brother-in law Richard, and my many friends, in particular to Marion, Wendy, Dale, Ros, Deb, Diana and Tracy. You have all tirelessly offered me encouragement and graciously worked around my limited time – thank you so much.

To my partner Pete for understanding what is involved in a doctorate and your belief in me that I would be able to complete this. For always being there for me as a sounding board for my ideas and to offer your quiet wisdom. My work is richer for this and your love and care has meant so much.

To my children, Ella, Gracie, Tom, and Luke. I always knew that you had grown into kind and generous people, but your understanding and interest throughout this doctorate have proven this even more. Thank you for coping with an often-preoccupied mum, for your incredible patience and understanding.

...As counsellors we often say that our clients gift us more than we do them, as they entrust us to share deeply of their lives. As a counsellor educator the same can be said for my students. Counsellor education is life-changing and incredibly demanding for students, and with each new group of students I am trusted to go on a shared journey of learning and change. To all my present and past students, many who are now my colleagues, thank you for all our shared moments that have taught and changed me, and for which I am so much richer. You have deeply inspired me as you have become the most compassionate and skilled people joining our counselling profession.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

After three decades as a tertiary counsellor educator, I am firmly convinced that the world of pedagogy is an untapped resource waiting to be more fully understood and utilised in our counsellor education endeavours. A similar concern is found in contemporary higher education and counsellor education literature which calls for more attention to be given to pedagogy alongside what is often a functional level, and for a greater alignment in the relationship between pedagogy and curriculum (Barrio Minton, Watcher Morris & Yates, 2014; Brackette, 2014; Malott, Hall, Sheely-Moore, Krell, & Cardaciotto, 2014). This research investigates ways in which further aspects of pedagogy can be considered and how a greater breadth of understanding of pedagogy can be achieved. The literature also mostly addresses the individual's development of teaching and learning (Boitshwarelo & Vermuri, 2017), with little emphasis given to teaching teams considering pedagogy collectively. Whilst individual pedagogical consideration remains an important endeavour, a collective means of pedagogical consideration has much to offer. This research produces new contributions to the ways in which teaching teams might collaboratively consider pedagogy and negotiate the relationship between pedagogy and curriculum.

The research question is *how might teaching teams within counsellor education effectively consider pedagogy from a collective viewpoint?*

Located under the umbrella of Participatory Research (PR) (Freire, 1984; McTaggart, 1997; Higginbottom & Liangputtong, 2015), this study was informed by an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) research methodology (Cooperrider & Srivastava, 1987, Bushe, 2013) to address the research question. In keeping with the PR approach, three of my teaching team colleagues (introduced later in this chapter) joined me as co-researchers. We were the team of counsellor educators delivering the Waikato Institute of Technology (Wintec) Paetahi Tumu Kōrero Bachelor of Counselling (a bicultural counselling programme) in Aotearoa¹ New Zealand (see Appendix A for programme details).. The inquiry produced collective pedagogies through an appreciative inquiry process involving three phases (described in Chapter 4) with a particular focus on pedagogy as a collective endeavour and its relationship with curriculum.

¹ Aotearoa, the Māori name for New Zealand. Common meaning “the land of the long white cloud”. Retrieved <https://www.maori.com>.

This research had two aims. The first aim was to develop and investigate a collective approach to pedagogy for our team, that could then be available to teaching teams more broadly in higher education. In this regard, it was envisaged that understandings attained through this study would be made available to others and that frameworks used by our team could also be applied more widely. A second aim was simultaneously present in this research. This was to come to a greater understanding of our preferred pedagogy as a teaching team on Paetahi Tumu Kōrero and to enact this more intentionally.

There were particular ideas about pedagogy that were taken up at the outset of the research in order to provide a baseline understanding of pedagogy in which to situate our discussions. As will become evident throughout this thesis, more complex understandings of the very nature of pedagogy became available as the research progressed.

Introducing pedagogy

There is no one single definition of pedagogy. Amidst extensive debate there does appear to be agreement by some as to the difference between the “act of teaching” and the broader notion of pedagogy (Alexander, 2008; Biggs & Tang, 2011; Freire, 1984). Alexander states: “In brief, teaching is an *act* while pedagogy is both act and discourses. Pedagogy encompasses the performance of teaching together with theories, beliefs, policies that inform and shape it” (2008, p. 3). Whilst it could be argued that there can never be teaching without pedagogy being at work (even if pedagogy is unintentional or unknown by the teacher), the definition offered by Alexander was chosen for this research to draw attention to the link between aspects of teaching practice (e.g. teaching strategies and instructional activities) and the direction of these borne from an underpinning set of assumptions of knowledge itself. Alexander’s definition could perhaps be considered as a call to teachers to make these factors more visible, thus it seemed a suitable starting definition for this research aspiring to make aspects of pedagogy more apparent.

However, it is important to note that the scope of pedagogy has long been contested. Knowles (1973, 1984) originally proposed that pedagogy referred specifically (and only) to the teaching of children. Andragogy he argued was the more accurate term for the teaching of adults, underpinned by principles of adult learning premised on adults as autonomous self-directed learners. In contrast, he viewed pedagogy as the learner being far more reliant on the direction of the teacher. Henschke (2011) reported that in later decades Knowles came to view pedagogy and andragogy existing along a continuum rather than distinct entities determined by the extent to which the direction is determined by the learner (regardless of the age of the learner). Hase and Kenyon (2000) describe a further development in the 1980s in educational methodologies namely what was termed heutagogy, where the learner is not only regarded as an autonomous learner but also directs *what* and *how* this learning will take place. The definitive aim of

heutagogy is to develop greater capability within learners that involves students determining their own learning processes including goals, learning contracts, learning strategies and assessments (Abraham & Komattil, 2017). In my search of the literature for this doctorate limited reference was made to andragogy in counsellor education and no reference found to heutagogy. For the purposes of this research therefore I chose to use the term pedagogy as an all-embracing term given that there is clearly a familiarity amongst counsellor educators and higher educators with the concept of pedagogy.

The genesis of this research

The genesis of my interest in pedagogy and counsellor education began some two decades ago whilst completing a Master of Science (in counsellor training and supervision) at Bristol University in the United Kingdom. This master's dissertation (May, 1996) involved an in-depth case study of the Bristol University Diploma in Counselling Programme (1995) exploring the ways in which the programme was achieving 'internal consistency' (Dryden, Horton & Mearns, 1995) between the counselling approaches taught and its underpinning pedagogy.

At the time, internal consistency of a programme was a requirement of the British Association for Counselling (BAC) (now the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy, BACP) for the recognition of counselling training courses (BAC, 1990, 1993). The course recognition criteria stipulated

This core theoretical model would be reflected not just in the theory, skills, and practice of the students, but also in the way the course is structured, assessed, *taught* [emphasis added] and administered. In other words, this core model runs through the course, providing coherence and internal consistency. (BAC, 1990, p. 3)

This master's study led me to investigate how courses that adopted an integrative approach (Norcross, 1987) comprising two or more theoretical counselling approaches rather than a single theoretical core model, were able to achieve this. The intention of the study was to understand the implications for pedagogical processes given such theoretical integration. The core theoretical approaches of the diploma being studied were Person-centered Counselling (Rogers, 1951, 1961, 1980, 1983), Cognitive-behavioural Therapy (Beck, A., 1976; Beck, J., 2011; Ellis, 1991) and Psychodynamic Counselling (Jacobs, 1985). Although these counselling approaches were underpinned by differing philosophical bases, the nature of integration on the programme was such that these three approaches were still able to be integrated and taught from what was described as a clear humanistic philosophical core. For instance, in drawing on psychodynamic concepts, students would consider how from a humanistic base transference would be used as a concept for understanding relational dynamics, but not necessarily as the main transference therapeutic relationship (as would be the case on a psychodynamic counsellor education programme) (May, 1996).

According to Niemeyer's framework of "theoretically progressive integrationism" (Neimeyer, 1993, p.140) this type of integration of theories on the programme can be considered as integration at the level of "formal" and/or "clinical theory" (p.143). This contrasted with "high level synthesis" (p.144) of the underpinning meta-theoretical assumptions. Whilst debate could be had as to whether such integration is effective or even feasible, of most importance here was the clarity with which the educators were able to describe experiential and process-orientated teaching and learning processes consistent with the programme's humanistic meta-theoretical assumptive or philosophical core. In this regard, their clear understanding as to the nature of their theoretical integration as a programme was providing a continual reference point for guiding teaching and learning processes. For someone like myself, who looked for direction pedagogically, this provided the clarity I needed.

At sea...

On my return to Aotearoa New Zealand in 2001, I took up my current position of Counsellor Educator at the Waikato Institute of Technology (Wintec), teaching on what was then the Diploma in Counselling Programme. Like the diploma programme in my master's case study, this was an integrative programme drawing from four core theoretical approaches:

1. Te Whare Tapa Whā² (Durie, 1994) underpinned by Mātauranga Māori³ epistemologies (Durie, 2001; Black, Murphy, Buchanan, Nuku, & Ngaia, 2014).
2. Narrative Therapy informed by social constructionist theory (White & Epston, 1990).
3. Person-centered Counselling (Rogers, 1951, 1961, 1980, 1983) rooted in humanistic assumptions (Embleton Tudor, Keemar, Tudor, Valentine, & Worrall, 2004).
4. Cognitive-behavioural Therapy (Beck, A., 1976; Beck, J., 2011; Ellis, 1991) from a modernist meta-theoretical base (Giddens, 1981).

Commencing teaching on the programme, I found that there was no requirement for courses to achieve internal consistency as was required for BAC course recognition in the United Kingdom. Not only was this not required, but unlike the Bristol Diploma in Counselling with its unifying humanistic core, the array of underpinning and seemingly divergent meta-theoretical

² Te Whare Tapa Whā: is a Māori model for understanding health, that has four sides of a whare or house, developed by Professor Mason Durie in 1984 (Durie, 1994).

³ Mātauranga Māori: "in the contemporary world, the definition is usually extended to include present-day, historic, local, and traditional knowledge; systems of knowledge transfer and storage; and the goals, aspirations and issues from an indigenous [Māori] perspective." Retrieved from <https://www.landcareresearch.co.nz/about/sustainability/voices/matauranga-maori/what-is-matauranga-maori>

assumptions of the approaches taught did not seem to lend itself to the notion of internal consistency, and/or provide the pedagogical direction that was familiar to me. I had arrived in the Waikato, a strongly bicultural (and within this multicultural) region of Aotearoa New Zealand, with its rich array of cultures, ethnicities, and philosophies including indigenous and western theoretical perspectives. I was teaching on a counselling programme in a landscape that unbeknownst to me, was the site of the intersections of not only diverse, but at times competing philosophical paradigms. In addition, it was a landscape where it would have been inappropriate to impose a unifying (western) philosophy, as this would have been an enactment of colonisation (as discussed later in this chapter). Finding a place to stand pedagogically for myself and looking for some direction from a core unifying philosophy and/or collective pedagogy, I was at sea...

Searching for pedagogical landmarks...

My struggle for metaphorical *pedagogical landmarks* would often raise its head over the ensuing fifteen years. This was brought sharply into view when I encountered situations where I was unclear *what* the focus of a teaching moment might be and *how* the learning might be facilitated given the array of possible philosophical and pedagogical standpoints to be taken up. Even more profoundly pedagogical concerns would arise in what I would term *dissonance* moments when what I considered useful pedagogical practice seemed at odds with the wider counselling programme. A pedagogical conundrum would occur for me annually when preparing to work with a new cohort of students in the personal growth groups considered a common pedagogical activity in counsellor education (Zhu, 2018). Opportunities would arise for facilitating an experiential process-orientated group, for which I was familiar, underpinned by humanistic principles and focused on students developing authentic interpersonal relational engagements. This however, seemed at odds with more postmodern outsider witness group processes (White, 1995) being utilised in other areas of the programme during which witnessing practices were used to authenticate students' stories of their personal and professional identity. Neither focus and/or pedagogical approach to group work was more or less legitimate or valuable and, there was extensive planning and discussion with colleagues about which teaching and learning activities were to take place. Despite this, I was still left feeling that discussions failed to satisfactorily move beyond the consideration of teaching strategies to our underpinning theories of knowledge and/or learning and teaching. A focus on these wider aspects of pedagogy may have provided the clarity I was hoping for in relation to my individual and our collective pedagogical practice.

My experience returning to Aotearoa New Zealand and encountering a multiplicity of theoretical counselling approaches offered in one programme was, I believe, reflective of a significant global shift occurring in our postmodern world towards greater diversity,

multiplicity, and acceptance of plurality (Cooper & McLeod, 2011; Negru, 2010). For example, Cooper and McLeod (2011) observed that a variety of fields including counsellor education are familiar with pluralism “a pluralist holds that there can be many “right” answers to scientific, moral or psychological questions which are not reducible down to any one, single truth” (p.7). This pluralistic framework holds a foundational belief that psychological difficulties may have a multiplicity of aetiologies, and that there is unlikely to be one correct approach to counselling.

Norcross (2005) captured the implications that such a proliferation of theoretical viewpoints on counsellor education programmes. He described how there had been a shift from eclecticism and integration in counsellor education programmes which taught students one single counselling theory or an integration of two or three counselling approaches, to “integration in the zeitgeist of informed pluralism” (p.4). Strano and Ignelzi (as cited in McAuliffe & Eriksen, 2011) likewise suggested that the plurality of theories available to an entry level counselling programme (over 400 by their count) needed careful consideration of what this meant for teaching. Negru (2010) made a similar plea for economics education stating that the then recent global financial crises had forced a reconsideration in the way economics was taught. Negru critiqued the “lack of pluralism in teaching economics” (p 183) calling for greater debate around the content of programmes and how to teach from a pluralist outlook. For Aotearoa New Zealand counsellor education, considerations of pluralism I believe also require attention to what this means as a nation committed to biculturalism, and with an acknowledged history of the devastating effects of colonisation (O’Malley, 2014). Lang and Gardiner use the term “bicultural pluralism” (2014 p. 73) to encapsulate this position in Aotearoa New Zealand (expanded in Chapter 2). Paetahi Tumu Kōrero⁴, the programme involved in this research has similarly been shaped and determined by this bicultural pluralist contextual landscape.

The programme: Paetahi Tumu Kōrero in the Aotearoa New Zealand context

Paetahi Tumu Kōrero, the programme involved in this research, was established specifically to provide a bicultural counselling programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. For full details of this programme please refer to Appendix A.

As mentioned above, issues of plurality and multiplicity are necessarily understood in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand as a nation with a contentious history of colonisation, the

⁴ Paetahi Tumu Kōrero is the name given to the bicultural counselling degree programme on its inception by the Kaumatua or Māori elder at the Waikato Institute of Technology.

disastrous effects of which continue to be experienced and addressed today (Huygens, 2016, King, 2003, 2004; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Māori, the indigenous people, or tangata whenua (people of the land) are reported as arriving in Aotearoa New Zealand over 800 years ago (Sibley & Liu, 2007). The colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand by Britain began in the 1800s with a treaty signed in 1840 between many Māori iwi rangitira (tribal chiefs) and representatives of the British Crown. Of critical significance is that two versions of the treaty were signed: one Te Tiriti o Waitangi, written in te reo Māori (the language of indigenous Māori) and, the other, The Treaty of Waitangi, in the English language. The first two of three articles in these treaty documents varied significantly in meaning through translation from English to te reo Māori and were differently understood (Moon & Biggs, 2004). This resulted in the British Crown claiming Māori had conceded their rights to sovereignty and ownership as opposed to Māori's understanding of having agreed to a partnership that involved kawangatanga (governance not sovereignty), tino rangatiratanga (self-determination for Māori) and absolute protection of their rights being guaranteed.

There are distinct periods in New Zealand's history in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. The immediate period after the signing (1840-1852) Durie (1994) considered as a period that saw a degree of co-operation and mutuality between the British settlers and Māori. However, with the introduction of a settler government in 1852, which transferred Crown sovereignty from Britain to New Zealand, the subsequent 120 years under successive New Zealand governments saw the brutality of wars, and generations of assimilation and oppression of Māori. This period saw the passing of many legislations that facilitated extensive land confiscation from Māori, the forbidding of Te reo Māori (Māori language) in schools and, the suppression of Māori customary and cultural practices (Orange, 1987). The impact of colonisation over almost two centuries has seen generations of Māori experience disconnection from lands, cultural practices and traditional knowledge's and language; the fabric of Māori identity, belonging, and wellbeing.

Since the 1970's social and political movements have sought to begin a process of decolonisation in Aotearoa New Zealand, to redress injustices and to honour Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Durie, 1994). Tuhiwai Smith (1999) describes decolonisation as "the long-term process involving the bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic and psychological divesting of colonial power" (p. 98). Amidst ongoing complexities and contentions, legal, social, political and educational measures have been implemented in this redress. For instance, the New Zealand Government's Tertiary Education Strategy, 2014 - 2019, priority three, lists Māori achievement and measures of success as a core requirement. Similarly, the Waikato Institute of Technology (Wintec), like many tertiary institutions in Aotearoa New Zealand, has Māori achievement as a key strategic priority, outlined in Te Ngāwhā Whakatupu', Māori Capability Framework

(Wintec, n.d.) setting out five areas of required capability for staff. In respect of counsellor education programmes in Aotearoa New Zealand, Te Tiriti o Waitangi obligations are specified clearly in the recent New Zealand Association of Counsellors (NZAC) Counsellor Education Standards (2016) under which Wintec's Paetahi Tumu Korero programme attained accreditation in 2018. These standards are explicit about programmes' responsibilities not only to the achievement of Māori learners, but also to prepare counsellors to work with people or groups of people who continue to struggle from the effects of generations of colonisation. For example, NZAC Counsellor Education Standards (2016, Standard 3c) states "The curriculum responds to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and prepares graduates to develop cultural competence for counselling practice in Aotearoa New Zealand." A further detailed list of what the curriculum needs to cover is also included.

The Waikato context of Paetahi Tumu Kōrero

Whilst acknowledging progress in the redress of almost two centuries of colonisation, as a counsellor educator in Aotearoa New Zealand it remains crucial to understand and acknowledge not only our colonial history as a nation but also the particular impact of colonialism for the regions in which we deliver our programmes. Paetahi Tumu Kōrero was developed and is taught in the Waikato region of Aotearoa New Zealand. In this region, the iwi Waikato-Tainui⁵ are tangata whenua⁶. O'Malley (2014) provides an account of the brutality of settler colonisation for Waikato Tainui. He gives powerful accounts of these impacts, most crucially the effects of Waikato War on the people of Tainui. He details the decimating invasion of British troops in Waikato in 1863-1864, and using the words of Alan Ward (1967) describes it as "the climactic event in New Zealand race relations" (Ward, cited in O'Malley, 2014, p. 111), and "as catastrophic as World War One" (O'Malley, 2014, p. 111), and yet rarely acknowledged:

The casualty rate constituted around 7.7 per cent of the total population [of Māori], with just under 4 per cent killed. By way of contrast with the greatest blood bath in New Zealand history – World War One – in 1914 the total population of New Zealand was just over one million, and of the nearly one-tenth of this number who saw active service overseas around 17,000 were killed and a further 41,000 wounded. In percentage terms this constituted around 5.8 per cent of the entire population of New Zealand, of whom around 1.7 per cent were killed and 4.1 per cent wounded. This staggering level of sacrifice is rightly remembered today but may be eclipsed by the casualty rate suffered by Waikato Māori in 1863 and 1864. (O'Malley, 2014, p. 124)

⁵ Four tribes comprise Waikato-Tainui iwi: Hauraki, Ngāti Maniapoto, Ngāti Raukawa and Waikato. Retrieved from: www.waikatotainui.com.

⁶ Tangata whenua, "people born of the whenua, i.e. of the placenta and of the land where the people's ancestors have lived and where their placenta are buried." Retrieved from <https://maoridictionary.co.nz/search?keywords=tangata+whenua>

O'Malley (2014) also highlights the subsequent widespread eviction of Māori from their lands in the Waikato and the resultant years of impoverishment, deprivation, starvation and illness resulting from the socio-economic impacts of losing land in a region for which Māori were renowned agriculturalists. Waikato Tainui were the growers and suppliers of agricultural produce to Māori in other regions of Aotearoa, and Europeans alike. Poignantly, Wintec City Campus, the site of delivery of Paetahi Tumu Kōrero, is in the central city of Hamilton on what was a key historical site of food production for Tainui. O'Malley also highlights the ongoing impacts for people of Tainui descent, where there continues to be visible impacts of such extensive intergenerational trauma and *mamae*⁷ (pain) carried by a people. Many of the students undertaking Paetahi Tumu Kōrero, and many of the clients with whom our student and graduating counsellors work, are descendants of the Tainui people who remain deeply impacted by these lived effects of this country's colonial history.

This historical landscape has shaped the development of Paetahi Tumu Kōrero and was present in the discussions leading to the development of the programme. This bicultural counselling programme at undergraduate degree level was the culmination of two endorsements of Wintec's Bachelor of Applied Social Science, Te Whiuwhiu o te Hau (Māori counselling) and Counselling, a generic counselling endorsement. These two streams had been delivered alongside one another for over two decades. With the disestablishment of the Te Whiuwhiu o te Hau endorsement, Māori and non-Māori educators committed to a partnership spanning approximately seven years to establish Paetahi Tumu Kōrero and worked extensively to develop a weave of Mātauranga Māori, Tikanga Māori⁸, Māori-centered and Decolonising Methodologies (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999) with modernist and postmodern theories and practices underpinning the programme (Flintoff & Rivers, 2012).

Participatory research (PR) emerges

The New Zealand Qualifications Authority, Mana Tohu Matauranga O Aotearoa, (NZQA) Accreditation Panel certifying the programme in 2015 described the venture of Paetahi Tumu Kōrero (Verbal Panel Feedback, October 2015) as an authentically bicultural programme that they stated was journeying deeper into uncharted territory for those involved. Given this recognition from the accreditation panel, the seven educators involved at the time expressed a keen interest in engaging in a collaborative research project to explore and understand in greater depth what it was that we were doing in our teaching to achieve what had been considered

⁷ Mamae: "injury, pain." <https://maoridictionary.co.nz/search?&keywords=mamae>

⁸ Tikanga Māori, "the customary system of values and practices that have developed over time and are deeply embedded in the social context." Retrieved from <https://maoridictionary.co.nz/search?keywords=tikanga>

authentic bicultural teaching practice. With my own desire to research pedagogy the time seemed ripe to dovetail our interests. I suggested a participatory research process (Higginbottom & Liamputtong, 2015; Freire, 1984; McTaggart, 1997) which could involve our team as participants, and which I could lead in fulfilment of my doctorate. The team agreed. With the NZQA Accreditation Panel's recommendation for some form of research into the programme to be carried out, the Centre for Health and Social Practice (CHASP) management team also acknowledged the timeliness of this research for the benefit not only to Paetahi Tumu Kōrero but other teaching teams within CHASP. Consent was given for my doctoral research to be undertaken with the teaching team of Paetahi Tumu Kōrero with my own role within this being both researcher and participant simultaneously. Ethical approval for this research was granted by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee (AUTEC). The Waikato Institute of Technology (Wintec) Ethics Committee granted approval based on AUTEC's approval.

The pull to appreciative inquiry (AI)

During the period taken to develop the research proposal and gain ethical approval, the Counsellor Education Team within Wintec's Centre for Health & Social Practice underwent a time of restructure. Based on organisational staff/student ratios and workload policies the programme was deemed to be overstaffed. As a result, three of the seven educators took voluntary redundancy. Losing three members of a strong teaching team of seven had the inevitable effect of impacting the remaining team's morale and increasing workloads, however, the remaining team were enthusiastic to continue this research. At the same time as the restructuring was taking its toll, I came across appreciative inquiry (AI) as a research methodology (detailed in Chapter 3). AI's attention to what is working well in a system offered our team the opportunity to focus on what we had already achieved as evidenced by the NZQA accreditation panel, and to do this from an appreciative stance. This generative spirit of AI, with its attention on the best in a system, also seemed fitting for our teaching team's energy, time available and much needed hope. The pull to AI that I experienced at this time is captured by Avital, Cooperrider, Zandee, Godwin, and Boland (2013) who wrote "[the] generative and open character of AI is alluring and captivating" (p. xiv).

Introducing my teaching team colleagues, my co-inquirers in this study

It would be usual practice to introduce my research participants in the methods chapter of a research study. As my colleagues who came on this journey of inquiry were so intricately involved in designing as well as undertaking our shared process it seems fitting that they be introduced to the reader at the outset of this thesis. My colleagues chose to use a pseudonym which has meaning for them. For myself, I use my real name.

Keita took up counsellor education in part-time in 2007 and full-time in 2012. This has included teaching, research, and co-development of the Paetahi Tumu Kōrero Bachelor of Counselling

Degree. Her pathway into counsellor education was through counselling, supervision practice and adult education work. She completed a Certificate in Adult Tertiary Education while teaching full-time. She has whakapapa links to Rongowhakaata Iwi in Gisborne which she became aware of in her adult years. Her early cultural identity was mostly informed by Western worldviews and practices. Her teaching pedagogy is primarily informed by post-structural theory, understanding identity development, and learning as primarily socially constructed. She advocates critical reflexive practice as a means for students to understand the theoretical, social, cultural, and political influences that impact on them, their learning and developing professional practice.

Lucia has taught in the area of social practice which includes social work and counselling, since 2000. She came from a work background of Iwi Social Services, Community Development and Career Counselling. Her father is of Ngai Takoto and Ngāpuhi descent and her Mother is Waikato Tainui. The Tiriti Treaty has been a major teaching focus and her teaching has been shaped by the need for critical and transformative pedagogies that support student engagement in a very emotive topic. Her contribution of Māori Centred Practice provides greater awareness of cultural considerations within the teaching / learning space.

Stewart trained in social work and worked extensively in mental health and addictions fields. His teaching philosophy is very informed by Freire with a belief that teaching should be emancipatory and enable the learner to recognise the power of their own stories. His teaching strongly also reflects social constructionist ideas viewing learning as a dialogue with the teacher as the facilitator of student's critical reflection on knowledge and its integration with their practice. Stewart is a Pākehā New Zealander of Irish and Scottish (Shetland Islands) descent.

Myself (Janet). My early professional life was in social work and counselling in primary healthcare (GP) and private practice. I became involved in counsellor education 25 years ago when I undertook a master's degree in the United Kingdom with a focus on counsellor education and supervision. This began a fulfilling career as a counsellor educator and supervision trainer. Of Jewish and English ancestry, I emigrated from the UK to New Zealand in my childhood returning to the UK for a period in my adult life for master's study. This movement between two "lands" has seen me fortunate to live, work and train in both the United Kingdom and New Zealand bringing the strong UK influence of person-centered and experiential ways of working, with a weave of Māori ways of understanding and being that are foundational to practice as a counsellor and educator in Aotearoa. In my teaching, I highly value adult learning and experiential learning theories and increasingly have been drawn to collective and dialogic pedagogical approaches. My involvement in counsellor education at

Wintec spans 17 years allowing me to be part of the introduction and delivery of Paetahi Tumu Kōrero, the programme involved in this research.

Chapter summaries

The remaining seven chapters of this thesis are briefly introduced here:

Chapter two: Literature review

Chapter two presents a hermeneutic approach to reviewing literature (Smythe & Spence, 2012) that seeks primarily to provide context to this study and to promote new thinking through hermeneutic engagement with a wide range of relevant works. Literature is reviewed from counsellor education, teacher education and higher education more broadly; the three fields most relevant to this study. A similar theme emerges to the concern of this research regarding the need for attention to be given to broader aspects of pedagogy in counsellor education. Similarly, it includes the need to go beyond the consideration of pedagogy as an individual matter to being considered from a collective viewpoint. Past and contemporary understandings of pedagogy are explored drawing from literature in all three fields and more specifically pedagogical trends in counsellor education literature are highlighted. This chapter also identifies a growing call in the literature for considering not only pedagogies as a shared endeavour, but the relationship between pedagogy and curriculum, and the potential of aligning the two.

Chapter three: Methodology

This methodological chapter outlines the participatory underpinnings that were foundational to my choice of research focus and methodology. The subsequent pull to appreciative inquiry with its generative nature is detailed, and the ability of the AI methodology to lend itself to the particular localised and unique needs of our teaching team. This chapter recognises the way in which AI allows the “thought style” (van der Haar & Hosking, 2004. p. 1024) of the researcher to shape its design which in this inquiry included phenomenological, interpretative and dialogical philosophical influences borne from my lifelong commitment to person-centered and experiential counselling approaches (Barrett-Lennard, 2005; Mearns & Cooper, 2005; Rogers, 1951, 1961, 1980,1983).

Chapter four: Method

Chapter four details the method used in this research; a unique three phase appreciative inquiry shaped in negotiation with my three teaching team colleagues, the research participants in this study. Phase one involved one-to-one interviews undertaken as individual preparation for the two collective focus groups comprising phases two and three of our inquiry. The way in which the unique three phases of our AI correspond with the four characteristic AI stages, discover, dream, design and destiny (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005) is detailed. The varying data analysis approaches used to analyse the data from the three phases in this study, is also explained.

Chapter five: Pedagogy revealed

Chapter five presents an analysis of the transcripts of the one-to-one interviews carried out in phase one of our AI. This analysis of how pedagogy was understood and considered individually revealed a striking commonality in the way in which participants' core ontological and relational values and aspirations lay at the heart of pedagogical practice. These are considered in light of conceptions of pedagogy akin to the viewpoint of pedagogy as an educator's living educational theory (Whitehead, 1999, 2018), cognisant with contemporary viewpoints in the field of pedagogy.

Chapter six: Shared meaning and vision, and pedagogy

This chapter presents an analysis of focus group one (the second phase in our appreciative inquiry process). The way in which this focus group divided into two parts is discussed. In part one, individuals shared their pedagogies and engaged in appreciating processes and the way of relating took the form of "encounter...or intersubjective moments of meeting" (Brown, 2015, p.199). In part two, powerful images were able to be generated. These relational processes in parts one and two are considered from a dialogical (Buber, 1958, Brown, 2015) and relational constructivist (van der Haar & Hosking, 2004) lens.

Chapter seven: Designing for destiny

Chapter seven presents an analysis of focus group two, the third phase in our collective process of considering pedagogy corresponding to the design stage characteristic of AI. This chapter presents an analysis of the way our teaching team converged to work on constructing four future designs for our programme in relation to our pedagogy. Some of the challenges to the fulfilment of these are highlighted in this current chapter and discussed again as research limitations in chapter eight.

Chapter eight: Discussion and conclusions

Chapter eight presents and discusses the conclusions drawn from this study. The way in which pedagogy was considered by the four participants offers conclusions regarding the nature of pedagogy in living theory terms and therefore how pedagogical reflection can be most effectively reflected upon and shared collectively. The impact of this study on the development of my own living educational theory is highlighted and parallels made for using a living theory approach to theory development in counselling students. This chapter concludes with strengthened resolve that the alignment between educators' individual pedagogies, the collective pedagogies of the team, and programme curriculum is a critical one.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This research aims to specifically investigate how teaching teams might effectively consider pedagogy from a collective viewpoint. The previous chapter detailed my involvement in counsellor education spanning several decades tracing my pedagogical challenges in what has become, an increasingly diverse and pluralistic pedagogical climate. Mention was made of the growing calls in contemporary literature for a rethink of pedagogy in this current pluralistic climate (Negru, 2010), and for broader aspects of pedagogy to be given attention in counsellor education (Barrio Minton, Watcher Morris & Yaites, 2014; Barrio Minton, Watcher Morris & Bruner, 2018; Malott, Hall, Sheely-Moore, Krell & Cardaciotto, 2014). The strength of these contentions in the literature crystallised my resolve to undertake this current study. This chapter now presents a more comprehensive review of relevant literature.

Literature Review Approach

There are a range of approaches to literature reviews and a strong argument for taking up an approach to reviewing the literature that is coherent with one's own research methodology (Smythe & Spence, 2012). A hermeneutic approach (Boell & Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2014; Smythe & Spence, 2012) to reviewing literature was fitting for this appreciative inquiry research which was strongly underpinned by phenomenological and interpretive philosophical influences. Boell and Cecez-Kecmanovic (2014) define the underlying premise of a hermeneutic literature review as follows:

We therefore propose hermeneutic philosophy as a theoretical foundation and a methodological approach for studying literature reviews as inherently interpretive processes in which a reader engages in ever expanding and deepening understanding of a relevant body of literature. Hermeneutics does not assume that correct or ultimate understanding can be achieved, but instead is interested in the process of developing understanding. Engagement with the literature and development of the literature review can, thus, be described as an ongoing hermeneutic process of developing understanding. (p. 259)

Similarly, Smythe and Spence (2012) assert that a hermeneutic approach requires us “to engage with text in a manner congruent to the philosophy of Gadamer [1900-2002]” (p. 13) in such a way that will “reveal new horizons of thinking” (Smythe & Spence, 2012, p.17). They advocate that a hermeneutic literature review seeks “to provide context and provoke thinking” (Smythe & Spence, 2012, p. 12) and furthermore, that “literature, which can include anything that provokes thinking on the phenomenon of interest becomes a dialogical partner from which scholarly thinking and new insights emerge” (Smythe & Spence, 2012, p. 12). This, they assert is in contrast to more traditional reviews that look to finding gaps in the research as a rationale for the need for one's own research. In this regard, Smythe and Spence argue for a broader view on what counts as literature:

Literature is rather a rich, complex array of meanings, all of which will be integrated across gaps of understanding, and all of which is representative of a point of view...The key purpose of such an endeavour in hermeneutic research is to provoke thinking. We expand the term literature to include philosophical texts, fiction, poetry, and anything else which engages the reader. (Smythe & Spence, 2012, p. 14)

This more expansive and inclusive viewpoint was particularly important for this study as it allowed the inclusion of a wide range of texts as well as research-based literature. The literature on pedagogy is vast, and many of the scholarly publications accessed in this literature search were opinion-based publications comprising each individual author(s) engagement with formal theoretical concepts and examples of their application. This format was far more prevalent than research and/or empirically based studies.

This more expansive view of literature being a continual “thinking partner” also enabled a different view regarding the way in which literature was sourced. The more traditional approach to literature reviews is for them to occur at the commencement of a study in order to locate, clarify a research question and/or justify the need for one’s own research. With a hermeneutic approach, relevant literature legitimately emerges throughout the duration of the study in order to continuously provoke and advance thinking. For this study, literature was sourced throughout the duration of the thesis from 2015 – 2019.

When taking up a hermeneutic approach to reviewing literature it would seem a tension exists between this emergent approach (Fingeld-Connett & Johnson, 2013), yet still being able to give a rationale and account of the way in which literature is sought and for why studies are included and or excluded. Literature on pedagogy is vast and spans a range of fields. The scope of this review is on publications in counsellor education and its broader context of higher education. Teacher education literature has also been included given its relevancy to counsellor education and its significant contribution spanning decades, to pedagogical development in higher education. For this research specific search terms were initially and regularly used throughout the study including *higher education and pedagogy*, *counsellor education and pedagogy*, *pedagogical reflection*, *individual pedagogical reflection*, *collective pedagogical reflection*, *pedagogical development*, *scholarship of teaching and learning*, *collective scholarship of teaching and learning*, and *pedagogy and curriculum*. Similarly, the Auckland University of Technology and the Waikato Institute of Technology libraries were accessed constantly to access a range of data bases including EBSCO, ProQuest, Cochrane, and Google Scholar.

Taking up this hermeneutic approach to reviewing literature, this chapter addresses:

1. My first conversation with the literature – calls in pedagogical publications for further attention to pedagogy.
2. Using literature to provide context - the historical and complex contemporary context of pedagogical writings- where despite a lack of attention to broad aspects

of pedagogy, a proliferation of specific pedagogical approaches in counsellor education and higher education exist.

3. An ah-ha moment: an encounter with Jack Whitehead's body of work on educators' the living educational theory (Whitehead, 1979).
4. Conversations with the existing studies on collective consideration of pedagogies and the alignment of pedagogy with curriculum.

A beginning conversation with literature: the call for a greater attention to pedagogy

My early dialogue with the literature was a significant one (as outlined in Chapter 1). I quickly discovered my concerns regarding a lack of attention given to broader aspects of pedagogy in counsellor education were resonant of similar calls in the field, and this crystallised a resolved to take up this study. The most influential study was a quantitative content analysis study carried out by Barrio Minton, Watcher Morris and Yaites (2014) who advocated for greater in-depth attention to be given to pedagogy in counsellor education in their country. These authors examined published journal articles of the United States of America (USA) American Counselling Association (ACA) and its divisions from 2001-2010, to determine the extent and nature of the focus on pedagogy. Their rationale for undertaking a content analysis was that it "provides one method of illuminating major trends and developments within a discipline" (Barrio Minton et al., 2014, p. 163).

Barrio Minton et al.'s (2014) research revealed that the pedagogical focus in the journals from 2001-2010 was more on course content and teaching techniques linked to achieving competencies, rather than pedagogical standpoints pertaining to theories of knowledge and learning. The researchers had examined 230 publications to ascertain the extent to which the focus was on teaching and learning theories and instructional research, rating the publications as *clearly grounded* or *minimally grounded*. The classification was of clearly grounded "if the content reflected consistent integration of pedagogical theory or instructional research, minimally grounded if it included mention of literature but lacked full explication or link to pedagogical theory or instructional research" (p. 170). Results using these criteria revealed only 14.78% (34 of 230) of the articles were clearly grounded and 12.17% (28 of 230) minimally grounded.

These authors drew two key conclusions from their study as to why little attention is given to pedagogy in counsellor education. Their first conclusion was that there was a lack of preparation of counsellors to step into teaching positions and that emerging counsellor educators were limited in their ability to engage with pedagogical ideas in the literature. Their second conclusion was that there was a lack of Evidence Based Teaching (EBT) in counsellor education and that this also contributed to the paucity of what they considered

in-depth pedagogical publications being produced by educators for publication. I will now go on to discuss and critique each in detail.

Barrio et al.'s (2014) first conclusion that counsellor educators in the USA have weaker foundations in teaching and learning theories than was realised, led them to assert that there was a need to educate future generations of counsellor educators to "develop into teacher-scholars" (Barrio Minton et al., 2014, p.175). Referring to Barrio Minton et al.'s study, Malott, Hall, Sheely-Moore, Krell and Cardaciotto (2014) expressed a similar concern that doctoral programmes should not only prepare students for future counselling practice, but also to take up positions as faculty on counsellor education programmes. Interestingly, whether such a concern is held in New Zealand is unknown given that publications pertaining to the preparation of counsellor educators in New Zealand are virtually non-existent. I was only able to locate one study by Crocket and Kotzé (2012). This qualitative research involved individual interviews between the authors and four adjunct staff (also counsellor practitioners) employed on a one year Visiting Teaching Fellowship (VTF) on the University of Waikato Master of Counselling Programme, Waikato, New Zealand. Crocket and Kotzé concluded that unlike the doctoral programs in the USA, in New Zealand the pathway for experienced counsellors into teaching positions is not well defined, and very little is known about counsellors who become counsellor educators including amongst other things, their pedagogical experiences.

The second conclusion by Barrio Minto et al. (2014) was that there was a lack of empirical research on pedagogy in counsellor education, and a lack of grounding or Evidence Based Teaching (EBT) practices⁹. In their view, this was evidenced in the limited number of what they would consider to be in-depth publications on pedagogy. They noted that rather than rigorous empirical studies there was a predominance of opinion-based theoretically focused publications, with articles limited to the inclusion of educator experiences, teacher reflections, teacher evaluations, and student feedback. They contrasted this with empirical research studies which they defined as "systematic inquiry that included formulation of research questions, clear methodology, explicated data analysis, and presentation of results" (Barrio Minton et al., 2014, p. 171).

Malott et al. (2014) expressed a similar concern stating that there was "a dearth of research in best pedagogical practice" (p. 295). Barrio Minto et al. (2014) observed that unlike higher education fields of medicine, nursing, psychology, and social work no resource

⁹ EBT is defined as "the conscientious, explicit and judicious integration of best available research on teaching technique" (Groccia & Buskist cited in Malott et al., 2014, p. 295).

existed in counsellor education in the USA that drew from EBT practices. Malott et al. (2014) argued that although counsellor educators may well be drawing on best practices more broadly from higher education (i.e. student-centred learning and experiential learning) they may not necessarily be applying these well to the unique endeavour of counsellor education. Recognising teaching as a discipline, they urged counsellor educators to engage in “explicit dialogue about why certain instructional strategies were chosen and how to address the impact of such strategies” (2014, p. 302). As a way forward, Malott et al. advocated that doctoral students complete a research paper addressing contemporary EBT in their doctoral level counsellor education programmes.

During the course of my doctorate Barrio Minton, Watcher and Bruner (2018) carried out a second quantitative content analysis, an update of the earlier one by Barrio Minton, Watcher Morris and Yaites (2014). In this second study they analysed the same publications from the period 2011-2015 to determine whether attention to pedagogy had increased. Comparing results with their 2014 published study they found that the common focus of the research in the publications was still on teaching techniques (43.04 % in 2001-2010 compared to 48.12 % in 2011-2015), however the proportion of research articles on pedagogical practice had more than doubled (9.13% in 2001-2010 compared to 21.80% in 2011-2015). The proportion of the pedagogical articles considered clearly grounded had also risen from 14.78% to 21.80% and those minimally grounded had decreased from 12.17% to 7.52%. Barrio Minton et al. (2018) wondered if their recommendations made in 2014 had contributed to this result, and they also credited the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs Standards (2016) for including teaching as one of the five core curriculum areas on counselling doctoral programmes involved in preparing counsellor educators. In this updated study the authors noted a shift in the “clarity of foundations in manuscripts regarding teaching and learning” (Barrio Minton et al., 2018, p.235). Although they were heartened by their findings, Barrio Minton et al. (2018) still advocated for the need for “investigating rigor and methodology used to understand teaching and learning in counsellor education” (p. 235).

Smythe and Spence (2012) assert that that “literature cannot be regarded as objective truth” (p.14) and in a similar vein they propose that researchers inevitably come to the engagement with literature with their own subjectivity and understandings. Similarly, Smythe and Spence assert that the researcher also may bring a “feeling, knowing, a readiness to read and reread” (p. 17). The studies by Barrio Minton et al. (2014), and Malott et al. (2014), and latterly Barrio Minton et al. (2018), added weight to my own views that there is a need for greater attention to broader aspects of pedagogy in counsellor education. They also proffered some contributory reasons for this state of play including the lack of training of counsellor educators and the need for EBT in counsellor education.

However, as I read and re-read these studies I had a sense that there was more to the lack of take up of pedagogical publications by counsellor educators than they were suggesting.

What then became figural for me was the observation by Barrio Minton et al., (2014) that the articles on pedagogy they had reviewed had a very particular opinion-based conceptual format. It was this comment that provoked my thinking further regarding whether it was this *format* of publication which emphasises the taking up of formal propositional theories and applying to practice, that is not representative of how counsellor educators actually understand, consider, and/or even construct their pedagogy. This may therefore be impacting significantly on the utility and relevancy of publications that are available.

There also appears to be an implicit assumption in many publications on pedagogy that the implementation of pedagogical approaches by educators is straightforward. Most of the publications focused on the pedagogical approach of one or more author(s). The way in which these ideas might be applied on programmes in situations where there are teams of people operating from a plurality and/or diverse range of pedagogical perspectives was less obvious. This critique is particularly poignant within the bi-cultural framework of counsellor education within Aotearoa New Zealand, which by definition requires attending to differing and indeed competing perspectives. In this respect, it may be that not only is more empirical research into pedagogical theory and practice needed (Malott et al., 2014), but also far greater engagement with the complexities of implementing pedagogy in what is recognised as an increasingly pluralistic climate of higher education (Cooper & McLeod, 2011; Negru, 2010).

This research aims to assist counsellor educators to develop a greater understanding the nature of pedagogy itself, hence enabling them to see the relevance of publications on pedagogy to their educational practice and to offer publications that engage with the complexities of pedagogical practice teaching alongside others.

The historical and contemporary context: pedagogical trends in counsellor education

The hermeneutic focus on finding *relevant* literature rather than achieving a comprehensive scoping of all publications (Boell & Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2014) was particularly pertinent in this review, given that what was emerging was both a vast and *complex* picture of pedagogically related writings. Whilst Barrio Minton et al. (2014), Barrio Minton et al. (2018) and Malott et al. (2014) were lamenting a lack of attention to pedagogy, almost contradictory to this was a proliferation of publications over decades proposing *specific* pedagogical approaches for counsellor education. Most striking also, was the way in which these pedagogical writings were so reflective of their historical and cultural context. It seemed important to discuss this picture consequentially.

Since the inception of publications in counsellor education literature there are clearly definitive periods of pedagogical emphasis, the 1970s – 1990s, the late 1990s – mid-2000s and, the mid-2000s – present. Recognising this provides an important historical and contemporary picture of the way in which pedagogy has been understood, and the dominant theoretical and philosophical influences that have shaped counsellor education pedagogies.

Nelson and Neufeldt (1998) offered an overview of the pedagogical influences in counsellor education from the 1970s to the time of their publication in the late 1990s. The early days of counsellor training they regarded as having a strong skills-based pedagogy and an emphasis on the cognitive skills of case-conceptualisation, group process, personal awareness, ethics, and to a lesser extent counselling theory and research. At the time of writing, Nelson and Neufeldt (1998) were advocating for the community of counsellor educators to take up a constructivist approach to counsellor education to take greater account of social context (Giroux, 1992). Support was forthcoming with constructivist pedagogy considered as the signature pedagogy for these times (Brackette, 2014). It is not surprising therefore that McAuliffe and Eriksen's text on *Teaching Strategies for Constructivist and Developmental Counselor Education* first published in 2002, one of the most comprehensive works on applying constructivist education to counsellor education, in my opinion became a seminal text for many in the field.

Barrio Minton et al. (2014) then suggest that a move away from constructivist counsellor education took place in the late 1990s towards pedagogies that addressed issues of social and cultural diversity:

There was limited incorporation of traditional learning and instructional theories in favor of a heavier focus on theories more closely connected to social and cultural diversity (e.g., transformative learning [Mezirow, 1991], liberation pedagogy [Freire, 1993], feminist pedagogy [Ropers-Huilman, 1998], and multicultural education [Banks, 1988]. (Barrio Minton et al., 2014, p.173)

These authors also make a connection between these pedagogical trends and their own concern at the lack of research based- publications on pedagogy (as mentioned in the above section of this review). Barrio Minton et al. (2014) continue:

...These theories have merit; however, some may lack the degree of research that underscores traditional learning theories (e.g., constructivist, social, and situational learning theories [Bandura & Walters, 1963; Halpern & Associates, 1994]; motivational and humanistic learning theories [Kolb, 1984]. (p. 173)

Contemporary pedagogical trends

As I reached the more contemporary publications on specific pedagogies in counsellor education and higher education literature (2000's- present), I was also encountering two other significant works, Whitehead's (1979) extensive body of work on living educational theory and Wright and van Eck's (2018) etic and emic conceptions of explanation (both detailed below).

Strong echo's and similarities were present between the emphases in the contemporary writings that I was immersed in, and these other two areas of work. There appeared to be a marked sea change from the mid 2000's, with clusters of readings that emphasised lived- experience, phenomenology, relationality, intersubjectivity, contextuality, diversity and/or plurality. In hermeneutic terms, the simultaneous engagement with the three works was pivotal and could be considered a fusion of horizons (Gadamer, 1976). This fusion was not only between me and the three areas of publication, but the fusion of the works in relation to one another (Boell & Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2015). Appendix C provides a small representation of contemporary readings clustered in these areas of emphasis. This small representative sample of writings in these clusters was in preference to trying to provide a comprehensive summary of all the available publications on specific pedagogical approaches. The latter would have been impossible to do given the proliferation across the search fields.

- Relational pedagogies based on intersubjectivity and mutual, reciprocal relationships in communities of learning in order to develop students' capacity for growth fostering relational connections (Duffey, 2006; Macaskie, Meekums & Nolan, 2013).
- Pedagogies that focus on embodied attunement and authentic relating (Duffey, 2006; Wilkinson & Hanna, 2016).
- Pedagogies that focus on students' discovering and critiquing their natural inclinations and values in relation to theoretical frameworks (Guiffrida, 2005; Wilkinson & Hanna, 2016).
- The influence of a phenomenological perspective in pedagogy focused on developing students' in-depth understanding of peoples lived-experiences, with this phenomenological understanding informing students' engagement with formal theories (Wilkinson & Hanna, 2016).
- Pedagogies which foster a valuing of diversity at their core, valuing people as an embodiment of their unique historical and socio-cultural contexts (Henriksen, 2006; Wilkinson & Hanna, 2016).
- Pedagogies that value plurality and multiplicity of viewpoints and theoretical perspectives, encouraging students to consider theories as partial, contextual, and continually co-constructed explanations (Cooper & McLeod, 2011; Lang & Gardiner, 2014; Macaskie, Meekums & Nolan, 2013).
- Pedagogies where issues of equity and social justice for marginalised students are central in the learning environment (Henriksen, 2006).
- Publications specific to counsellor education in Aotearoa New Zealand that give emphasis to place-pedagogy (Penetito, 2009) where Māori cultural concepts in relation to place-space in the learning environment are foundational (Kotzé, Crocket & Waititi, 2016)

For the present study, these groupings of publications are of interest in that they reveal what is of central concern to contemporary teaching contexts and in preparing graduate

counsellors for diverse and pluralistic practice contexts.. These groupings also show how pedagogy is increasingly concerned with the intersubjectivity of relationships within the learning context and the extent to which phenomenological perspectives have influenced pedagogical thought. This phenomenological influence involves the focus on students' engagement with theoretical ideas from a phenomenological understanding of themselves (their natural inclinations and ontological values) and, students' capacity to attend phenomenologically to the diverse worlds of their clients.

What is interesting here is that this suggests the way in which educators are conceptualising their pedagogical practice. Wright and van Eck (2018), mentioned above, make a useful comparison in this regard which distinguishes between "two conceptions of explanation...an epistemic conception (EC) and an ontic conception (OC)" (p. 998), addressing the philosophical question regarding what comprises an explanation for something. They define epistemic conceptions as viewing "explanations as complexes of representations" (p. 998) that become norms of explanation which then become the norms of knowledge. Ontic conceptions on the other hand are describe as explanations of realities or facts, not as representations as in EC, and that "do not aim at norms of goodness" (2018, p.999). The sample of publications in Appendix B shows a definite move towards ontic conceptualisations rather than epistemic. For instance, in Guiffrida (2005) and Wilkinson and Hanna's (2016) publications, there is a definite ontic conceptual underpinning to their pedagogy that focuses on students forming explanations from their lived-experiences of counselling practice, from their natural inclinations and, from their core ontological values.

Whilst these publications reflect these ontic conceptions of pedagogy, how these ideas are presented in these publications, in my view, remains in a more epistemic format. There remains a format in these articles of providing theoretical representations of pedagogical ideas, followed by their application in practice which resembles an epistemic representation form. A striking exception to this is Kotzé, Crocket and Waititi's (2016) publication that resembles an ontic presentation, exploring place pedagogy through vivid accounts of their lived-experiences of teaching that took place on a marae¹⁰, Even more striking in Kotzé et al.'s publication is the use of a "material-discursive account of one student's narrative" (p. 317) woven through the work that captures the profound impact on one student's learning as a counsellor as he encountered the place and space of the marae, and the impacts of a place pedagogy. Kotzé et al.'s style of writing could perhaps be considered 'ontic' and

¹⁰ Marae: "The cultural meeting house of Māori, the indigenous peoples of New Zealand. More specifically, the courtyard or open area in front of the *wharehenui*, or meeting house where formal greetings and discussions take place." Retrieved from <https://maoridictionary.co.nz/word/3664>

therefore, as having a congruence with the underpinning tenets they are exploring in their study. In hermeneutic style, my conversation with their work is somewhat heartening and leads me to wonder if these authors are not leading the way in respect to finding a different way of writing about pedagogy. I hope this present study might similarly discover alternative ways of writing about pedagogical practice.

Contemporary global trends - neoliberal impacts on pedagogy, academic identities and curriculum

Reviewing the literature from the past two decades, there was a striking predominance of publications addressing particular global trends that are directly impinging on and impacting teaching practice. These presented to me as a crucial part of the complexity of the contemporary context of pedagogy.

As mentioned above, recent trends in pedagogy are addressing greater plurality and diversity in teaching contexts themselves and are aspirational to produce graduates competent in diverse and pluralistic climates of practice. In addition to these trends, there is a concern repeatedly expressed in literature regarding the effects of a global neoliberal ideology on higher education and counsellor education pedagogies, teaching and learning, curriculum and academic identities (Hughes, 2017; Ingleby, 2015; Kidman & Chu, 2017).

Though defining neoliberalism is not straight forward and/or an uncontested phenomenon (Lui, 2017) it is generally considered to mean a political and economic ideology that has dominated many governments and societies around the world from approximately the 1980's to the present. Connell (2013) provides a useful definition of a neoliberal view of education:

Neoliberalism has a definite view of education, understanding it as human capital formation. It is in the business of forming the skills and attitudes needed by a productive workforce - productive in the precise sense of producing an ever-growing mass of profits for the market economy. (p. 104)

Ingleby (2015) identifies how this competitive individualism and maximisation of neoliberalism has seen a shift to “students as consumers of educational products” (p. 518) with employability now one of the key agendas of higher education. Martin (2017) also writes of the way students are now “encouraged to imagine and take up education in particular ways...many students will pass through the toll gates of the modern university without being exposed to teaching programmes designed to stimulate alternative ways of learning and knowing” (2017, p. 1). The implications of a change in emphasis in education for human capital and economic policy (Walker, 2006) are clearly far reaching. In countries that subscribe to neoliberal politics around the world, tertiary institutions have clearly been extensively restructured and regulated (Davies, Gottsche & Bansel, 2006; Roper, 2018). Hughes (2017) asserts that there has been much discussion on the increased demands on

academic staff in university through neoliberal economic regimes whereas less consideration has been given to pedagogies under neoliberalism. Walker (2006) most pertinently writes of the shift to “a discourse in teaching and learning rather than curriculum and pedagogy... [and] thinned out versions of pedagogy” (p.11). Hughes observes “Many academics view tertiary education as both an individually and socially transformative process, and there is a sense that the current discursive environment engenders an inertia wherein this commitment is lost” (2017, p. 21). Davies et al. (2006) also speak of a disillusionment and distress amongst educators in environments dominated by the “performance paradigm” (p. 81). They highlight the way in which an emphasis on evidence and outcome measures rather than intellectual values such as “what is valued as sound intellectual work” (p.80) has led to a work force of educators debilitated by the effects of neoliberalism and disconnected from the inspirations that sustain them.

New Zealand has not escaped the effects of neoliberalism. Research by Kidman and Chu (2017) investigated the effects of globalisation, neoliberal experimentation and managerialism practices for Māori and Pacific academics, who they term “minoritized/ethnicized” (p. 7). Their ethnographic research involved interviews with 43 senior academics identifying as being of Māori and Pacific ethnicity and who were employed in nine New Zealand universities and Wānanga¹¹. Drawing on the sociological analysis of work and organisational structures by Abrutyn (2016), Kidman and Chu (2017) highlighted participants’ experiences of being distanced from the academic decision-making in their institutions. They observed that academics who were more easily able to establish identities and uphold the neoliberal Anglo-European values of the organisation, were more embedded in the institutions and selected for leadership positions. However, Māori and Pacific academics often felt isolated and forced to the margins of institutions as “...macro and micro-level interactions within the neoliberal university create institutional status systems framed by ethnicized notions of academic insiders and outsiders; a practice known as “whitestreaming” which refers to the structures of academia that protect and maintain Anglo-European/Pākehā privilege (Kidman & Chu, 2017, p. 8).

Kidman and Chu also detailed participant experiences of not only disconnection from decision making but intellectual, professional, and social isolation, inequalities in career trajectories and, of particular significance for the present study, pedagogical struggles. Struggles included alternative forms of knowing and place/space requirements foundational to working from indigenous pedagogies being unavailable and/or denied. Interestingly,

¹¹ Wānanga, in this instance refers to tertiary institutions that are uniquely Māori learning environments.

these authors make a call to resistance through scholarly activism citing Mendez (2008) who writes of scholarly activism “where the researcher uses her position within the academy to contribute to social justice struggles, while at the same time working to place at the centre alternative voices and ways of knowing” (Mendez cited in Kidman & Chu, 2017, p. 15). This call to and/or from academics (and students) to a position of resistance is echoed by many in recent literature suggesting perhaps a ‘sea change’ occurring in higher education. A key role in this resistance is the taking up of pedagogical standpoints (Hughes, 2017; Martin, 2017). Hughes (2017) for example, asserts that even within contemporary neoliberal tertiary institutions ‘pedagogical work’ that addresses communication and power systems can be “decisively organised to create a collaborative space” (p. 24). This collaborative space Hughes proposes would see academic capital built for students and more democratic teaching moments available for staff. Hughes recommends Connell’s (2013) transition pedagogy where democratic dialogic teaching emphasising transparency between academics and students could achieve both an individual and social transformative agenda in higher education. Numerous other calls to resistance through pedagogy are being made including critical (Ingleby, 2015; Martin, 2017), emergent (Connors & Sharar, 2016), dialogic (Skidmore, 2006) pedagogies, and many more.

Pedagogical development and reflection by educators

In addition to reviewing pedagogical trends and contextual impacts on pedagogy, this review of literature sought to understand how pedagogy is currently being reflected upon and developed by educators. This was important to locate the findings of the present study regarding how educators went about reflecting on pedagogy within the literature on pedagogical reflective practice. Literature was sourced from counsellor education and the extensive body of work on pedagogical reflection and development in teacher education. Ideas from both were also used to design the reflective processes utilised in the method of this study (see Chapter 4).

In teacher education literature pedagogical reflection was often framed as *teachers’ reflective practice* (Russell, 2018) whereas in counsellor education literature it was characteristically described as the construction of a *personal philosophy of teaching* (Manthei, 2012; Whitman & Beeson, 2018). Both are examined below.

Pedagogical development as “reflective practice” in teacher education

Not surprisingly the field of teacher education offered the most literature and research on individual teachers’ and individual teacher educators’ pedagogical development, with *reflecting on teaching* having a substantial focus in teacher education literature. Brandenburg (2008) credits Stenhouse (1975) with being an early advocate of reflective

practice in teaching and a champion for the importance of researching teaching. There are also well-recognised influences in these reflective practices. For instance, Craig (2010) describes Dewey's (1938) theory of reflection on experience, and Schön's (1983) concept of reflecting-in-action and reflecting-on-action as "footprint(s)" (p. 189) throughout the literature on teachers' reflective practice. These influences are very familiar to my own established understandings of reflective practice and, therefore, informed the design of the individual reflection process used in the present study.

Self-study (Bullock, 2012; McDonough, 2013; Elliot-Johns & Tidwell, 2013; LaBoskey & Hamilton, 2010), well-established in teacher education, has been another key influence. The aim of Self-study is for teachers and/or teacher educators to focus on tensions, dilemmas, critical incidents and/or issues in their teaching practice to examine their underlying intentions, assumptions, and aspirations; with the intention of improving practice and gaining a greater understanding of the kind of educator one would like to be (Brandenburg, 2008). Brandenburg (2008) provides background to the history of Self-study, describing how it was developed as a formalised programme, the Self-study of Teacher Education Practices (S-STEP) (Loughran, 2004) as an organised response to a call for teachers to "take a research stance" (Brandenburg, 2008, p. 21) to their work.

As a research method Self-study was characterised by taking an *insider view* of teacher educator practice (Brandenburg, 2008) and as "systematic and rigorous inquiry into practice, often instigated by a problem which then leads to the theorising of practice and a deeper understanding of the why of teaching and learning about teaching and learning" (Brandenburg, 2008, p. 21). Brandenburg (2008) used a Self-study to undertake extensive research into her own teaching practice as a teacher educator and focused on "examining the ordinariness of everyday interactions through assumption hunting" (p. xi). Brandenburg, influenced by Brookfield's (1995) notion of critiquing assumptions, emphasised the asking of oneself critical questions "the 'why' of teaching and learning" (p. xi) for new learning and outcomes to emerge. McDonough (2013) also investigated her own journey of pedagogical development using Self-study which involved examining situated teaching performances and critical reflection-in-action to identify her underlying paradigmatic assumptions. At the outset of the present study, I was much aligned to the idea that identifying assumptions was a main priority in pedagogical reflection (Brandenburg, 2008; McDonough, 2013), therefore the Self-study method was influential in considering how I could incorporate reflective processes in the research design.

Pedagogical development as a “personal philosophy of teaching” in counsellor education

In counsellor education literature little reference was made to developing pedagogy but rather of constructing a “personal philosophy of teaching” (Manthei, 2012; Whitman & Beeson, 2018, p. 14). The notion of a “personal philosophy” parallels the emphasis in counsellor development of the construction of a personal counselling theoretical orientation. Manthei (2012) described this as an “autobiographical [counselling] statement” (p.1). The familiarity of counsellors with the process of constructing personal philosophies and the transferability of this process to the development of a personal teaching philosophy is captured by Whitman and Beeson:

How you understand your role as a counselor [sic] educator and articulate your beliefs about the process of learning and teaching is as central as is your ability to articulate your theoretical orientation and understanding of the counseling [sic] process as a counselor [sic]. (2018, p. 14)

Prefaced with an acknowledgement of the many available examples of ways to construct a personal philosophy of teaching, Whitman and Beeson (2018) offered a list of what they consider to be minimum inclusions in a teaching philosophy. These were beliefs regarding: how students learn, how instructors teach, the roles of each party, teaching methods and goals, assessment considerations and attention to diverse learning styles. On face value such a list appeared somewhat “static” and Whitman and Beeson themselves prefaced it as a pragmatic basis for constructing a philosophy. Placing greater emphasis on the teaching philosophy being uniquely personal in nature they cited Lang’s (2010) description of the teaching as a “creative nonfiction” (Lang, cited in Whitman and Beeson, 2018, p. 25). Whitman and Beeson also recommended that educators use “specific examples and narratives supporting those sections [their list of inclusions, in order that] your personal philosophy will result in a personal and idiosyncratic representation of your beliefs and strategies for learning and teaching” (2018, p. 25). This focus on narratives and storying as creative non-fiction further suggests that within counsellor education there may be a shift towards an understanding of educators’ pedagogy in more ontic ways.

Pedagogy as living educational theories

“In a hermeneutic study, it is the philosophical insights, and the thoughts stumbled across, that can most powerfully call one into thinking and thus shape the analysis and the findings of the research” (Smythe & Spence, 2012, p. 21). Undertaking a hermeneutic approach to literature enabled some exciting and profound moments in this research. The most significant ah-ha moment (Finfgeld & Johnson, 2013, p. 200) came mid-way through this research. In a doctoral supervision session one of my supervisors mentioned Jack Whitehead’s educators’ living educational theories (Whitehead, 1989). From this point in my study, Whitehead’s writings became a significant conversational partner as I engaged with the way in which the participants

in this study were expressing their pedagogical practice and ideas. What also ensued was the invitation to begin writing my own living educational theory (see Chapter 8) which brought an autoethnographic focus to this research, a further dimension to the appreciative inquiry.

Whitehead has a long career (1989 – present) researching and writing about living-educational theory. His extensive body of work on pedagogy as educators' living educational theories considers pedagogy in terms of a construction by living beings in their unique contexts of practice rather than as educators applying more formal pedagogical ideas to practice. Whitehead (2018) regards the traditional view of a theory as “a general explanatory framework that can generate descriptions and explanations for empirically observed regularities and the behaviour of individual cases” (p.9. This view of theory he also describes as a “propositional logic” (p. 11), which he considers as constraining the way educators think about their theory. He writes:

I am arguing that the propositional form is masking the living form and content of an educational theory that can generate valid descriptions and explanations for the educational development of individuals. This is not to deny the importance of propositional forms of understanding. I am arguing for a reconstruction of educational theory into a living form of question and answer, which includes propositional contributions from the traditional disciplines of education.
(Whitehead, 2018, p. 11)

Whitehead is very specific that the generation of theory in living form involves discovering and producing one's living educational theory from systematic reflection on accounts of educational practice. He asserts it involves “living individuals and the contexts within which a living-theory is being produced” (2018, p.11). In these terms living theory is a dynamic and ever-changing phenomenon.

Living educational theories are predicated on the belief that “our faith in life-affirming energy is the grounds for our ontological values and commitments to the universe and its inhabitants” (Whitehead & McNiff, 2006, p. 86). From a living theory viewpoint, it is these ontological and relational values (how we understand ourselves and others and the nature of our relationships) that we embody and make “explicit through our [educational] practices and theories...our ontological values transform into our educational commitments” (Whitehead and McNiff, 2006, p.86).

The generation of such a living theory, Whitehead contends, is concerned with clarifying and communicating one's ontological values as they emerge in accounts of education practice and to include these “as explanatory principles in explanations of [one's] educational influences” (Whitehead, 2018, p. 2). Whitehead further asserts that these values, or ontic conceptions, are not only embodied in our practices but also “come to act as the explanatory principles and living standards by which we judge our practice” (Whitehead, 2018, p. 8). This highlights that it is precisely because our unique living theories are created from within our practice, that these values or explanatory principles and

living standards are then the measures by which we evaluate our theories. Whitehead also proposes that through questioning educational practice with such questions as “how do I improve it?” educators can produce a living educational theory. He describes this as “an individual’s explanation of their educational influence in their own learning, in the learning of others and in the learning of the social formations that influence practice and understanding” (2018, p.7). Whitehead asserts that contradictions in these explanations of educational influence are experienced by the educator when what we espouse to value in our practice is witnessed as contradictory; what he terms “our own I’s existing as living contradictions” (Whitehead, 2018, p.13). Such a view is particularly pertinent in my own history as an educator given that it was the repeated experiencing of “myself as contradictory” throughout my teaching career that inspired the present study and is discussed more fully in Chapter 5.

Collective consideration of pedagogy and/or curriculum

The central aim of the present study is to investigate how teaching teams might effectively consider pedagogy from a collective standpoint. From the outset of this research an important dialogue with the literature has been to consider the extent to which pedagogy is addressed from a collective perspective.

An interesting picture emerged of the way in which pedagogical reflection appears to largely be focused on individual educator’s development of their pedagogical practice even when this reflection is shared in a collective setting. Whilst this individual focus in relation to educator pedagogical reflection and development predominates, it would appear that curriculum development is moving towards involving a greater collective input from students, and programme stakeholders. The relationship between pedagogy and curriculum, and the call for a greater alignment between the two, is also a growing feature of publications.

An individual focus on pedagogical reflection

Throughout the literature reviewed above, pedagogical reflection by educators in its many forms was largely on an individual basis. However collective input into an individual’s development did appear common practice. For example, with the Self-study, its proponents appear to emphasise collaboration with others to gain “deeper and richer understandings and insights” (Gibbs, 2006, p. 248). The focus appeared here to be on individuals reflecting *with the support of one another* in order to deepen their individual teaching practice. What appears absent is how teaching teams might draw on Self-studies in considering pedagogies *in relation to one another* in a teaching team. I contend that using self-studies in this way could support the positioning of pedagogy as a more shared endeavour and lead to greater possibilities for impact and action at a systemic level.

This critique aligns with others who argue that the existing forms of educators' reflection in the literature have an overly individual focus. For example, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), a practice of systemically studying teaching and learning common to a range of disciplines in higher education, including the counselling profession (Brackette, 2014), is challenged by Kahn, Goodhew, Murphy and Walsh (2013) for its overly individual focus. Located in the engineering discipline at the University of Liverpool in the United Kingdom, Kahn et al. observe how the SoTL has been incorporated into academic institutions through the teaching awards process, a reward system they critique as having a communal aspect yet still clearly grounding teaching as an individual activity. Kahn et al., claim that:

For teaching, though, collaboration is more typically oriented to matters of organisation or student support, rather than to substantive disciplinary matters. While colleagues within given departmental settings do establish common working cultures in relation to teaching...the act of teaching itself usually remains individual. (2013, p. 902)

In their view, the SoTL not only falls to the domain of the individual it "remains on the margins of life in universities" (2013, p. 901). Kahn et al., (2013) are very explicit about the effect of this, referring to Habermas' Theory of Communicative Action (1984) to underpin their concern. Kahn et al., suggest "a relatively restricted basis exists for the forms of open communication that Habermas (1984) ...contends are required for mutual understanding to emerge" (p. 902). Drawing attention to the increasingly pressured contemporary environment of higher education these same authors advocated for new forms of scholarly activity for reasons resonant with my own concerns. They argue for:

...a rich and diverse network of professional relationships is present ... [and] shared practice constitutes an essential basis for new discursive knowledge to impact practice. One cannot expect mutual understanding to emerge of its own accord as to how new knowledge should be integrated into existing practice. (2013, p. 902)

In their publication, Kahn et al. (2013) present their case study of an extensive international network of SoTL across 50 universities, developed since the late 1990's. They report this has worked to embed the SoTL as a mainstream and collective endeavour within their engineering departments. Whilst a more far reaching project than the present study, the underpinning sentiment of their work resonates with my own interest. They describe this as "two or more parties pursuing shared practice in order to achieve goals that pertain to that practice" (p. 904). Kahn et al. also recognise that institutionally there is a growing imperative for shared endeavours and a greater alignment between all aspects of institutional life, including the institutional vision and goals, curriculum, and the activity of teaching and learning. This also supports my own underpinning motivations for the present study.

Growing collective involvement in programme and curriculum development.

A growing area in the literature reviewed was in relation to collective involvement in programme and curriculum development in higher education, including in counsellor education. Recent studies focus on the co-creation of higher education of curriculum with students (Bovill & Woolmer, 2018; Lang & Gardiner, 2014; Wright & Lang, 2011) and/or with stakeholders in a programme's practice communities (Lang & Gardiner, 2014; Wright & Lang, 2011). For example, in a study by Lang and colleagues in Aotearoa New Zealand (Lang & Gardiner, 2014; Wright & Lang, 2011), the teaching team involved in a postgraduate counselling programme undertook an extensive consultative process "listening to the voices of indigenous peoples and counselling stakeholders" (Lang & Gardiner, 2014, p. 73). What resulted was an extensive programme review including of their pedagogical practice to offer "a form of bicultural pluralism, bicultural because the indigenous and coloniser have worked together to build cultural bridges, and pluralistic because the framework can be applied to all cultural groups equally" (p. 73). This study was one of the few that explicitly addressed where and how they engaged in pedagogical changes as part of their programme and curriculum development.

The relationship between pedagogy and curriculum – not a straightforward one or one in the same?

Hyun (2006) suggests that the relationship between pedagogy and curriculum is not a straightforward one, not least due to differing understanding of terms. Boitshwarelo and Vermuri (2017) suggests that there is disconnect between the two, pedagogy and curriculum. Boitshwarelo and Vermuri (2017) define *curriculum* as "what is to be learnt in particular contexts and how that is packaged. It is usually underpinned by why it is important that something is to be learnt" (p. 279). They outline a curriculum as comprising "rationale or purpose, goals or learning outcomes, a structure of how it is to be implemented (e.g. sequencing)" (p.279), although they recognise that the methods of delivery may also fall under the domain of pedagogy. Boitshwarelo and Vermuri (2017) argue that greater clarity is needed in the relationship between pedagogy and curriculum to address issues of quality in teaching and learning and to avoid what they term the "disconnects between curriculum goals and pedagogical approaches" (p. 278). In their view there are few suitable frameworks for addressing and considering the link between the two.

Leafgren, DeBenedictis, Keller and Kesson (2004) also explore the interrelationship between pedagogy and curriculum asserting "unless pedagogical decision-making is random, chaotic and without purpose, it must emerge from and be evaluated, either implicitly or explicitly against some vision of curriculum" (p. 83). It could be argued that such a contention is somewhat obvious. However, as Leafgren et al. and Boitshwarelo and Vermuri are at pains to point out, such interconnectedness is not fully appreciated and/or

realised. Leafgren et al. (2004) elaborate that if we were to have ‘better curriculum theory’ (p.83) this would lead to better pedagogy and therefore better teaching if, “the relationship between those elements is nurtured” (p. 83).

In my view, one of the most useful contributions to the debate on the alignment or link between pedagogy and curriculum has been made by Jančec and Lepičnik Vodopivec (2019) who contend that given today’s postmodern societies there exists to an even greater degree the “implicit pedagogies” (p. 41) of educators and programme “hidden curriculums” (p.41). They define implicit pedagogy as:

individual conception of education shaped under one’s personal experience, value system, and attitudes in which one believes and can be in discrepancy with the explicit, official pedagogy presented by prescribed pedagogical attitudes... Between these two pedagogies there is never complete harmony and concordance” (p. 42).

What is most relevant is that they go on to contend that these implicit and often hidden pedagogies contribute “to the phenomenon of the hidden curriculum... [and] in many ways appear to be more effective than the published manifest curriculum” (p. 42).

These authors urge greater meaning to be given to the “hidden curriculum” (p. 42) suggesting it “offers numerous pedagogical answers” (p. 42). For the present study, the work of Jančec and Lepičnik Vodopivec (2019) offers to not only give greater credence to the sharing of pedagogies in order to develop curriculum but also the suggestion that pedagogy and curriculum may in fact be less distinct from one another than previously thought.

Concluding thoughts from the literature

Taking up a hermeneutic approach to the vast body of work on pedagogy has allowed me to form a picture of the complex field contemporarily and provided critical understandings that have determined the shape and outcomes of this study. This review has shown that whilst there is a predominance of publications on specific pedagogical approaches in counsellor education, and on the contemporary global influences shaping pedagogy, there is also concern that greater attention needs to be given to broader aspects of pedagogy. There is also a clear shift in recent decades towards a more ontic vs epistemic conception of pedagogy. The most substantial body of work in this regard is that of Whitehead where pedagogy is viewed in terms of educators’ living educational theories (Whitehead, 1999, 2018). From this perspective, pedagogy is produced and constructed from lived accounts of teaching practice rather than as an existing predetermined set of propositions. This review has also highlighted that pedagogical reflection and development, whilst often times conducted in collaborative contexts, has largely remained for the purposes of individual educator development. Only recently does there appear to be a

recognition of the potential gains from collectively considering pedagogy towards a shared goal (Cowan, George & Pinheiro-Torres, 2004; Hyun, 2006). However there appears within this a somewhat naïve assumption that pedagogy is somewhat unanimous and straightforward in teaching teams, and therefore could be easily aligned. Jančec and Vodopivec's (2019) recent publication on implicit pedagogies and hidden curriculum suggests that there is a need for greater research into the relationship between such concepts.

In summary, the review found no publications that specifically focused on how counselling educators might collectively share and understand pedagogies, and how this might relate to curriculum development. The present study hence seeks to understand how diverse and multiple pedagogies in a contemporary teaching team can be accessed, shared, and harnessed in the interest of the shared pursuit of teaching a counselling education programme in Aotearoa New Zealand.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This research drew on an Appreciative Inquiry (AI) (Cooperrider & Srivastava, 1987) methodology that sits under the broad umbrella of Participatory Research (PR) (Freire, 1973; Higginbottom & Liamputtong, 2015; McTaggart, 1997). This methodological choice was the culmination of three key considerations. Firstly, finding a fit for the research question. Secondly, fulfilling my participatory aspirations to engage in a collective endeavour. Thirdly, selecting a methodology that was relevant and manageable for my teaching colleagues as prospective research participants.

The chapter shows the relevance of PR for the investigation of pedagogy in a team context. It also highlights the link between participatory research methodologies, predicated on processes of inclusivity and co-operation, and my aspirations to undertake a project with these participatory values at its core. There are a range of research approaches available under the umbrella of participatory research for example, Participatory Action Research (PAR), (Reason & Bradbury, 2001), Co-operative inquiry (Heron, 1996) and Appreciative Inquiry (AI) (Cooperrider & Srivastava, 1987), etc.

This chapter describes the selection of AI for this research, its features, and its relevance for our team. AI is known for its ability to be employed differently within a broad range of contexts whilst retaining integrity with the core philosophical underpinnings (van der Haar & Hosking, 2004). This flexibility allowed our teaching team to forge a process suited to individual's available time and the required time frames for this doctorate.

AI is also recognised as being shaped by “the “thought style” of the narrator” (van der Haar & Hosking, 2004, p.1024). This chapter discusses my thought style forged from an involvement in the counselling profession over three decades. In this regard, my commitments to phenomenological and interpretative philosophical underpinnings and dialogical theory (Brown, 2015; Buber, 1958) are key influences brought to this appreciative inquiry.

Participatory Aspirations

A commitment to participatory ideals was a strong determinant in my embarking on research that involved engaging others in a discovery. Participatory research (PR) (Freire, 1973; Higginbottom & Liamputtong, 2015; Mc Taggart, 1997) is described in the literature as an umbrella term for a “school of approaches that share a philosophy of inclusivity” (Cargo & Mercer cited in Higginbottom & Liamputtong, 2015, p.3), and at their core involve processes of co-construction, where knowledge construction is a co-operative and participatory endeavour (Higginbottom & Liamputtong, 2017).

Participatory endeavours have featured strongly over my professional career in research as well as teaching practice. Counsellor education by its very nature, is a co-operative venture which is almost always delivered by teams of counsellor educators maximising the group as the context

for learning (Faris & van Ooijen, 2011). My involvement in counselling programmes has therefore, always seen me as a team player committed to (and convinced of) what can be achieved when a teaching team is working together at its best. The simple maxim that *the whole is greater than the sum of the parts*, (Aristotle, 384 BC - 322 BC) has been a lived reality time and again in my context of teaching.

From decades of involvement in tertiary institutions, I had also reached a firm belief that to achieve any significant degree of change within these systems requires the efforts of a collective. Questioning whether this belief was merely a cynical response to a feeling that my individual capacity for influence had increasingly become limited, I was reassured by Reason and Bradbury's (2001)'s assertion that we are in a zeitgeist of a call to participation. Although Reason and Bradbury were referring particularly to the field of research, I believe their comments have relevance for higher education. They wrote:

Action research is a participatory, democratic process concerned with developing practical knowing in the pursuit of worthwhile human purposes, grounded in a participatory worldview which we believe is emerging at this historical moment. It seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their communities. (Reason & Bradbury, p. 1)

Realising that my pull towards participatory endeavours was indicative of a broader trend or "spirit of the times", this confirmed my methodological choice. It also strengthened my resolve that the research question itself, seeking to move pedagogical consideration from an individual endeavour into the collective domain, was timely.

Tenets of Participatory Research (PR)

A central feature of PR is the view that knowledge is developed through cooperative processes. Further that this knowledge is not only co-constructed between individuals but embedded in the lived experiences of those involved. Therefore, participants in PR are viewed as *experiencing* individuals (Borg, Karlsson, Kim & McCormack, 2012), which by definition places them as co-researchers in the research process.

Drawing from these ideas the intent of this study was to engage my colleagues as co-researchers. Knowing my teaching colleagues were enthusiastic to be involved, I was also aware that I would be gaining a doctorate from the research and wanted to ensure there was genuine transparency regarding this. Managing this tension between my very genuine participatory aspirations with my personal gain, Higginbottom and Liamputtong (2015) offered a helpful way to consider this. These authors wrote that PR research needs to "have a meaningful and translational impact" (p. 4) for those involved. In respect to being meaningful for my teaching

colleagues, researching our teaching together had often been mooted as a desire during team meetings. It had also been encouraged by the NZQA Accreditation Panel (2015) when approving Paetahi Tumu Kōrero, the new bicultural counselling degree (Chapter 1). In this regard, I sought to dovetail my own interests with what had been expressed in these moments. A repeated theme from these conversations had the desire to conduct research to ensure that what we had successfully achieved so far as a teaching team was not lost. It was established therefore, that there was shared interest in the aims I put forward for our inquiry, and that given pressures on the team, as the doctoral researcher, I would hold the bulk share of planning, organisation, structuring, and writing.

Appreciative Inquiry (AI)

There are a range of PR approaches that we could have taken up as a teaching team investigating pedagogy collectively. Appreciative Inquiry (AI) was most suited given it allowed for the level of involvement that the team could realistically manage. Furthermore, its philosophical underpinnings of generativity were a much-needed hopeful focus for our inquiry, at a time when team morale was low.

Origins of AI

AI is difficult to define and categorise in simple terms. Van der Haar and Hosking describe the range of ways it has been defined including as “an organisational tool...a theory of organising...a theory-independent method...a world view or paradigm (2004, p. 1024). A common distinction that is often made, and missing in van der Haar and Hosking’s description, is between AI used in the field of organisational development, and appreciative inquiry as a research methodology.

AI as a PR methodology is commonly associated with Action Research (AR) which was originated by Lewin (1946). AR and AI share commonalities of being closely linked with organisational development and being focused on change orientated processes. However, AR and AI are also acknowledged to have key philosophical differences and practices. The former has a strong focus on a specific problem(s) within an organisation or team which through research, AR seeks to understand and address. In contrast AI researchers consider AR to be overly problem-based and seek to research from the starting place of what it is that is working well.

AR and AI share a focus on being interactive and tending to an iterative process focused on action and reflection (Egan & Lancaster, 2005). However, where cycles of action and reflection are integral to AR, for AI this is not essential. In this regard, for our teaching team that was experiencing heavy workloads, committing to an open-ended and repetitive cyclical process in AR felt overwhelming and unmanageable. By contrast, AI with its adaptable design (van der Haar & Hosking, 2004) was suited to our available time and felt inviting.

AI was originated by David Cooperrider when completing his PhD in organizational dynamics (1985). His approach to organisational development deviated from the traditional problem-focussed approaches that dominated organisational development and instead he based his thesis on asking people questions in organisations about what they valued and their achievements. Reed (2007) writes of these beginnings, “the basic idea of asking questions that were *appreciative* had been born’ (p.22). In its early years of AI, much attention was given to the *positive core* of organisations, with attention focused not on an organisation’s problems but to accounts of its positive core, with “positive core analysis at the heart of positive change” (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005, p.11). Mapping and mobilizing this positive core was central to AI, encompassing all that is life enhancing in an organisation including its: collective strengths, organisational wisdom, collective aspirations (Cooperrider and Whitney, 2005) etc. This attention in AI to what is working well rather than a problem-focus was suited to our teaching team given our expressed desire to research what had been working well to date in our teaching of the programme.

AI and generativity – a contemporary influence

This focus in the formative years of AI on positivity, the positive core, and positive psychology has come under much scrutiny (Fitzgerald & Oliver, 2012). Considerable criticism has been levelled at what was perceived as AI creating a dichotomy between things being considered either positive or negative, with the criticism that such a distinction is both impossible and/or at the least limiting. Critique has also focused extensively on AI and the “shadow work” of organisations (Onyett & Hill, 2012, p.17). Critics advocate that an organisation’s shadow, similar to a human being’s shadow (Jung, 1947), holds much repressed and or denied material that is rich for working with, in the process of change and development. They argue this is at risk of being lost in AI through “a norm of positivity” (Onyett & Hill, 2012, p. 18). Further criticism has also been levelled at the positivity focus of AI failing to address significant possible distress and hurt amongst an organisation’s members. With the multiplicity of positions held within organisations, Bushe (2010) points out that what is positive for one group may not be positive for another, and worse still what is positive for one group may be at the expense of another and may ignore structural inequalities and power dynamics.

More recently, Bushe (2013) offers what I would consider to be one of the most helpful contributions to such concerns. Bushe clarifies the importance to AI of positivity and more recently *generativity*, which he highlights has become more “apparent and accepted” (p. 90). Bushe asserts that he views both positivity and generativity as fairly independent characteristics of AI. He argues that positivity whilst important, “is not sufficient for transformational change but that generativity is a key change lever in cases of transformational change” (p.90). Bushe (2013) observes “there remains much to be done to understand what generativity is, the interplay of generativity and positivity in appreciative inquiry, and the processes by which AI

enhances generativity” (p.90), however the importance of generativity to AI he contends “has become more apparent and accepted” (p. 90).

Bringing a more contemporary view, Zandee (2013) like Bushe (2013), draws attention to the generativity of AI. She reports how Cooperrider and Srivastva, the originators of AI, have continued to develop AI and “answered Gergen’s [1978, 1994] call for generative theorizing” (Zandee, 2013, p.70). In Cooperrider and Whitney (2005) this generativity underpinning is evident:

[AI] is a radically affirmative approach to change that completely lets go of problem-based management...as a paradigm of conscious evolution geared for the realities of a new century; as the most important advance in action research in the past decade; as offspring and heir to Maslow’s vision of a positive social science; and as a methodology that takes the idea of the social construction of reality to its extreme, especially with its emphasis on metaphor and narrative, relational ways of knowing, on language, and on its potential as a source of generative theory. (p. 15)

As detailed in Chapter 1, it was this generative nature of AI, not positivity that drew me most to this methodology. For our teaching team facing significant restructure change and loss, my intention was to offer a research process that would connect the team with the peak of what we were achieving and that could generate hope. Significant also, was AI’s focus on tapping into growth potential and the life-giving momentum for change (Avital, Cooperrider, Zandee, Godwin, & Boland, 2013) that resonated with my own belief that momentum for change lies in accessing our human capacity for self-actualising (Rogers, 1961), a view embedded from three decades working as a professional counsellor.

A further pull to AI was my conviction that generative and hopeful endeavours are much needed in contemporary times. Avital et al. speak to this call to generative endeavours:

Nowadays, the term generativity refers not only to a crucial trajectory in adult development but also to a fork in the road faced by many different fields of endeavour. For instance, in contemporary human science, this concept is coming to signify the enormously important constructionist call to generative theory that challenges the status quo and opens the world to new possibilities. (2013, p xii)

AI and transformational change

Interestingly, Bushe (2013) incorporates the theory of generativity into an even broader view of change in transformational terms, offering what I would consider to be one of the most comprehensive explanations of how AI achieves change. Bushe advocated there are three transformational change levers underlying AI: generativity, changes in narratives and discourses, and emergent change (2013, p. 110). With respect to generativity, Bushe draws on the seminal works of Gergen (1978) and Schön (1979) who both define generativity capacity as “how we come to see things in new ways” (Schön cited in Bushe, 2013, p. 91). Bushe contends that rather than attempting to explain the past, the emphasis by AI originators Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) was on the “generative creation of new ideas, perceptions, metaphors, images

and theories that furnished better alternatives” (Bushe, 2013, p.91). Bushe also noticed how this birth of new narratives came about when a group generates or is given ways of experiencing and or perceiving their organisation or work differently. He wrote “the ongoing narrative is altered by new images and ideas and sometimes important new relationships are built among the people who participate” (Bushe, 2013, p. 105). He stresses the emphasis on surfacing “values and aspirations that enliven the system” (p.105) and shape the images that point towards a better future. A more recent development in Bushe’s thinking is the third lever in transformational change, emergent change. He observed how this can be seen occurring in AI when there is a preparedness by people to let go of how they are currently doing things, or think things should be done, and instead there is a “collapse of coherence...increasing the odds of a group of people reorganizing at a higher level of complexity” (2013, p. 108).

Bushe offers considerable depth of explanation concerning these processes of transformational change that occur in AI. In this regard, his explanations were some of the most fitting for what I was observing taking place in our inquiry process. These are given much greater attention in the analysis section of this research in Chapter 6 and 7.

Generative processes of relating in AI

A further contemporary influence in the field of AI is Zandee’s (2013) five dimensions of generativity. Similar to Bushe, Zandee (2013) draws on Gergen’s (1978) *generative processes of relating* focusing on the nature of interchanges that take place in an inquiry in order to enable generativity to take place. Zandee’s framework comprises five dimensions to inquiries that enable this generativity: inquiry as meeting, inquiry into small things, inquiry as valuing, inquiry as liberating play, and inquiry as adventure.

For this research, I took up Zandee’s (2013) five dimensions of generativity as an underpinning stance in my facilitation of our appreciative inquiry. I also analysed what actually took place in our collective ways of relating from the viewpoint of these five dimensions. I choose Zandee’s framework in preference to the more common AI five principles, constructionist, simultaneity, anticipatory, poetic and positivity (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005, p. 41). In my view, Zandee’s five dimensions framework reflects the shifts that have occurred in AI research from its early focus on positivity to the more contemporary focus on generativity. Not surprising, given that Cooperrider and Whitney developed their five principles framework during this early period where the focus on positivity was central.

Zandee’s (2013) five dimensions framework therefore, informed the design of our AI process. Three of Zandee’s dimensions were particularly influential inquiry as meeting, inquiry into the small things and inquiry as valuing. To discover Zandee’s framework that applied these in the context of AI gave me permission to facilitate some of the most important foundations of my professional counselling and teaching practice within this study.

In particular, the dimension of inquiry as meeting, where Zandee (2013) draws on Buber's (1958) dialogical theory of I-thou relating and genuine dialogue is central to my way of being in counselling. Zandee describes how "inquiry as meeting invites a more intuitive and embodied approach that stimulates knowledge creation through connection... [involving] the intricate dynamics of touching stories and moving dialogue" (p. 77). She believes that that through such dialogue what she terms "new thought for action will occur" (p.84). I-thou relating, genuine encounter and dialogue, and the belief that such ways of relating enable the generation of new understanding, are foundational to my practice as a counsellor and teacher. Zandee's framework showed me how these might be applied in AI.

The second dimension that held resonance was inquiry into small things. In this dimension, Zandee advocated attending to "budding stories and the silenced voices to bring out what is meaningful in them... [and to attend to the] edge of our named existence" (2013, p.78). In our appreciative inquiry in-depth reflection focused on very specific moments of teaching practice to reveal experiences and meanings in pedagogy with the expectation, as Zandee aptly describes, that we would venture beyond the edges of these named experiences into new pedagogical understandings.

The third dimension, inquiry as valuing, was also a crucial stance I took up in relation to our AI. For Zandee, valuing refers to the essence of how we can contribute to the betterment of this world and how research and/or our inquiry can add value. Zandee describes the intent of appreciative inquiry in this regard as "we may create new stories for the world that carry more hopeful images of relatedness" (p. 81). As mentioned, Zandee's work was a significant discovery for me in this research. This comprehensive framework that encapsulates so many of my foundational values within the context of AI methodology, gave me permission to bring into this research my embedded ways of relating and affirmed my view there can be the very profound production of knowledge in and through relationships of this nature.

Personal philosophical influences in this study

Discovering Zandee's application of my deeply held values and beliefs regarding relating and knowledge construction was therefore heartening. Also encouraging, was the commonly held view of AI, that it is a methodology that is not only shaped by its particular context, but by "the "thought style" of the narrator [researcher]" (van der Haar & Hosking, 2004, p 1024). This gave me permission to intentionally bring my own thought style into our AI. My thought style or theoretical influences from a personal philosophical paradigm developed over three decades in the counselling profession include: phenomenological, interpretive, person-centered and experiential, and dialogical influences.

Phenomenological influences

As a counsellor, I have worked largely from relationally orientated approaches particularly person-centered and experiential counselling approaches which have at their core, phenomenological and interpretive processes (Barrett-Lennard, 2005; Mearns & Cooper, 2005; Rogers, 1951, 1961). This drew me to research methodologies that resonated with, and/or like AI, could incorporate these same phenomenological and interpretive underpinnings.

Barrett-Lennard (2007) writing of relationally-orientated counselling draws on the seminal work of Rogers (1951), considered to be the originator of person-centered counselling. Roger's contended that the baseline of the counselling relationship was that the therapist and client need to be in psychological contact and present to the experiential field of each other. Barrett-Lennard (2007) taking this up more contemporarily wrote:

...the therapist needs to be inwardly at ease and congruent at least *within the relationship with the client*. This congruence permits a genuine quality of presence and full availability for experiential connection. (p.128)

Barrett-Lennard elaborates that through deep connectivity to the client's experiencing (or phenomenon), if communicated to them in a way they can become aware, and in conjunction with acceptance, the client can become more open to self-related experience, more self-accepting and, more self-congruent. Relatedly, Mearns' (2003) concept of meeting at relational depth, defined as an "extraordinary depth of human contact" (p 5), is often considered to distinguish the person-centered school of therapy from others. In a similar vein, Cooper and Bohart (2013) wrote "the relationship is the therapy, and it is through a deep and enduring level of connectedness with the therapist that the client is seen as being able to come to re-connect with self and others" (p. 11).

Why such a depth of relational practice is considered imperative for therapeutic healing requires an understanding of the ontological underpinnings of relationally-orientated counselling approaches regarding what it is to be human. Cooper and Bohart (2013) observed that for Roger's (1951, 1961), humankind were experiential beings, and subjective experiencing is "the very essence of our existence" (Cooper & Bohart, 2013, p. 103); Roger's (1951) also believed that we have one basic innate tendency to strive to self-actualise this experiencing being. Rogers (1961) central premise, and to which I hold, is that growing up we develop at a time when we are very dependent on significant others for acceptance and valuing, and construct self-configurations (Mearns & Thorne, 2007) concerning how we perceive ourselves in relation to the conditions of worth placed on us by others. Often, in order to meet the conditions of worth of others for acceptance, and/or in self-preserving ways in the case of a lack of acceptance, we construct self-configurations that are at odds with our innate experiential being (Rogers, 1961). Over time, and what can take us through the door into counselling, is that there

can become an intolerable incongruence between our present felt experience and our self-configurations that we have developed to adapt to others. Huge distress can result from a sense of being disconnected from oneself, from others, and /or in existential terms from “being in this world”. In person-centered and experiential therapy to be fully functioning (Rogers, 1951, 1961) is the capacity for full openness to experience, a willingness to process experiences, the capacity to connect with one’s innate being, and to live fully in each moment. Empleton Tudor, Keemar, Tudor, Valentine and Worrall consider that a person who engages in effective therapy for long enough and achieves this, could be described as “living phenomenologically” (2004, p. 19).

Person-centered and experiential therapies have at their core therefore phenomenological processes “to elicit the client’s world as they experience it” (Strasser, 2015, p. 101). It is not surprising given my decades of involvement in person-centered and experiential counselling that I would be drawn to research methodologies that value these processes, that hold an underpinning ontological position of relativism and subjectivity and that believe that knowledge is embedded in the phenomenon of individuals lived experiences. However, although there are significant and useful parallels between person-centered and experiential therapies and phenomenology, the relationship between the two is not entirely straightforward. Cooper and Bohart (2013) point out that Roger’s himself gave little evidence that he was influenced by Husserl or Post-Husserlian phenomenologists. They also point out that phenomenologists would not agree with Roger’s notion of the actualising tendency but rather in their view “would strive to bracket this along with all other assumptions” (Cooper & Bohart, 2013, p. 106). Similarly, whilst both emphasise the experiential nature of humankind, what is meant by “experience” and what is considered available to awareness, they also contend is not a simplistic one, in either in Rogerian terms, or in the world of phenomenology. Understanding these nuances of phenomenology and experiential processes therefore remains an ongoing journey of exploration in relation to this research, and in my teaching and counselling practices.

Interpretive influences

The nature and level of interpretation is a key consideration in any research and one to which I gave a lot of thought in this study. Similar to phenomenological processes, interpretive processes are an integral part of counselling and I sought to work out how my familiarity with these interpretive processes in counselling might translate into the research domain and to this study.

In addition to phenomenological processes, Strasser (2015) addresses the place of interpretation within counselling “we are always interpreting the objects and events of the world from our own unique perspective. Hence, one event perceived by multiple bystanders can have the equivalent number of interpretations” (p. 101). In my approach to counselling, I hold the view that to be truly appreciative of another person we need to not only connect to and facilitate their experiencing, we also need to grasp how a person is perceiving, understanding and interpreting

their experience for themselves. Strasser (2015) advocates that this bracketing of our own assumptions and interpretations is the first step in this therapeutic process. The degree to which counsellors hold strictly to not offering an interpretation to a client does however vary considerably amongst the family of person-centered and experiential approaches. Warner (2000) suggests five levels of interventiveness amongst such approaches from level 1, where the therapist brings nothing from outside the client's frame of reference to level 5 to where the therapist unbeknown to the client is bringing material and influencing the direction of the therapy. Levels 1-3, Warner describes as characteristic of therapists who hold more strongly to a non-directive intention and who hold paramountcy with the self-actualising tendency (Rogers, 1951). My own practice, according to Warner's (2000) five levels of interventiveness would sit somewhere between level three where "the therapist brings material into the relationship in ways that foster the client's choice over whether and how to use as to how they can use this" and level four, "where the therapist brings material into the relationship from their own frame of reference and from a position of expertise" (Sanders, 2013, p. 49). The person-centered and experiential approach that most significantly informs my own practice, process-experiential psychotherapy also termed emotion-focused therapy, Sanders describes as "self-consciously at level 4" (p. 57).

With respect to AI, interpretive underpinnings fit well. At the heart of AI is a desire to discover the meaning held by participants by understanding a situation from within (Stowell, 2013). Scotland (2012) explained that for research with interpretative underpinnings "truth is a consensus formed by co-constructors and therefore knowledge has the trait of being culturally derived and historically situated" (p. 12). In this research I was interested in the diverse meanings for our participants and the meaning that would be constructed between us. As a doctoral researcher there was also a further level of interpretation and meaning making that I brought to bear on the transcripts of our recorded conversations after its completion. Holding the meanings for my participants in conjunction with my own interpretations, is a familiar position I navigate as a counsellor in relation to offering an interpretation of meaning to clients, alongside the meaning they make for themselves.

Dialogic influences

A further theoretical influence that I have brought to this research is dialogic theory (Buber, 1958; Brown, 2015). As discussed above, I strongly identified with Zandee's (2013) belief that foundational to generativity in AI is the dimension of inquiry as meeting. For myself, I understood this in terms of Buber's (1958) authentic relationship and the I-thou encounter and sought to facilitate processes of relating that achieve an encounter of this nature in our appreciative inquiry.

The ideas of the I-thou relationship (Buber, 1958) was a concept available to me since my early counsellor training in the 1980s. However, in these early years, the authentic I-thou relationship,

characterised by Rogers (1961) core therapeutic conditions, largely viewed change as centered in a person's individual psychology. In recent decades, a substantive shift has taken place amongst some person-centered and experiential approaches (Sanders, 2013) to considering change in intersubjective terms, influenced by Buber's (1958) dialogic philosophy. From this intersubjective viewpoint "the human change process consists entirely in the co-constructed intersubjective relationship between the helper and the person" (Sanders, 2013, p. 57), rather than change only occurring within an individual's subjectivity. Hermans, Hermans and Lyddon (2006) describe this as a shift towards a *more dialogic-self* and to *dialogic encounter*. A position they consider has been taken up more recently and extensively in western psychology. They write "In contrast to singular, bounded and decontextualized conceptions of self that have permeated so much of the psychological literature, the self is increasingly regarded as multidimensional, relational, and inextricably 'connected' to social, political, and cultural context" (p. 1). Hermans, Hermans and Lyddon credit postmodernism for its challenge to modernist notions of an essential self to self as multiplicitous (Gergen, 1991).

Considering the nature of self and the way in which relational encounters take place whilst potentially somewhat complex, has been important in this research that is relying on the interactions between participants in the creation of knowledge. In this respect, dialogical theory has provided a lens to contemplate the kind of dialogue that is required for co-operative processes of knowledge construction. From a dialogical view, the self is capable of two kinds of movements, centralising and decentralising. Hermans and Hermans-Konopka (2010) considered it possible to hold both a substantial self and also a multiplicitous self that can be subject to a multiplicity of changing positions experienced in others and can integrate such diversity within a degree of stability and continuity of self. Hermans and Hermans-Konopka (2010) argued that a well-developed dialogical self is "not only the alterity of the positions of the actual other appreciated, but so also are the positions in the internal and external domains of the self" (p. 108). Brown (2015) also believes this capacity of the dialogic self is required for research that seeks the site of knowledge creating in the dialogic encounters of participants. She contends that dialogical moments may occur in the research conversations where "deep calls unto deep" (Buber, cited in Brown, 2015, p.198) and that the dialogical is the source of knowing.

Dialogical understanding was significant in the design of the processes of relating for this appreciative inquiry in order to facilitate an encounter that would allow us to explore pedagogy from a collective viewpoint and lead us into unknown territory. I also aligned to Brown (2015) view that in dialogical research intersubjectivity is privileged in analysis before the consideration of subjective experience or theoretical knowledge. The implications of this viewpoint for the analysis carried out in this study is considered in Chapter 4.

Concluding thoughts...

Appreciative inquiry has proven a versatile and flexible methodological choice for this research. This chapter has outlined AI's fit for our teaching team that has allowed them to become co-researchers in participatory research yet engage at a level that was manageable. Although this flexibility was an important factor in selecting AI from a range of methodologies within participatory research, it was perhaps the enlivening spirit of AI that drew us towards it as a team.

The capacity of AI to be shaped by my particular phenomenological, interpretive and dialogic philosophical commitments has been also been described in this chapter on methodology. The next chapter details the specific format and structure of our inquiry informed by these positions. This inquiry was intentionally facilitated by myself as doctoral researcher, jointly negotiated and shaped with my team, and in many respects unfolded with organic momentum.

CHAPTER 4: METHOD

This study sits within the umbrella of participatory research (PR) and as the previous chapter identified takes up an appreciative inquiry (AI) approach, a methodology that lends itself to being shaped both by the local context, and the philosophical commitments, or “thought style” (van der Haar & Hosking, 2004, p. 1024) of the researcher.

In this study, my teaching colleagues and I shaped an appreciative inquiry for which we had energy and enthusiasm and was also manageable given workload pressures. This chapter sets out this unique design which involved three phases: one-to-one interviews followed by two focus groups. These three phases will then be described in turn including: the design, the format and, the method of data analysis used. Throughout these descriptions the influence of my personal commitments to phenomenological, interpretive and dialogical theoretical traditions (as outlined in Chapter 3), can be seen.

Our particular AI design

AI emerged as the preferred methodology for this study after negotiation with my teaching team colleagues. The methodology that I had originally considered for this research was a participatory action research (PAR) process with “appreciating” as a tenet (Participant Information Sheet, Appendix C). However, as discussed in Chapter 3, AI with its greater flexibility in design and generative focus was considered more suitable for us. This change from PAR to AI was accepted given that it was in keeping with the ethical approval that had already been granted by AUTECH for a participatory study.

AI is well known for its particular 4D format; discover, dream, design, destiny (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). However, AI is also celebrated for its adaptability to context and to the needs of the people involved (Ludema & Fry, 2008; Reed, 2007; Van der Haar and Hosking, 2004). Van der Haar and Hosking (2004) propose that one of the reasons for AI’s adaptability is its constructionist underpinnings, where knowledge is constructed through relational processes, which means that by necessity, it is an emergent process. For Barge and Oliver (2003), it is the “spirit” of AI that lies at its heart and to its success, and which therefore demands flexibility, and avoids it being merely a technical process.

This sense of attuning to the “spirit” of our appreciative inquiry was present very early on in the design of the appreciative inquiry in this study. My three teaching colleagues and I met together, I explained the methodology of appreciative inquiry (Preliminary Ideas for Teaching Team, Appendix D) and we co-designed a format for our inquiry for which we had energy and enthusiasm. This comprised a three-phase inquiry process including one-to-one interviews, to

prepare individually in preparation for coming together, followed by two focus groups. The match between our inquiry and the characteristic 4D model is as follows:

Our AI Process	Characteristic 4 D Cycle of AI. (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005)
Phase 1: One-to-one interviews	Stage 1: Discover
Phase 2: Focus group one	Stage 1: Discover (continued)
	Stage 2: Dream
Phase 3: Focus group two	Stage 3: Design
Post Research	Stage 4: Destiny

Our participants

This study involved four research participants including myself as the research lead and participant. Participants were given the Participant Information Sheet (Appendix C) and a Participant Consent Form (Appendix E). My three colleagues chose a pseudonym for the study **Keita, Lucia, Stewart** and I kept my own name, **Janet**. An introduction to the four of us is provided in Chapter 1.

Our three-phase process

Phase 1: One-to-one interviews

The first phase of our appreciative inquiry was a one-to-one interview between myself and my three colleagues. The team decided that Lucia would then take the interviewer role with me to facilitate my own guided reflection.

Design

The one-to-one interviews were based on a Self-reflection guide (Appendix F) that I had given to my colleagues prior to our interviews. As the core of appreciative inquiry is to inquire into what matters most to people therefore at the outset of the guide it stated that its purpose was an “invitation to give voice to what matters to you regarding your teaching and pedagogy” (Self – reflection Guide Appendix F, p.1) and to support the discovery of our pedagogy. Two key ideas influenced the design of the guide: Dewey’s (1938) theory of experience and Argyris and Schön’s (1974) concept of espoused theories and theories-in-use.

Firstly, Dewey’s (1938) theory of experience places experience at the heart of reflection (Craig, 2010), therefore I invited the reflection on experiences in our teaching practice in the guide. Dewey understood thinking and doing to be inextricably linked and that the way to understand what it is that practitioners think is from an “insider-view” of experience (Craig, 2010, p. 191).

Dewey believed that it is only experience characterised by discord, uncertainty, instability and, or experience that was problematic that truly enables reflective thinking to take place. This view of the nature of experience is potentially at odds with the more traditional appreciative inquiry approach where the emphasis was deliberately on positive experiences (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005) rather than problematic ones. However, as discussed in Chapter 3, contemporary proponents of AI find the dichotomy of negative and positive an unhelpful one (Bushe, 2012; Fitzgerald & Oliver, 2012). I share this more contemporary view and believe that what “matters most” to people can be discovered both in optimum experiences and those of a dissonant nature. The latter dissonance experiences are experiences as dissonant precisely because something within the experience contravenes or threatens to contravene what it is of value. My decision therefore was to include both optimum/peak and dissonance experiences in the Self-reflection Guide (Appendix F) in order to give participants two possible experiential in roads into what matters to us in relation to pedagogy.

The Self-reflection Guide invited reflection on a peak experience defined as one *“you would consider as a teaching moment when you had a heightened sense that all you believed in pedagogically was present in what you were doing”* (Self-reflection Guide Appendix F, p.1) and a dissonance teaching experience *“when what you were having to do was difficult or challenging given that it was counter to your pedagogy”* (Self-reflection Guide Appendix E, p. 2).

The second concept informing the design of the Self-reflection Guide was Argyris and Schön’s (1974) two types of theory, espoused theory and theory-in-use. “Espoused theory refers to the worldview and values that people believe guide their behaviors. Theory-in-use refers to the worldview and values reflected in the behaviors that actually drive their actions” (Savaya and Gardner, 2012, p. 1). As Savaya and Gardner (2012) note, Argyris and Schön advocated that for most people theories-in-use are not in their awareness and they are not always the same as their espoused theories. Argyris, Putnam and Smith (1985) Ladder of Inference’s is a framework I used often in teaching counselling students to facilitate their identification of the thinking that is guiding their actions. The questions in the Self-reflection Guide (Appendix F) for this study were structured along similar lines to an inference process. Friedman and Rogers (2008) described the Ladder of Inference as:

The ladder is a metaphor for the reality-constructing process that enables people to trace the mental steps, or inferences, that lead from the bottom of the ladder (concrete, directly observable data such as the exact words spoken, or actions taken) to increasing levels of interpretation (e.g. frames and theory building). (p. 252)

Format

During the one-to-one interview, my role would best be described as a facilitator of my colleagues’ guided reflection. I used familiar skills from my practice as a counsellor in these research conversations namely skills of paraphrasing, reflecting content, clarifying meaning and

understanding, summarising etc. As detailed in Chapter 3, drawing on phenomenological influences, my intention was for each of us to be supported to reflect in depth on our teaching experiences trusting that new understandings of these experiences would be revealed in the process of reflection. I deliberately did not offer my own interpretations or meanings of experiences at this stage, as the purpose of the interviews was for us each to gain greater self-understanding. There were occasions when I shared a resonance with my own experience and/or when expressed dreams and hopes were like my own, however I did not attempt to offer a meaning or interpretation from my own viewpoint.

The one-to-one interviews lasted approximately 90 minutes duration and were audio recorded and transcribed. Copies of each participant's transcript was given to them afterwards to both check for accuracy of meaning, and also to read over in preparation for focus group one.

Analysis

The one-to-one interviews based on in-depth reflection on teaching experiences, focused on the way in which the four participants in our study understood pedagogy as it was revealed through our reflections these experiences. Crowther, Ironside, Spence, and Smythe writing of hermeneutic phenomenology as a methodology state it "provides glimpses of the meanings that reside within human experiences" (2017, p. 826).

These same authors offered a detailed way to go about analysis using a phenomenological approach through crafting stories and working with these. Using Crowther et al.'s, process, I followed three steps as I worked with the one-to-one transcripts:

- 1) Crafting stories staying as close as possibly to "deriving narratives from the transcripts" (Crowther et al., 2017, p. 826).
- 2) From these crafted stories considering the possible understanding and meaning that these held for each person
- 3) As researcher to "attune in a way that opens and [invited me] to work with data in emergent ways" (Crowther et al. 2017, p. 827).

Working hermeneutically, Crowther et al., describe how this process leads to the fusion of horizons (Gadamer, 1976), when the "bridging of personal and historical distance between minds occurs" (Gadamer cited in Crowther et al. 2017, p. 827). This was the criteria I held in mind as I sought to engage with my colleagues' stories, not only capturing their meaning but then attuning to this meaning until there was a sense of the fusion that Gadamer describes (1976) between their meaning, and my own. This was a much-disciplined process that drew on many counselling skills, including attuning to felt meanings (Gendlin, 1981). Chapter 5 presents this hermeneutic phenomenological analysis of the one-to-one conversations.

Phase two: Focus group one

Focus group one was the beginning of the collective part of our AI. Lucia, Keita and I took part in focus group one, as on the morning of the scheduled process Stewart felt unable to attend given an overly heavy workload. We decided to continue given that his workload situation was on-going, and he could not see his way clear for some considerable time. At the end of focus group one, Stewart joined us for kai (lunch), and we briefed him on the morning's group process.

Design

Focus group one was the beginning of our collective discovery. Flor (2005) states that the discovery stage is where participants discover “shared meaning” (p.86) as the first step towards creating collective aspirations and “shared vision” (p.86) in the dream stage. In order to orientate our group to discovering shared meaning and vision I considered Bushe's view of the importance of creating an inquiry space from the outset “that contributes to the group's ability to understand and bring into being its collective aspirations” (2013, p. 104). In this respect, I gave us all the following questions to consider prior to the group:

Preparatory Questions	
1.	What draws your attention in your pedagogical reflection, and why?
2.	What were the life-giving moments for you in your pedagogical practice?
3.	Were there any moments of dissonance for you?
4.	What do you value, celebrate in your pedagogical practice?
5.	What picture of, or sense did you make of your underpinning pedagogical influences?
6.	What has this reflection offered you?

Format

A quiet room was booked a way from our teaching spaces and office space. We settled into together with morning tea and I opened the formal group time with a short quote from a reading that I had sourced that set the intention of the inquiry. The process was divided into two parts.

Part One: Sharing and Appreciating
1. Take turns to share reflections uninterrupted while others listen and jot responses on paper to the following three questions: a. As I am listening to your reflections, stories and accounts, I appreciate the value you place on, your intention, your passion for...

- b. As I listen, the impact for me on my practice, the questions it raises for me are... And/or the generative aspect for me is...
 - c. What this raises regarding our collective teaching is...
2. We each take turns to respond to speaker from our jottings
As we were setting up this process on the morning of the focus group, Keita suggested we add a third step
3. Speaker responds with what this was like to receive the appreciations

I had prepared a list of questions for the second part of the focus group however as we reached the end of part one, I spontaneously offered the following two questions:

Part Two: Pulling together

1. What is standing out in our conversation?
2. What do we “not wish to forget” and want to take forward?

At the conclusion of our group process we stayed together for lunch and Stewart joined us.

Analysis

In the analysis of the transcript of focus group one, I used the same hermeneutical approach (Crowther et al., 2017) that I used for the one-to-one interview transcripts, which involved crafting and engaging with the dialogue in terms of the meaning for participants, followed by bringing my own meaning to fuse with theirs. There were three rounds of sharing pedagogy and appreciating that took place. These crafted excerpts are presented in Appendix G, Charts I- III: Excerpts of Appreciating Dialogue, Focus Group One.

Approaching the analysis of these excerpts of appreciating dialogue I was interested in two questions in respect to my research question regarding how teaching teams most effectively consider pedagogy from a collective viewpoint:

- 1) What was the nature of our way of appreciating in this appreciative inquiry that could be helpful in determining how teams might share with, and appreciate one another, in relation to pedagogy?
- 2) Relatedly, what was the nature of our way of relating more broadly, that then enabled further inquiry and co-constructing to take place with ease? What might this offer teaching teams more broadly with respect to helpful ways of relating in respect to a collective process considering pedagogies?

There was a definite shift in our style of relating (outlined more fully in Chapter 6) midway in focus group one which signalled a shift from the discover to dream stages in AI. From a more reflective process where one person would share and the others reflect and then take turns

to respond, part two suddenly became a high paced interactive dialogue, resonant of a co-constructing conversation. Appendix H, Charts IV-VIII Excerpts of Co-constructing Dialogue Focus Group One, presents these interactions during which five images for the future were built.

The analysis of focus group one used both a dialogical theoretical lens (Buber, 1958, Brown, 2015, Zandee, 2013) and a relational constructionist perspective (van der Haar & Hosking, 2004) present in contemporary AI literature. Using these frameworks, I sought to identify specific relational processes that were useful in our inquiry as we embarked on our collective consideration of pedagogy that could be recommended to teaching teams wishing to undertake similar collective explorations.

Phase three: Focus group two

Focus group two was the third phase in our appreciative inquiry that corresponded to the design stage characteristic of AI (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). Stewart who had been unable to attend focus group one came for the latter half of this second focus group.

Design

In preparation for focus group two I gave each of us the transcript of focus group one to read. I also provided a book of sixteen readings on a vast range of counsellor education and higher education pedagogies (Appendix I, Book of Readings on Pedagogy). As outlined in Chapter 4, I had held off from giving us the readings until it seemed appropriate timing to make a connection with the formal body of literature on pedagogical theories. This was to avoid the possibility of settling for a discussion of our espoused theories (Argyris and Schön's (1974) that may have been encouraged through accessing the readings, rather than first identifying our theories-in-use. On reflection this appeared well timed.

Format

At the start of focus group two I set out the intent of the design stage:

Our next stage in AI they call the design stage. I was reading Bushe's [2011] work where he speaks about focusing on "our hoped- for future together", which I like. The same article also talks about "commitments that we want to make going forward" rather than goal setting and planning which sometimes gets into that old problem-solving way of thinking. So, I like both of these frames. (Janet)

In addition, I reiterated the questions I had given us in preparation for focus group two.

- 1) *What are you drawn to in the transcripts and/or readings?*
- 2) *What is our hoped-for future for us collectively?*
- 3) *What would we like to commit to as ways forward? (Janet)*

Keita, Lucia and I agreed that we would take turns to speak firstly to 1) and 2) leaving 3) until later in the morning when we felt we were sufficiently clear as to any commitments we wished to make.

Analysis

For my analysis of focus group two, AI frameworks were utilised to consider how this phase of our inquiry resembled the stages characteristic of AI. In particular the work of Bushe (2013), Carter (2006), Cooperrider and Whitney (2005) and Moody, Horton-Deutsch, and Pesut (2007) offered an analysis to be made of the way in which we could be seen to “converge” and began designing realistic future commitments for ourselves as a team. This analysis highlighted the way in which at this stage of our AI our pedagogical reflections began translating into possible future programme and curriculum developments. Insights from the analysis of this phase of our inquiry were aimed at discovering more broadly how teaching teams might utilise a collective process in relation to pedagogies to impact programme development.

Ethical considerations for the study

Engaging my teaching team colleagues in a collective process required thoughtful consideration of the duality present during this time in our relationship as co-teachers to research participants. At the outset of the study, to ensure my colleagues felt able to opt out of the taking part the Research Leader at Wintec handled the consent process and was available. Similarly, my colleagues had direct access to my AUT doctoral supervisors should they wish to contact them to discuss any aspect of the study at any time.

It was decided by all participants that they wished to use a pseudonym, and in addition that given the possibilities of still be identified given the small community of counsellor educators in Aotearoa New Zealand, that all transcripts would be checked by participants to ensure consent was given to use any dialogue.

The workload pressures as a result of recent restructuring and job losses were a constant backdrop during this research requiring care in the expectations that this research placed on my colleagues, and the way in which any conversations pertaining to this were reported in this study. The ability of my colleagues to negotiate these realities is a testament to their experience, openness, and professionalism.

Concluding thoughts...

This chapter has set out our unique three phase design of AI that corresponded very clearly with the characteristic 4D stages of AI in more traditional approaches. The design and format of each phase has been detailed describing the way in which I facilitated AI processes, the preferences of my teaching team colleagues in implementing these, and the organic nature of such an inquiry that produces something very unique and emergent. Woven through this inquiry are also the influences of my embedded person-centered and experiential ways of working as a counsellor and educator that in turn are underpinned by my phenomenological, interpretive and

dialogic philosophical commitments. This chapter shows how these influenced both the design and format of the inquiry and more explicitly in the lens of analysis used in working with the transcripts at each phase.

CHAPTER 5: PEDAGOGY REVEALED

This chapter focuses on the findings of the first phase of our appreciative inquiry which involved one-to-one interviews reflecting on our individual pedagogies. The intention of the one-to-one interviews was to gain a clear picture of how the educators involved in this research *individually* view pedagogy in order to both determine how pedagogy is understood, and what would be most helpful for individual educators to prepare to engage in collective considerations of pedagogy.

This chapter presents an analysis of the transcripts of the one-to-one interviews with the four members of the Paetahi Tumu Kōrero teaching team named with pseudonyms, Keita, Lucia, and Stewart, and myself using my real name, Janet. We each came to these one-to-one interviews with decades of experience and reflectivity in teaching, therefore our interviews were another “moment in time” reflections on the back of many previous reflections on our pedagogies.

Hermeneutic phenomenological analysis (Crowther, Ironside, Spence & Smythe, 2017, p. 827) was used in the analysis of the verbatim transcripts of the one-to-one interviews (see Chapter 4). This involved three stages: deriving narratives and crafting stories from the verbatim transcripts, considering the participants own meaning of the stories and, my own engagement with participant stories to enable further possible meaning to emerge. The crafted stories are italicised throughout this chapter. These are often lengthy accounts as they reveal the way in which pedagogy is understood by participants as a complex interplay of factors, which is best seen in fuller rather than partial and/or fractured accounts.

This chapter reveals marked similarities between all four participants in the way pedagogy is understood and articulated as an interplay of teaching and learning factors rather than as a fixed set of ideas about teaching and learning. Similarly, for all four participants, the continual reference point for our pedagogical practice was our very clear pedagogical goals intricately linked to our broad educational aspirations for students. The stories of our teaching practice and the in-the-moment thinking, decisions and actions also revealed how our pedagogy was firmly predicated on deeply held ontological, relational and epistemological values. At the same time, it became evident that our pedagogical practice was also continuing to be produced and constructed in teaching moments, contingent on the situation at hand. These understandings of pedagogy are discussed in this chapter from the lens of pedagogy as an educators’ living educational theory (Whitehead, 1999) that is ever changing, dynamic and emergent. Similarly, with what are considered ontic as opposed to epistemic conceptual foundations (Wright & van Eck, 2018). Amongst the participants in this study, reference was made to formal pedagogical theories in so much as they helped to explain our educational influences more than as an interest in the pedagogical positions themselves.

Stories of the interplay of teaching and learning

In reflecting on peak pedagogical experiences participants gave descriptions of there being a “sense of the coming together” to the experience. In my own story it was this synergy that drew my attention to the teaching experience that I began my reflection with:

I've chosen a moment from the Rangahau Māori research class last week as it is fresh in my mind. Why I chose this one as it had that sense of synergy, flow and completeness to the whole class. (Janet)

For all participants there was also an awareness that their peak experience was not just about one aspect of their teaching practice but rather the culmination of a number of factors. Present in each of the stories was a description of the interplay of their own pedagogical ideas and practices, the students' engagement with those practices and most significantly the participant's perception that their intentions and aspirations for students' learning had been realised in those moments. My own story reveals this interplay:

I started the class with the students checking in regarding their research question and whether it had changed over the weeks. So that was a nice beginning. I used that to get a sense of how engaged they are in their thinking process; Are they thinking about it? Are they carrying it with them? Is what they are learning about research still alive for them? I was thinking too how I might then link the content of the class for that day to this, trying to figure out what is happening in their processing. I try to do that with a lot of my classes.

I kept it really simple because research can be so complex. I gave them a short piece of writing which talks about the purpose of a literature review. Then we explored what would be useful in terms of undertaking their literature review assignment in relation to finding a 'real' research question relating to their learning for their practice. What was driving me is my strong belief in student's driving their own inquiry that adult learners need to be on board and need to 'want to know'. One student had her articles for her literature review lined up and they were all saying at different points "I've had an 'aha' about my research question". They were having ideas for each other too which was rather lovely. It felt collaborative and it had a synergy of links to practice, links to what is sustaining them in their passion for their practice, links to their particular group of people they are working with and, links to their assessment. What revealed the synergy itself to me was the student's level of personal engagement with their own research idea. (Janet)

In my story, I recognised that the synergy of the teaching session came about through the attention I gave at the outset to determining the students' levels of engagement, interest, and passion for the topic, and to enabling a clear grasp of the concept of a literature review and its relevancy for current their learning and practice. I considered these teaching strategies were significant in bringing about what I witnessed as a high level of enthusiasm amongst the students for shaping their own and other's assignment research questions. This was a realisation of my pedagogical intention and hope that students would drive their own learning inquiry.

The interplay articulated in my story is a weave of: descriptions of my teaching actions such as checking in *what would be useful in terms ...to their learning for their practice*, the ideas

underpinning these actions *students' driving their own inquiry, that adult learners need to be on board and need to want to know* and, the noticing of indicators that the students' were developing enthusiasm *I've had an 'aha' about my research question*. Most evident here is the interdependency of aspects of teaching and learning that speaks to what Brandenburg (2008) writes of pedagogy "Pedagogy, in simple terms in this context, refers to the synergistic relationship which exists between learning and teaching - one informs and is impacted by the other" (p. xii).

In the following participant's story, there is a remarkable similarity to my own in his articulation of the interplay of factors in his peak pedagogical experience:

My peak moment was a couple of weeks ago when I was doing a tutorial for a colleague and they had asked me to talk about cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT). I was talking through the way in which personalities are viewed in CBT and what causes distress. My colleague popped back into the class, sat down and said, "do you mind if I listen?" and organically this conversation happened between this colleague, myself and the rest of the class. It was really good because my colleague challenged me to consider if in CBT terms distress is caused by distorted thinking how might these core beliefs will be fed and influenced by discourses of dominance in society? The level of engagement with the students was great. In fact, we needed more time. They were asking really, really astute questions. Their interest, their ability to personally engage means they are making connections which for me is an indication of learning. This is paramount for me; I could almost say that it is tantamount to applause in some ways. After class, my colleague said, "I hope I wasn't unhelpful". I said, "no actually I really, really enjoyed it because it encourages me to think more critically about what I'm saying, these approaches are not mutually exclusive and in order for me to have a clearer understanding about the positions I come from I need to engage with the different truths that exist". That is what I hope for the students in becoming critical practitioners.
(Stewart)

Here in Stewart's reflection of his peak experience he recognised that the organic nature of the teaching session came about when his colleague came into class and engaged him in a critical reflection on his approach to counselling. Stewart described how this spontaneous debate was an opportunity for him to model to the students a level of critical reflection that he is hoping to see them achieve in their own practice. That they were *asking really, really astute questions* were indicators that the students were not only highly engaged in the discussion, but also that they were making connections for themselves that Stewart considers crucial to learning and becoming *critical practitioners*.

As in my own reflection, Stewart's story resonates with Brandenburg (2008) definition of pedagogy as the synergetic relationship between teaching and learning, and Connor's and Sharar (2016) who advocate that consideration of pedagogy must pay attention to an interplay of factors.

Stewart's and my own reflection show a similarity in the pattern of teaching and learning factors that we identify as being at play. Most striking is the importance we place on the nuances in the

students' behaviour and responses that would suggest our pedagogical aspirations or goals have been realised in the actual session. This would appear a criterion for determining for us that a pedagogical experience is "peak".

Stories of unfolding and emergent pedagogy

In the following excerpt, Lucia captures the unfolding nature of pedagogy during a process of students' sharing with one another in a separate caucus of tangata whenua students (students who identify as Māori, the indigenous people of Aotearoa). These students had been involved with the whole class (both tangata whenua and tangata Tiriti (non- Māori)) the previous day talking about Aotearoa's contentious history of colonialism and oppression, and the implications for developing counsellors. This class was to provide separate space (caucus) for tangata whenua to process this experience from the previous day:

My peak pedagogical moment came when I had the tangata whenua caucus. It came after a very emotive day setting up the module with all the students' together, tangata whenua and tangata Tiriti. For me I am a very process orientated person, so we opened up with a karakia (prayer) and then I wanted to provide some space for us to talk about the previous day's discussion on discourses, and their feelings about the impact of some of the statements that were made during this. That was my goal.

So, I opened up an appreciative inquiry type process, giving each person a space that was wholly theirs, to reflect in any way that they wanted to. What followed was quite spiritual actually. Students took turns to share stories that were very emotive, very courageous, and very vulnerable given that they were sharing stories that they were uncertain how others would react. They were much personalised in their languaging of anger and resentment towards other people and towards themselves, speaking still very much in the first person. Remembering these students were getting to know me, they shared some really personal stuff, trusting I was going to take care of them. It was quite dynamic, quite challenging, quite emotive, and quite reflective all in that moment.

With all that was happening in the room, I was very responsive to where they were at all the while figuring out "Where to from here...? Where to from here...?" Listening to what I was hearing, not intervening and allowing the story to happen, remembering the stories, holding, so that when we'd finished where to from here would become clear to me.

What was lovely was that at the end of the process the students had made a shift themselves- precisely because they didn't have to speak. There'd been the requirement that everyone have space, they had to actually be consciously listening, following the dialogue and acknowledging the emotions of others. I noticed that they were honouring of each other's' differences even if they disagreed – by the end I could see the shift just in the story itself. It reminded me of being in a Māori context on the marae, on the paepae, or speaking platform, where the men get up and take turns to speak and some get really angry, and everyone else is not able to interrupt until it's their turn, and by the time the last speaker gets up there is a sense of calming down around it all. It was so lovely at the end when I felt their energy and felt the "lights going on" around the realisation for themselves that they had not until now been truly seeing the other person. It was just so nice that they could have empathy for the person and see that person differently as a result of the process. (Lucia)

Lucia describes a very clear teaching goal, *to provide some space for us to talk about the previous day's discussion on discourses, and their feelings about the impact of some of the statements that were made during this*, and the very intentional structuring of an appreciative inquiry process *giving each person a space that was wholly theirs, to reflect in any way that they wanted to*. Lucia recognises that this intentionality of structuring enabled her students to risk some very vulnerable processing of the huge impacts of the previous day's class. Lucia recalls her own alertness and responsive to the moment by moment unfolding of what was taking place, all the while being aware of her constant internal dialogue as to what might be needed at the end of the process. Lucia recognises the intensity of remaining with this not yet knowing *Where to from here...? Where to from here...?*

Lucia then recounts her delight in realising (as she knows it can), that the collective "*story itself*" had brought about the shifts she had hoped for the students. Lucia made connections with her knowing of the way shifts towards healing and change that take place through the collective process on the paepae (Māori marae speaking platform), the cultural lens from which she could further frame her experience *It reminded me of being in a Māori context on the marae...by the time the last speaker gets up there is a sense of calming down around it all*.

Lucia's story pays attention to different dimensions of pedagogical practice: the unfolding nature of her pedagogical experience, the emergent nature of her pedagogical practice and, relatedly her internal processing as an educator *I was very responsive to where they were at all the while figuring out*. Lucia's descriptions of her way of being throughout her story of her pedagogical experience have resonance with Elbaz-Luwisch's (2013) notion of "presence...her way of being for *another*" (p. 216). Elbaz-Luwisch defines presence as "responsiveness, calling for (at least) awareness of self, receptivity to others and connectedness to what is going on in the situation at hand" (p.216). Elbaz-Luwisch elaborates that from the viewpoint of presence, teachers make judgements based largely on the unfolding qualities in a situation and not based on predetermined routines and to this end, teachers accept that teaching is unpredictable. Elbaz-Luwisch writes that "teaching deals with ends that are emergent" (2013, p. 217). For Elbaz-Luwisch (2013) a teacher's presence must be open minded and ready to observe what is emerging in students and in the situation. She goes on to state that in her view given presence's responsive and dynamic way, for even a few moments at a time presence can be a major achievement, and "cannot be merely a momentary thing but has to be sustained so that teachers gain access to the qualities of the educational situation" (2013, p. 216). As I interacted with Lucia's crafted story my overriding sense was as Elbaz-Luwisch states, her presence was not something achieved lightly.

As Lucia was recounting the unfolding and emergent process (Elbaz-Luwisch, 2013), Lucia began recalling her internal thought process and/or internal dialogue *While all that was happening in the room....* Schön's concept of reflection –in-action "a reflective conversation

with the situation” (1983, p. 295) seems pertinent here as Lucia captures the way in which she was noticing her own questions, *where to from here?* as the situation was unfolding. In effect conversing with the situation at hand. Of significance in Schön’s work, and indeed Dewey’s, whose theory of inquiry (1933) was influential for Schön, is the way in which uncertain, unexpected, and/or surprising experiences, promote reflective thinking. Dewey (1910) wrote of reflective thinking, it “involves a state of doubt, hesitation, perplexity, mental difficulty in which thinking originates; an act of searching, hunting, inquiring, to find material that will resolve the doubt, settle and dispose of perplexity” (Dewey cited in Downey & Clandinin, 2010, p. 385).

Russell (2018) in clarifying the distinction between critical reflection and Schön’s concepts of reflective practice and reflection-in-action, asserts that reflective practice is not a continuous process rather a response to unexpected or surprising moments that typically trigger a consideration about “tacit practices and their underlying assumptions” (p. 8). For Lucia, it would appear that this experience of significant uncertainty gifted her the chance to reconnect with what she knew that transformative shifts for students can come about through collective processes, such as in this instance the collective storying of experience.

Comparing Lucia’s reflection of her peak pedagogical experience with the earlier reflections by myself and Stewart, there would appear more explicit *reflection-in action* in Lucia’s account. Reasons for this could be varied. Lucia described how *I am a process orientated person*, which could mean that she could be more drawn to noticing and recalling her own process of reflection- in-action than myself or Stewart. An alternative explanation could be found in the underlying premise in Dewey’s theory of inquiry (1933), that it is only in experiences characterised by uncertainty, discord and/or surprise (that give human beings opportunity for problem-solving) do we engage in thinking considered by Dewey, to be truly reflective. Relatively stable situations, such as the experiences in my own and Stewart’s stories, may not in this view have enabled the in-the-moment depth of reflective thought recounted in Keita and Lucia’s stories.

Stories of the relationship of knowledge and pedagogy

Considerable variation exists in the literature as to how we consider, understand, classify and language knowledge related aspects of pedagogy (Brandenburg, 2008; Craig, 2010; LaBoskey & Hamilton, 2010). Keita’s rich reflection on her dissonance experience offers glimpses into the nature of her relationship between knowledge and pedagogy:

It is a moment that occurred in a class that was the first time I had taught that module. They were year one students and of course diversity can be quite a challenging topic. I was new at it; they were new at it. Students were engaging in an exercise that talked about where they were from and as people were sharing, one of the students made a

*comment that implied everyone was basically the same (a Kiwi). Instantly I had a **clunk** moment.*

I glanced around the room. There were some people I guessed may not have considered themselves in this way and had the potential to be marginalised and excluded by the comment. So, in that moment I immediately became aware of the potentially marginalising discourse that “we are all the same”, and my responsibilities as a teacher to address this. I sat with it for a very brief amount of time and drew on a practice that I have developed for when something is said in a public forum like that, and where other people have been spoken for. I said, “I wonder if you might speak for yourself on this because there may be other people who don’t consider themselves to be Kiwis?” I thought I said it really respectfully and thoughtfully, but it wasn’t experienced in that way. It was experienced as a “public telling off by a teacher”. My intention was one thing, but how it was experienced was another.

It was then that I decided to be silent. I decided not to respond further. Of course, I was thinking this wasn’t a telling them off moment, rather my intention had been to raise some awareness of the collective discourse and effects around “speaking on behalf of others”, an invitation to just be a bit more reflexive, I guess. At the same time knowing that I was meeting a dominant individualistic discourse at play in the classroom “I’m being told off I’m bad, I’m wrong, and I’m being singled out publicly and those kinds of things”. I found it really helpful to be able to think about what happened as discourses. I know these are discourses that people are captured by and that they didn’t have the knowledge of these as discourses. I also felt some real sadness that I had contributed to that shaming that they had experienced even though I had those good intentions. It was like those discourses had captured both of us. They had positioned both of us badly and so that was at the heart of it.

I did what Bronwyn Davies calls “choosing to inhabit a discourse”, I took up the position of silence as I was aware of the limited speaking position that the individualistic discourse in the classroom was offering me in that moment. An individualistic internalised blame position was taken up rather than the opportunity to view what was happening in terms discursive relational processes. (Keita)

Keita vividly recalled her “clunk moment” when she hears a comment being said by a student and realises in the split second the potentially marginalising impact of the comment for others in the room. Keita’s immediate thought was that what the student had said was an example of a common collective discourse that exists in relation to Te Tiriti based relations in Aotearoa New Zealand, that basically *we are all the same*. Simultaneously, Keita became aware of what she termed *my responsibilities as a teacher to address this* and drew attention to this. Keita’s viewing of the student’s “speaking on behalf of” from her own understanding of discourses was what led her to attempt to draw attention to the student’s practice by framing the student’s comment in terms of the way collective discourses can capture us all. Keita considered at the time that this would be a non-threatening way to draw attention to the student’s practice and an opportunity for all the students to learn about discourses as they present in the classroom. From the reactions of the student concerned and other students, Keita realised immediately that her intention had been misunderstood.

At first glance, Keita's reflection-in-action, with her clear identification of the ideas and thoughts that were guiding her during what took place, would lend itself well to an analysis of her implicit theories-in-use (Argyris & Schön, 1974), or as Friedman and Rogers define the ideas that are "implicit in our actual behaviour" (2008, p.254). Whilst potentially useful here, Smith (2015), whose work developed from her critique of Argyris and Schön, suggests that how we consider knowledge in relation to our practice involves far greater attention to the messiness of values and ends and the complexities of contexts, than addressed in their exegesis. She writes:

Building knowledge out of practice is never easy. The practice context requires researcher and practitioner alike to give up unilateral control, to meddle in messy matters of values and ends, and to grapple with emotionally charged issues, all of them subject to competing interpretations. Still there's no avoiding it. These issues – and the infinitely complex contexts in which they arise—are not only relevant to practice, but the very essence of it. (p143)

Smith goes on to propose that Schön's (1984) concept of framing, where a practitioner's framing of a situation is shaped by the governing values implicit in their theories in-use, could be considered differently. Smith (2015) suggests that as practitioner's "capture their in-the-moment thoughts, feelings and actions" (p. 153) that they then reflect on these in terms "1) How do I see myself in relation to the other person in the situation? 2) What goals am I setting for myself as a result? [and] 3) How might this framing limit the actions I have at my disposal?" (p. 153). In this regard, Smith (2015) offers a more relational perspective on knowledge and teaching than theories-in-use, that incorporates "imbued interpretations of ourselves in relation to others and the goals we set as a result" (p.153). She also adds that our frames are shaped by the contextual backdrop that shapes how we consider each other and, our experiential knowledge forged from years of experience that we have at our disposal.

Bringing Smith's analysis to bear on Keita's story, Keita articulates her acute awareness of how she viewed herself in relationship to the many people involved in this situation and what she considered to be her responsibilities in respect of this. These included: to the student who spoke "on behalf of others": to the "others" (the students who she felt a responsibility to ensure they were not quietly marginalised), to the community of educators, and to the wider community itself. As a result of this relational perspective, we see Keita's intentions outplayed in her actions, as she endeavoured to fulfil her responsibilities to all parties and offer opportunities for learning about discourses that were presenting themselves in the here and now situation. From Smith's perspective, Keita's years of experiential knowing in relation to post-structural ideas of discourse informed her in deciding to draw on a practice of inviting the student to speak for herself, and also then enabled her to recognise and understand that her pedagogical aspirations, intentions and impacts in that moment were being both shaped and hindered by the broader contextual backdrop of the classroom. Her decision to then *take up a position of silence* was the

result of her framing of her experience as one where she knew that had become *limited speaking positions* available.

Smith's perspective on practitioner knowledge construction in relational and contextual terms has a close alignment with Whitehead and McNiff's (2006) concept of a living educational theory, which regards the core of an educational theory to be ontological and relational. Whitehead and McNiff regard our tacit embodied knowledge in relation to educational practice to be the translation of our ontological values (how we view being human, and critically how we regard and engage with others) that we transform into epistemological values and judgements which we then make external and explicit through our educational theories and practices; in essence our "pedagogical commitments" (Whitehead & McNiff, 2006, p. 86). These ontological, epistemological and effectively pedagogical values, Whitehead and McNiff describe as coming to "act as the explanatory principles and living standards by which we judge our practice, and, because our theories are created from within are practice, they are also the standards by which we judge our theories" (p. 85). Therefore, as each practice situation is unique and contextual, our theories of education are not fixed and static but rather are living theories. In the following excerpt we further see how Keita's ontological values were deeply embedded in the explanatory principles being enacted in her practice:

It is a decision that I made many years ago that if I felt like I was in a privileged position and I met racism or sexism, I would speak up. I will do it at a family dinner, you know, I mean there are times when I would just stay silent, but there are certainly times when somebody will tell a joke at a family dinner I will point out its effects or they won't tell a joke in front of me because they know that will happen. There's a very fine line there is not a line between my post-structural ideas of living and my post-structural way of teaching. It was almost like once I discovered post-structuralism it was that fit for me. (Keita)

Here Keita reveals that deeply embedded in her explanatory principles and pedagogical commitments is her lifelong commitment to speaking and acting for social justice. Her educational theories and ontological aspirations she herself declares, are inseparable.

Relationship to propositional knowledge

With the more contemporary view of knowledge in relation to educational practice as being a more living, personalised and contextual construction (Alexander, 2008; Whitehead, 2009; Whitehead & McNiff, 2006) it is interesting to consider what role formal knowledge has in respect of our participants pedagogical practice. Returning to Lucia's story of her peak experience is useful here:

*It was fascinating what had taken place to bring a shift in these students towards an empathy for one another **and** I was still sitting there thinking these are year ones' and how am I going to get them to be thoughtful? These students were very different spaces in terms of their processing levels and self-awareness in the context of what triggers them. We still had work to do. That's why I really like Brookfield's reflective model.*

They had been appreciating each other's voices, appreciating the courage and vulnerability in some of those voices, looking at their emotions and they reached a place of settlement and calmness. Now I felt, [from Brookfield's model] that they needed to step back and put themselves in the feelings of the other – the speakers from in the room the previous day, the tangata Tiriti (non – Māori). It gives the learner a little bit of structure to get from where they are sitting in their own autobiography making these big assumptions of what has happened and getting nowhere because it's going around in circles. I like how the next part of Brookfield's reflection needs you to put yourself in the shoes of the other person and understand their world view, understand their position and try and figure out as much as possible what you think that could be. I really like that, and I help the students all the time to be thinking about that, as otherwise they'd never build any empathy. His model it is very intentional, I like doing that in my facilitation process. (Lucia)

Lucia describes how she was noticing the ways in which students were speaking that indicated where were at in their processing and reflexivity. Throughout her account Lucia is checking in with a key theoretical influence in her teaching, Brookfield's (1995) framework of critical reflection, a framework with which she is very familiar and supports her pedagogical intentions. Lucia was influenced by this theory in facilitating critical reflexivity and in relation to her aspirations for the students that they would become reflexive and ultimately empathic practitioners *I like how the next part of Brookfield's reflection needs you to put yourself in the shoes of the other person and understand their world view.*

Whitehead regards the traditional view of theory/theories, as more general explanatory frameworks “explanations offered in the conceptual terms of propositions” (2018, p.9), propositional theories in effect. Alternatively, Whitehead (2018) proposes that within living educational theory propositional forms of understanding are important only in so much as they are “existing within the explanations given by practitioners in making sense of their practice...[they do not] characterise the explanation””(p.11). In Lucia's reflection she is very much, as Whitehead suggests, referencing her propositional influences in as much as she recognises their influence in shaping and informing her thinking as the teaching session unfolded, not so much as theories that she set out to enact.

The following excerpt from my interview with Stewart shows his articulation of his knowledge influences in relation to his pedagogy. In this instance, Stewart is not reflecting on a specific peak or dissonance experience, rather in more general terms:

I know in terms of a pedagogical point of view the way that I try to work. As much as possible it is student- centred and constructivist. In the mental health classes, there are a number of students there who live on a daily basis with their own mental health issues so they have a great deal of expertise in terms of the way in which they might engage with some of the therapies. With the constructivist position the idea is that a person comes to the classroom with what they know, and you find that zone of proximal development. There is a quote/unquote “an expert other” and it is in that zone where you get the bringing together of those knowledges. I will make a teaching point and then I will illustrate it through my own practice experience and through that it draws out the students talking about their experiences. (Stewart)

Here, Stewart articulates the very foundational principles of his constructivist pedagogy in terms of how he sees his students as learners who bring their own wealth of experience and expertise to join with his own expertise, and that explains how he seeks to work in the edges of their development, or the “zone of proximal development” (Vygotsky, 1978. p.86). Stewart recognises that for this particular group of students this means working from who they are as people with lived-experience of mental health difficulties. Here Stewart was not reflecting on a specific experience that might enable accessing his implicit theories-in-use (Argyris & Schön, 1974) or his embedded explanatory principles (Whitehead, 2009). Rather, in Stewart’s articulations of his pedagogical point of view he used the linguistic concepts of specific formal educational theories woven with his own unique languaging and application of these. Such a weave may be the testament to the familiarity of these theories for Stewart, and/or may be indicative of the fact that even when speaking more generally about our theoretical influences we do this as “explanations of our practice” (Whitehead, 2009, p.89) rather than in academic terms.

Articulations of pedagogical approaches and frameworks

Wilkinson and Hanna (2016) observe that there are over 500 counselling theories and approaches today. Unlike Wilkinson and Hanna, from my search of the literature no one appears to have put a figure on the vast number of pedagogical approaches in higher education or counsellor education specifically. In terms of a figure, I too wouldn’t want to hazard a guess, suffice to say the number would be great and new pedagogical positions appear to be emerging constantly in the literature. In this study, the way we each referenced this vast body of pedagogical approaches differed:

It comes back to social justice which is part of that post-structural critical reflexive pedagogical position that I take up in my counselling and I’ve brought that into my teaching. (Keita)

Keita articulates a much-nuanced naming of her pedagogical position that gives clear reference to the post-structural paradigmatic foundations and assumptions, and the critical reflexive pedagogical processes and aspirations that form the basis of her pedagogical (and counselling) practice. Keita also makes a clear statement of the relationship of her pedagogical framework with her ontological valuing, social justice.

Keita’s clarity and certainty with reference to her pedagogical theoretical framework was notable. Likewise, Keita’s particular languaging of these influences (i.e.: *critical reflexive* in contrast to *reflective*) indicates her awareness of the nuanced differences in pedagogical approaches and suggests the importance to her of naming her own pedagogy in a way that is absolutely representative and definitive of who she is.

For myself whilst offering a compilation of pedagogical approaches that are influential and comprise my own pedagogical framework, there was less surety in the way I spoke of these:

I think I have a strongly relational experiential pedagogy with a critical edge verses a critical pedagogy. I hope I'm far more critical in my pedagogy than I was when I first arrived back in New Zealand fifteen years ago. I have a strong skills development pedagogy too which I think comes from the responsibility I feel to develop the skills in students to be good counsellors, who have a place in our society. I keep talking about the next generation of graduates who are savvy and can compete out there. Counsellors are doing some amazing work out there and society can't do without us, but we struggle to get jobs so I've got this almost political focus that actually let's produce people who can go out there and hold their own and carve our own place out there, that shapes my pedagogy.(Janet)

In articulating my own pedagogical framework, I begin tentatively *I think I have a strongly relational experiential pedagogy... I hope I'm far more critical...*, identifying two pedagogies, relational and experiential that have been the cornerstone of my pedagogical practice over the decades. I then reflect on the way in which ideas of critical pedagogies are influential. Further identification of a skills development pedagogy that emerged during the course of my one-to-one interview with Lucia, my interviewer, was mentioned.

Present in my articulation of my pedagogical theoretical influences there is a tentativeness and, compared to Keita's more definitive and complete statement of a pedagogical theoretical framework. In a similar way, there was a sense of there being a discreteness between the pedagogical theoretical components in my account rather than there being a coherent whole as with Keita. The impact of context in influencing the shape of my pedagogical framework was also very present in my reflection as I articulate my ever-present awareness of the ongoing struggle for status for counselling as a profession in New Zealand which drives my strong emphasis on skill pedagogies in order to position our students well in the competitive climate.

For Lucia, her articulation of her pedagogical theoretical framework was intricately linked with her articulation of her identity as Māori and what it means to be Māori in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand. The following story captures the intricacies of context, ethnicity, identity, culture and...pedagogy:

I like critical pedagogies; I like transformational pedagogy... As a Māori who has grown up in a society that reminds me every day that I am Māori and in different ways overtly or covertly marginalised accordingly. So, I like to think I am actively engaged in a teaching and learning process that honours social justice and social change. As educators it is important for us to be transforming our students into counsellors and social workers that meet the ideal change agent out there in society.

I think too that I am very much Māori in my heart. I think that shapes my teaching and learning engagement with students and I invite that in the room as much as possible in the skills classes as much as in the Treaty classes. For me, when we talk about a Māori pedagogy, whilst people talk about taken teina, [the "older" student guiding the "younger"], I prefer ideas of the collective learning process, the group learning process, the group sharing and the strength of the group. These are very natural ways of being for me. That students can see the value of being a member of the group and how to be supporting the wellbeing of the group. I'm not keen on the individual learner, I'm not keen on isolating the individual learner.

I think teaching and learning is tapu [sacred]. The process is tapu. There are lots of understandings around tapu and noa (not sacred) that I bring into my teaching process and that I am still figuring out. I think the most central is wairua [the spiritual], how wairua sits in the teaching and learning engagement process with students. It's this real essence of the light going on as things just align properly and you have got that feeling it's there. Wairua moments do happen in the classroom, but more often than not happen at the marae. I also like the marae context of the group, the notion of space, the notion of time and how it is used in the teaching learning process. That for Māori, time and space is a notional thing and a tangible thing is quite a complex thing and I am still working at being clear about it in the context my teaching, I'm not trying to say this is what all Māori do, but I'm trying to make sense of recognising that everything I do has very much a Māori flavour to it, and figuring out what is that flavour and what does it look like and where does it come from within the Māori concepts and the customary practices and the ways of being that I've been brought up with. (Lucia)

Lucia articulates how being Māori in Aotearoa, and her daily lived-experience of marginalisation in its many forms, underpins her critical and transformative pedagogical aspirations and practices. Lucia offers an unfolding story of what *being Māori in my heart* means and looks like for her in terms of her teaching and learning practices and distinguishes the aspects of her own Māori pedagogy as distinct from a well-known tuakana-teina pedagogy (Pere, 1994; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Lucia highlights Maori customary practices and ways of being that are significant in her teaching and articulates that she is continuing to figure out what this means and looks like. Lucia's reflection draws attention to the way in which pedagogy sits in an historic, socio-cultural and political context. Pihama, Smith, Taki, and Lee (2004) writing of Kaupapa Māori pedagogies, highlight that for Māori (and I would argue it should be the case for us all) their pedagogical understandings and practices cannot fail to emphasise pedagogy as it operates in societies institutional structures characterised by "economics, power, ideology and constructed notions of democracy. *Kaupapa Māori* challenges the political context of unequal power relations and structural impediments" (p. 10). Pihama et al. (2004) write of Māori pedagogy itself:

Ako is a traditional Maori concept that can be translated as Māori pedagogy...The difficulty in attempting a description of *ako* is that there is no clear separation between *ako* and other Māori cultural concepts. *Ako* was [traditionally] determined by and dependent on *Māori* epistemologies, values, knowledge and constructions of the world. (p. 13)

Lucia's articulation of her journey in understanding what it means for her to be Māori in relation to her pedagogy offers a beautiful insight into both how she has, and continues to uniquely consider and out work, her own embedded cultural understandings and practices in her pedagogical practice and how this integrates with her very clear structural analysis of the wider institutional back drop of our educational endeavours.

Stories of struggles ...and dreams

It seems pertinent to begin this analysis of participants' accounts of their struggles of a pedagogical nature, on the back of the previous section relating to Lucia's story that draws

attention to the historical, social-cultural and political post-colonial context of Aotearoa New Zealand. In the following excerpt, Lucia reflects on the way increasing class size is impinging on her pedagogical aspirations and practices and muses about what it would mean to embrace a critical perspective not only in her teaching but in relation to these institutional discourses:

I've got 60 people in the classroom; the class sizes are huge. Normally there are two of us in there, but I have had to hold it all by myself for the first time. It's taxing, I'm noticing that some days I am fine in my energy levels and sometimes I run out halfway through the class. I need to have different ideas around the teaching and learning process as all these learning ideals are challenged by the size of the class.

Pedagogically I think the dilemma is the neoliberal kind of setting that we are in that really is conflicting with our ideal teaching learning educational philosophy that we hold dear.

Maybe we have to teach within the limits. Peter McLaren talking about critical pedagogy says we have to look at the dominant discourse that sits in the educational context and how that can be an imposition of social injustice. We are advocating for social justice in our programme content but why are we not having a critical eye on the dominant discourse of the educational institution that we are located in? The two don't align. (Lucia)

Recent changes in staffing allocations and class size have meant that Lucia is now having to teach on her own rather than co-teach. Lucia speaks of the implications of this for her process-orientated pedagogy that is much harder to sustain in large groups without collegial support. Lucia identifies these systemic demands as characteristic of the neoliberal discourse that has been impacting on education for decades. The irony of the dichotomy between the eschewed values of the programme with the institutional realities is not lost on her, and Lucia is questioning whether a rethink of pedagogical practice will become necessary to survive.

Lucia's reflection is a reminder that our pedagogical practice is contingent on much broader factors than our own desires and preferences. Elbaz-Luwisch (2013) observed how teaching as a profession has become more difficult over the years with rapid changes and constant reforms that lead to excessive stress and burnout for teachers. She refers to the Nias' (1993) work on the "lost self" (Nias, cited in Elbaz-Luwisch, 2013, p.137) which sees teachers "struggling to make sense of the latest reform and what- if anything- to invest of themselves ..." (Elbaz- Luwisch, 2013, p. 137). Blades and Bester (2013) similarly describe the current form of educational climates as underpinned by values that they describe as "disconnecting values of modernity" (p. 7) and that are creating disconnected responses in teachers unable to reconcile their own values and aspirations within such contexts.

For Keita, her story of struggle also has echoes of "a lost self" expressed not so much directly in relation to institutional values but in terms of the complex philosophical landscape within the programme itself:

I don't know if I will come to this somewhere else, but you know, I often find myself sitting in team meetings and I say things and then think I'm a million miles away from

what sits well with me in terms of how I should be speaking or how I should be articulating things. I know there are times when I get distanced from my own pedagogical aspirations. (Keita)

Reflecting further on this distancing Keita articulates:

I don't experience any pedagogical jarring with any of my colleagues. I experience all of my colleagues as pretty critical and pretty reflexive on practice. I mean you have given me some of these readings that inform your practice that I know are absolutely resonating with me. I'm not saying there is any jarring, but I guess is it not being able to take myself pedagogically to some of the places I'd like.

This programme is interesting, I'm getting more and more questioning... I often get a sadness that have I been misunderstood. While I'm standing in a post-structural position I'm not advocating for narrative therapy when I stand there, but students often think that is what is happening. I experience this as a misunderstanding because when I read the literature on post-structural approaches to teaching counselling narrative is not where I'm coming from. I'm coming from that more critical perspective, but that involves similar language to narrative therapy, because narrative therapy is drawn from that paradigm. I can see why there's a closeness, but I believe we can work from any approach and have a critical reflexive position and/or a mixture of approaches. But it is almost like no matter what I say and no matter how many times I will say "so from a person-centered space or from a cognitive behavioural space or from an indigenous space" the invitation to be critical, to be reflexive around that is met as a criticism possibly or that I am advocating for a way of being that is narrative. So that is a challenge that I'm living all the time. (Keita)

For Keita, her experience was one of being somewhat perpetually misunderstood regarding the way she is informed in her teaching by her post-structural position and what she is seeking to bring to the students learning in relation to these ideas. Keita identifies herself that the post-structural and social constructionist ideas that inform her practice are complex and often easily confused. She continues:

And I don't mind paradigm shifts, but I think students have to understand they are making paradigm shifts because when you are moving from an approach that works with the essence of a person (person-centered) and then an approach that works in a discursive relational way (post-structural), a social relational way verses an internal relational way then that has implications for the language you use. (Keita)

Keita recognises that the key difficulty she faces reflects a broader tension between post – structuralism and other paradigms that at their core have very different ontological foundations.

Keita articulates elsewhere in our interview that not only are the students misunderstanding her intentions and struggling with the paradigm shifts, but also in her view the teaching context itself does not manage these fundamentally differing paradigmatic foundations, and therefore, is often not set up for her to work in post-structural ways. For Keita teaching practices such as, raising awareness of discourses in the learning environment, inviting critical reflexivity, and working with the students in relationally discursive ways, are not always available to her in the present teaching environment.

Keita's poignant reflection emerged suddenly in Keita's guided reflective conversation immediately after she had named her pedagogical position as a *post-structural critical reflexive pedagogical position*. Keita's images of at times feeling silenced, misunderstood and distanced from her pedagogy are powerful ones. Craig (2010) observes that in the intersections of teaching and reflective practice, teachers' stories of the impacts on their identities, voice, agency and emotions are recurrent themes. Keita's struggle to be understood sees her "dreaming" or imagining ways to find her voice:

I ask the question always of how I might make myself more understood. There aren't really places in our programme to have those philosophical discussions with students. I think they would be really good conversations for us to have like a bit of a panel each sort of sitting speaking about our pedagogical philosophical positioning in terms of our teaching. (Keita)

Finally, my own story of confusion of a pedagogical nature, like Keita's also sits at the programme level:

But...there are moments on the programme when I am not clear. I consider myself coming from an experiential pedagogy, but I ask myself why I sometimes don't process a student's emotional experience in relation to their learning in the whole group? I'm not sure within the programme around those processing moments anymore. My training in the UK, where I learnt to teach, processing as a whole class would occur as that was linked to their pedagogy as a programme offering some direction. For instance, if you signed up for a psychodynamic counsellor training programme you would expect that there would be some extensive level of psychodynamic processing that went on in the counselling training group. The same to an extent on a person-centered programme. On our programme though, I don't think the students are signing up to that so there is a level of confusion for me, what are the students signing up to? And how does this fit pedagogically with the programme and for me?

There are other moments on the programme like which skills to cover? I am not clear about anymore. We cover this pluralistic range of theories and ways of working, so at different moments I keep getting tripped up on what skills and ways of being do I model. I model some ways of being relational, being ethical, being collaborative but there are some micro skills in there that are quite different in the different approaches. Does it matter that I might model particular skills more than others? I am just not sure of the coherency of what I am doing at times. I'm not saying it's not happening; I just struggle to feel sure about it. (Janet)

In my story, I am giving examples of my pedagogical practices that I am at times choosing not to enact given a lack of clarity as to whether the programme itself is set up in a way to support them. My greatest concern in relation to this being my perception that the programme is not clear in its expectations of students regarding the pedagogical ways of learning they can expect and are being invited into.

My concern here is similar to Keita in that we both recognise there are times in our teaching when we perceive the programme to not be set up to support our pedagogical practices, and we choose alternative practices as a result. Essentially in making these choices, it could be argued we are

not fully realising our pedagogical practices or aspirations. However, my account differs to Keita's in that I am voicing an expectation of the programme to provide some kind of collective guideline for how to work pedagogically:

Maybe if the students are saying I really want to practice from a particular way whether it's a narrative way or kaupapa Māori way. Are we, and they, really clear about those skills and knowledge they need to use those skills, the competencies (for want of a better word)? Do we as a programme and do the students know where they need to be in relation to those skills by the end of year one, two, three? I think there is something about scaffolding I'd like to see happening much more, I think about scaffolding a lot. (Janet)

In my story, I am both lamenting what I consider to be a lack of clarity in relation to the specific skill competencies associated with the various counselling approaches that the students are choosing to work from, and at the same time beginning to dream of possibilities for developing a clear framework within the programme to scaffold their skill development across all three years. As I immersed myself in and analysed the stories from my own one-to-one interview with Lucia, I began question whether my expectation for greater clarity as a programme in relation to specific pedagogies is an unrealistic and/or indeed an unhelpful one.

Concluding thoughts...

There was an apparent ease amongst all four participants in being able to articulate much nuanced accounts of our teaching actions, identify the underpinning intentions of our practice and recognise the indicators in students' responses and behaviours that indicated whether our hopes for their learning had been realised. This well-developed reflective ability to recall experiences and engage in reflective conversation may indicate that all four participants have a well-developed understanding of the nature of pedagogy itself, and/or it may be reflective of our level of experience and length of time as educators, that spans decades. In addition, the practice of counselling is predicated on reflective practice both in the way counselling engages clients in extensive self-reflection and, the level of reflexivity required from the practitioner. Engaging in reflective conversations is in many respects a "bread and butter" activity for us. However, two participants engaged in reflection cognisant with Schön's reflection-*in*-action (Schön, 1983, 1987), accessing their *in-the-moment* reflective processing whereas the other two participants did not. This may have been due to the level of uncertainty and/or discord in the teaching situations they chose, which Dewey (1933) considers is critical for *in-action* reflective thought. Alternatively, the experiences selected by the other two may have drawn our eye to other dimensions of pedagogy that seemed more figural in our reflections. Such wondering has implications for how we invite and structure reflection in order to enable particular dimensions of pedagogy to be revealed.

Immersing myself in participants' crafted stories what became very apparent was how all of our articulations speak to the contemporary perspectives on pedagogy resonant with a view of

pedagogy as an educator's living educational theory (Elbaz-Luwisch, Whitehead & McNiff, 2006), where living theories are uniquely and contextually constructed. Time and again our crafted stories revealed explicit and implicit embedded values, aspirations, knowledge and identities that at different times and in different moments came into play. Static descriptions of pedagogical ideas and concepts were noticeably absent. An abiding awareness also throughout my one-to-one interviews with my colleagues and throughout the analysis of the transcripts from these, was how each of us would speak of our hopes for students learning in teaching moments and, never far from this, our educational aspirations for them as future counsellors and for the societies we hoped for the future. As all educational theorists over history remind us, and particularly those I have drawn from in my analysis here, our educational endeavours are intricately linked to our hopes for the flourishing of humanity (Brandenburg, 2008; Dewey 1933; Elbaz-Luwisch, 2013; Whitehead, 2018).

As we reached the end of phase one of our appreciative inquiry and poised on the edge of phase two, Lucia made a comment in her one-to-one interview that spoke to an anticipation for what might continue to be discovered, aspired to, dreamt and taken forward as we embarked on the collectively stages of our investigation into pedagogy:

For me, our appreciative inquiry process is about being more engaged in figuring about what my pedagogy is or what pedagogies sit comfortably with me in my teaching learning process. I'm quite excited about figuring that out, doing more reading about it as there might be pedagogies out there that I'm doing and I'm not realising, so having that curiosity to explore that as well. To look at what is my foundation and then what can I bring in as well. I'm really excited about that in the context of when I'm in the room by myself and when I'm in the room with colleagues. I would be interested to figure out what influences me. I am excited to look at this together... (Lucia)

Lucia expressed her expectation that our inquiry process would reveal more of her present pedagogical practice as well as offer her ways forward in her development. She expressed an interest to consider not only what this meant for her personally but brought her awareness that on many occasions she is co-teaching with colleagues and therefore this collective study into pedagogy is one she looked forward to.

Lucia's reflection is a reminder that at the core of the first stage in an AI is *discovering and revealing* the best of what is and to surface deeply held values and aspirations. This in turn begins to envision even greater dreams of the future (van der Haar & Hosking, 2004). Beginning our AI with these one-one-interviews my hope was that in revealing our own pedagogies more intentionally, we would then be positioned well to come with confidence and anticipation into a collective process of sharing, discovering and envisioning. Lucia's comments suggest that this had been achieved.

CHAPTER 6: SHARED MEANING AND VISION, AND PEDAGOGY

The previous chapter presents my analysis of the one-to-one interviews between myself and my colleagues where we individually reflected on our pedagogies in preparation for coming together in our first group, focus group one. This chapter now presents an analysis of the transcript of focus group one.

This first focus group somewhat organically morphed into two parts; both are discussed in this chapter. Part one involved a semi-structured appreciative process as each of us took turns to share back from our one-to-one interviews. Part two involved collectively determining as a teaching team what we wished to take forward from this sharing. This process in part two involved generating ideas and images for our future (Barge & Oliver, 2003; Bushe, 2013) as a teaching team.

It is not always easy to decipher where the AI four stages, discover, dream, design and destiny, begin and end. In our inquiry there was a definite shift between parts one and two that resembled the move from the discovery stage to the dreaming stage of AI. Flor (2005) provides a useful way of differentiating between the discovery and dreaming stages in his delineation of discovery as being where people are **finding shared meaning** and dreaming, where they are **building shared vision**. This delineation was very evident in our experience in focus group one. The different nature of these two parts called for a different approach to presenting and analysing the findings in this chapter.

For part one, resembling the discovery stage, Charts I-III Excerpts of Appreciating Dialogue, Focus Group One (Appendix G), are crafted summaries of the semi-structured appreciative process that we undertook three times in relation to Keita, Lucia and my own sharing (Stewart was unable to take part due to workload pressures). A relational constructionist perspective (van der Haar & Hosking, 2004) and a dialogical theoretical lens (Brown, 2015; Buber, 1958) were used to analyse the nature of our relating (underpinned by appreciating) that enabled us to firstly, find shared meaning and secondly, move organically to building our shared vision.

For part two, resembling the dreaming stage, Charts IV – VIII, Excerpts of Co-constructing Dialogue, Focus Group (Appendix I), depict key moments of co-constructing dialogue as we began building these images of our shared future. During this process of co-constructing, five images of the future for our programme were generated collectively by us. These images were: the fostering and supporting of a greater vulnerability for students' in their processes of learning, working more overtly with discourses in the learning environment, having greater clarity regarding the post-structural theoretical influences in the programme, establishing shared foundational commitments for the programme and, establishing permission with students in relation to what they are signing up to in the learning processes. My analysis includes not only what images were generated, but also the way in which this co-construction took place.

Part one: Discovery and finding shared meaning

The discovery phase of AI aims to inquire into and appreciate what it is that gives life to people: what matters to people, and how they experience and understand it. This then contributes to a greater appreciation of the organisation in its entirety (Carter, 2006). From a post-structural viewpoint, resonant with AI underpinnings, Barge and Oliver (2003) suggest that there are multiple possibilities regarding what can become the subject of appreciation. They contend that what needs to be appreciated will be established collaboratively and more significantly that the group will determine this during the AI process rather than it being predetermined. The dialogue between Lucia, Keita and I, in Chart I-III (Appendix G), shows how we determined the nature of appreciation unique to this inquiry.

Appreciation as understanding

Chart I shows Lucia and my response to Keita's sharing. Lucia and I express an understanding of her very deep passion for justice that underlies her pedagogical practice and seats her very firmly within a post-structural pedagogical position. Keita has explained the teaching practices that this calls her into, which at times she experiences as being misunderstood. She has also described how on some occasions she chooses to remain silent when she perceives the context is not enabling. Lucia responds to Keita:

What stood out for me was just practice and your desire to support professional practice development of counselling from this philosophy of just practice. Also, how you notice the discourses that students bring to the teaching learning environment and how that challenges your goals of just practice. How you have a goal of giving voice to that discourse, addressing discourse in the moment and the challenges that have come because of that. (Lucia)

This response from Lucia's shows her understanding of what is aspirational for Keita, what it is Keita is endeavouring to achieve through her passion for just practice, **and** the complexities surrounding this. Moody, Horton-Deutsch and Pesut (2007) drawing on the ideas of Gergen (1999) write that "the language of appreciation is a language of understanding ... it is the capacity to express positive sentiments and to listen and give deeply of oneself in order to achieve unity of understanding and being with others" (Moody et al., 2007, p.321). Most significant therefore, is how Lucia articulates the complexity for Keita and offers her appreciation from the lens of discourse, which is the language of Keita's post-structural paradigm *a goal of giving voice to that discourse*. There is a sense from Lucia that she both "gets it" in terms of how Keita views it for herself, and that she also values the lens of understanding that Keita herself brings to this. Lucia then shares how she experiences similar challenges around the discourse's students bring and aligns herself with a hope implicit (rather than explicit) in Keita's sharing that collectively we might find ways of working with these discourses. The extent of Lucia's response to Keita encapsulates Moody et al. (2007) view of appreciation as a unity of understanding and being with. It also fits Grant and Humphries

(2008) definition of appreciation as a taking full account of the other's position. They write "appreciation may also mean to know, to be conscious of, to take full or sufficient account of" (p. 403).

Appreciation of lived-experiences and aspirations of excellence

There are two areas that are common to all of our appreciations of one another. These are our appreciation of each other's descriptions of lived-experiences of teaching moments, and appreciations of one another's aspirations for excellence.

In respect to the former, we appear emotionally drawn to one another's descriptions of our pedagogical practices. Our appreciations are of one another's descriptions of lived-experiences of teaching (van Manen, 2016), rather than appreciations of any theoretical formal terms used. This aligns with van den Nieuwenhof (2013) who writes "Telling stories avoid the distancing that often goes along with rational logic...Appreciative Inquiry (AI) provides the possibility for true encounters as living beings and as a living experience" (p. 185). Chart II (Appendix G) shows my response to Lucia as I appreciate how Lucia's speaks about her teaching moment:

You have a lovely way of speaking to your goal of ensuring that the students have space to share their personal reflections on their experiences, and then you talk a lot about encouraging the students to be appreciating each other and the students reaching understandings of one another. (Janet)

Here, I pick up Lucia's language of her lived-experience of teaching namely *encouraging students' to be appreciating each other*. It is this language that becomes picked up as part of our collective dreams further in our focus group process.

In a similar way Keita picks up language used in Lucia's descriptions of her lived-experience of teaching practice that also becomes a thread through our collective dreams:

And this creating a context to look after and invite students to look after each other that just stood out to me as something really important to you. (Keita)

The language of *creating a context* and *students' looking after each* is picked up in this discovery stage and is also taken forward to subsequent stages in our inquiry. Carter (2006) describes how in the discovery stage, it is the stories that help to build a picture of the world as each individual recognises and experiences it, which in turn contributes to the collective picture that emerges.

The second notable focus of our appreciations is on one another's aspirations towards excellence. Barge and Oliver (2003) state that a distinctive aspect of appreciation is that it "connects to the emotional and spiritual life of organizational members by tapping into their passions and strong feelings about what constitutes excellence in their work context" (p. 125). In the above example, this interaction further highlights Lucia's appreciation of what Keita aspires to pedagogically and what it is that constitutes excellence for her namely *just practice*. My response to Keita also appreciates aspirations of excellence when I state "*the value you*

place of respectful relating” which captures what lies at the heart of her hopes for students as practitioners.

Appreciating as alignment

In Charts I-III (Appendix G), it is evident that through our appreciating we aligned ourselves with each other. Barge and Oliver (2003) suggest that even though the broad shape of appreciation is jointly constructed, within this, individuals still continue to make decisions for themselves about what they appreciate. More specifically, they contend that in doing this, individuals tend to adopt a pragmatic criterion in terms of appreciating what seems to offer future possibilities and is useful. In Chart III (Appendix G), in response to my sharing, Keita aligns herself in a somewhat pragmatic way with my concern for scaffolding. This appears to resonate with something she has also considered. Quite pragmatically also, she develops this idea further suggesting a focus on learning strategies as a way to take this forward:

The idea of scaffolding, not only where do they [students] need to be at the stage, but how do we best scaffold them to that stage resonated for me when you were speaking because it is something that I wonder too. I wonder too what kind of learning strategies we can put in place to do that scaffolding so that there is a flow. So that there isn't a dissonance which is what you named a bit later. (Keita)

Here, Keita aligns herself with my concern for scaffolding, and interestingly aligns with the vocabulary or language of scaffolding, rather than reinterprets or rephrases this differently. Scaffolding as a concept, then becomes part of the vocabulary that we build together, as a shared vocabulary that we can carry throughout our inquiry. Barge and Oliver writing of vocabulary in appreciative inquiry state:

When individuals adopt a pragmatic criterion to make decisions, they simultaneously embrace the spirit of appreciation by searching for new vocabularies and possibilities to engage the life enhancing and adopt a fairly concrete standard for making choices within the flow of conversation as to what needs to be appreciated. (2003, p.133)

There is a similar alignment with language from me in relation to Lucia's sharing in Chart II (Appendix G):

The thing that I really liked is your expectation of the students' capacity to take on board not only their own learning, but the responsibility jointly for one another and together for the collective learning process and I would like to grow that more. (Janet)

Here, I search to retain the language that she uses to describe her pedagogical practice *responsibility jointly for one another and collectively for the learning process* as it was language that spoke to me of growth for my own practice, and for our team collectively. By comparison, sometimes there is alignment using different language to do this. For example, in Chart I (Appendix G), I align myself with Keita's struggle to work as she would like pedagogically but rather than staying close to Keita's words, I offer my own description of a struggle that has resonance for me:

That resonated for me because at times I don't fully take up my pedagogical positions either on the programme. I don't feel we have the permission or the contract with students fully to take up those positions and sometimes we have our hands tied behind our back or our wings clipped. For us collectively, I wonder how we can address these issues so that we can fully take up those positions that our pedagogies invite us to as educators. (Janet)

In this excerpt I state, “I don't fully take up my pedagogical positions either” and offer a couple of the metaphors *our hands tied behind our backs, or our wings clipped*. The latter metaphor *our wings clipped* becomes one that Keita takes up and also gets carried through the inquiry. As Lucia did previously, in this metaphor, I am reaching for an implicit hope that that we might collectively address these issues so we can fully realise our respective pedagogies and metaphorically “fly unhindered”.

Our way of relating more broadly

In addition to an analysis of our ways of appreciating, I also considered the way we related to one another more broadly. Zandee (2013) regards the most important considerations of appreciative inquiry to be the nature of the relationships created that enables the inquiry to happen. Drawing on Buber's (1958) dialogic theory, Zandee places importance on meeting through genuine, I/thou, dialogue. She writes “inquiry as meeting invites a more intuitive and embodied approach that stimulates knowledge creation through connection” (Zandee, 2013, p.77). Brown (2015) likewise explores Buber's dialogical process and dialogical knowing in relation to research. Brown describes the dialogical process that occurs within unique moments, and between people, that enables a “dialogical call to their becoming” (p. 196). This she states then “opens the possibility of dialogical knowing” (2015 p. 196). Brown describes this dialogical process as involving “imaging the real, making the other present, [and] confirming the other” (2015, p. 193) which requires turning towards and seeing the other, recognising the other, and an accepting of the other, respectively. All are required in the dialogical processes that enables the discovery of new understandings to emerge.

In Chart 1 (Appendix G), Lucia and I are clearly intent on appreciating what mattered most to Keita, in effect turning completely towards her and endeavouring to *see her* as she is. Brown describes this as a listening to a degree often not reached, to what “is life” for the other. This, she asserts enables not only the *seeing of the other*, but they then experience being noticed. Brown further advocates a *making the other present* which “moves beyond a purely cognitive process about the other, to an increased awareness, acceptance and support of them in their wholeness, unity and uniqueness” (2015, p. 197). Lucia's response to Keita could be considered a *making the other present*:

... how you notice the discourses that students bring to the teaching learning environment and how that challenges your goals of just practice. How you have a goal of giving voice to that discourse, addressing discourse in the moment and the challenges that have come because of that. Your post-structural, post-modernist

pedagogy is really important, and something I agree with and appreciate too, I think actually it is a plus. (Lucia)

Here, Lucia captures the complexity of Keita's experience in relation to the challenges in the teaching context, followed by her acknowledgement of the importance of the post-structural position for our programme. This validated Keita and spoke to an acceptance of her pedagogical intentions as being important not only to her but to us collectively. My response to Keita also in stating *I wonder how we can address these issues so that we can fully take up those positions that our pedagogies invite us to as educators* could also be considered as *confirming the other* (Buber, as cited in Brown, 2015, p. 198), in my acknowledgement of what I hope for Keita and for us all. This expression of my desire that she be able to be fully present in our team resonates with Friedman (1996) who wrote "it is only so far as you share with me and we struggle together that I can glimpse the person you are called to become" (p.368). Brown writes similarly "confirmation of the other [is] in their present existence and [for] future potentialities for dialogue" (Brown, 2015, p.198).

Chart 1 (Appendix G) shows the deep impact for Keita's of our *seeing, making present* and *confirming*. For Keita, our validation of who she is and what she holds dear, appeared not only to touch her deeply, but also then enabled her to acknowledge more fully just how prevalent the silencing had become. It is then, that she connected with the metaphor of *not having our wings clipped*:

Gosh you know I'm sitting there saying it's not understood. Here just now, I experienced some understanding and some valuing of what I hold dear in my teaching. That was really quite moving for me, because I do notice a lot of silencing and it seems to be more often...I like that idea too of going forward together and creating a receiving context for the students, so they know what to expect in the learning space and so that we are able to not have to have our wings clipped. (Keita)

A similar dialogical analysis of *seeing, making present* and *confirming* can be brought to bear on the interaction in Chart III (Appendix G) in relation to my own sharing. I volunteer where I think I am sitting pedagogically and give examples of my lived- experience of this:

I wrote down that I think my pedagogy is a relational experiential possibly dialogical pedagogy with a critical edge, a transformative kind of critical edge verses being a critical pedagogy. I think that is where I'm sitting. (Janet)

In response Keita offered:

So not only did you speak or define your practice as relational experiential dialogical with a critical edge, but that is what you were describing in your talking about it, so you didn't just name those things you actually showed them in your talk. (Keita)

Keita's response could be viewed as a *seeing the other*, or a noticing which in turn consolidated my own realisations, in effect a further calling me towards who I am to become (Friedman cited in Brown, 2015). Fife (2015) highlights how from a dialogical perspective, the "self" is continually emerging in and through relationship with the other, or in this case for me, in relation to Lucia and Keita:

It was lovely to listen to you describing what you are noticing as it consolidates what I'm intending. Things like I am not doing this for students' one day practice it is for their future practice, and that I am engaging the students in personally meaningful ways, creating and modelling a learning environment that reflects the way of engaging in the counselling process. (Janet)

In a further analysis of our dialogical interaction, in Chart II (Appendix G), Lucia shared with Keita and I how through our dialogue she noticed how she is very process orientated and that her pedagogy sits in being Māori:

It was good to have that opportunity to recognise actually a lot of my pedagogy sits in being Māori and what I've learned around being in a Māori setting. It keeps me safe; it helps me know that the learning may be challenging, but I know what I'm doing as these are the practices that keep me safe. If I do this, I'll be alright, I'll be looked after. (Lucia)

Kieta and I then highlight the effect of Lucia's kōrero (speaking) for us and what we recognise would be of value for our programme:

The spiritual and magical aspect to your practice stood out to me. I wonder if we give enough attention to some of that. So, the fact that you gave attention to that was really moving. (Keita)

You have a lovely way of speaking to your goals ensuring the students have space to share their personal reflections on their experiences. You talk a lot about students appreciating each other and the students reaching understandings of one another...The thing that I really liked is your expectation of the students' capacity to take on board not only their own learning, but the responsibility jointly for one another and together for the collective learning process.(Janet)

For Lucia, the impact of this dialogue is:

Listening to your connection to my story was really helpful... I really appreciate that we are different but there are some common ways and beliefs that we have and when we share those stories there's this richness that happens... I also get excited that now we are making these connections of our own stories to our vision for the programme. (Lucia)

In her work, Brown draws our attention to Buber's concept of the "between". Brown cites Buber (1947) who said, "where I and thou meet, there is the realm of the 'between'...which will help to bring about the genuine person again and to establish genuine community" (Buber, cited in Brown, 2015, pp. 198-99). In the interaction in Chart II (Appendix G), the impact of Lucia's sharing on Keita and I seems to shift the interaction from one where we are primarily *confirming* one another, to this realm of the *between*. In terms of intersubjectivity, Keita and I are clearly being affected through our interaction. Brown continues, that it is in the between "which generates effects on those involved and makes possible different ways of being and knowing" (Friedman cited in Brown, 2015, p. 199). It is at this moment that most clearly signalled that as a collective we were beginning to define what it was that we shared and considered important in respect to pedagogy.

Part two: Dreaming and building our shared vision

As stated previously, Flor (2005) delineates between the discovery stage of appreciative inquiry where people are *finding shared meaning* and the dreaming stage where they are *building shared vision*. A definite shift along these lines took place in our inquiry mid-way through focus group one, where in part one we were finding shared meaning and in part two, building shared vision. The latter is discussed in this section.

In part one of focus group one, we had seen the genesis of both sketchy and some well-articulated dreams. Each of our various hopes and aspirations had been expressed during the three rounds of interaction captured in Charts I – III (Appendix G). We had also begun to align ourselves with those that held shared significance such as *scaffolding students learning, creating a receiving context for our learning processes, students sharing responsibility for the collective learning process etc.* To this point, it could be considered that the sharing of dreams, hopes and aspirations and our alignment had been in the realm of *finding shared meaning*. As we reached a natural pause mid-way through focus group one, I then made the following invitation:

What is standing out to us? What don't we want to forget, or do we want to make a record of [on a large sheet of paper]?" (Janet)

To which Keita replied

I'm not sitting with many differences; I'm sitting with mostly shared stuff... (Keita)

On reflection, my invitation and the nature of Keita's response ushered us into what felt like the start of a process of co-creating and *building shared vision*. Suddenly our interactions took on a different feel as we began generating five key shared images of how we wished our collective future to look. The dialogue relating to the building of these images is presented in Charts IV-VIII (Appendix I).

Co-constructing

Van den Nieuwenhof writing of the generative nature of dialogue in appreciative inquiry states "Organizing is mainly a conversational process in which people together construct an organizational reality out of a variety of different positions from a more general organizational discourse" (2013, p. 159). Van den Nieuwenhof regards that it is in the "in-between" (p. 159) that the hidden potential for change lies and that through conversational and/or discursive processes, people together construct meaningful pictures for the future. Zandee and Cooperrider (2008) similarly describe appreciative inquiry's underpinning constructionist world view which holds that the locus of knowledge is in relationship as opposed to being located within individuals.

In our inquiry this "in-between" co-constructing becomes visible in part two of focus group one. Charts IV – VIII (Appendix H) shows this shift in the nature of the dialogue between Lucia,

Keita and I, from our previous lengthier taking turns to speak in part one, to short sharp contributions that built on one's another's ideas, co-constructing interactions in effect. In this respect, the interchanges became a back and forth refinement and development of ideas, for example in Chart IV (Appendix H), Lucia, Keita and I co-construct a picture or image of what it would mean for the programme if we were able to foster and support students in their vulnerability:

*We talked about vulnerability as one of the things that we want to explore further.
(Lucia)*

How we facilitate it and lay the foundation for vulnerability. (Keita)

Recognising that the learning process is a vulnerable process and how the programme might hold that? Is that what are you thinking? (Janet)

Recognising that there are some topics that are more vulnerable than others and our goal is to be noticing that and setting the scene for a space to be nurturing and safe. All those words that we've been talking about for students. (Lucia)

...and the tutors... (Janet)

Sacred, safe, trusting, careful as care-full. (Keita)

Yeah, that's a good word I like that. (Lucia)

*The question that Lucia asked of herself is a very, very rich question. "What was it that enabled that the vulnerability [in her peak teaching moment] to happen?" You actually identified that it was about the students **appreciating, supporting and understanding** each other. It is fostering that in the students. It is still a good question, your words were appreciating, support and understanding of each other. (Keita)*

***Trusting each other to look after each other, to me that is how what we have to set things up in order for vulnerability to be able to be used.** (Lucia)*

From this short interchange an extensive picture emerges that pulls together the possibility of there being a foundational place for vulnerability in relation to teaching and learning processes on the programme. Rich descriptions of sacredness, safety and care-full-ness that would need to be present on the programme to foster appreciating, supporting and understanding, of students in relation to one another. It is Lucia's comment "*Trusting each other to look after each other, to me that is how what we have to set up in order for vulnerability to be able to be used*" that speaks to what Cooperrider and Whitney cited in Carter (2006) called creating a "convergence zone" (Carter, 2006, p. 56) where a visible picture of an actual future is discerned. This picture of students as well as tutors, looking after one another had been seeded and considered so far in our focus group. It was at this point in the conversation that Lucia speaks into being, a more expansive image of the future that then becomes an actual possibility. Van den Nieuwenhof (2013) writes that "Small moments in the dialogue can suddenly change the whole field of possibilities" (p.160).

Local-cultural constructions and situated language

A similar dialogic process of co-constructing a future image unfolds in Chart VIII (Appendix I). In the following interchange, again it is Lucia at the point of convergence, who speaks into being a collective new image or frame of understanding:

...and what can they expect from our roles? (Janet)

It is difference that they're signing up for, our different teaching practices and styles. (Keita)

Yes, different teaching practices. (Janet)

As well as some shared expectations as well. (Keita)

And, something about the permission for us to be fully in our role. (Janet)

Yeah not having our wings clipped. (Keita)

Well I think permission for us to maintain tikanga. (Lucia)

Yes, that's a nice way of putting it to be able to maintain tikanga. (Janet)

and kawa in this particular context we are talking about. (Lucia)

Kawa and tikanga that's really nice Lucia, that is a nice way of putting it I like that. (Janet)

Viewing these moments of convergence in Charts IV and VIII (Appendix H) from a relational constructionist appreciative inquiry perspective what is co-constructed in such moments are seen as “relational realities” (van der Haar & Hosking, 2004, p. 1022) as opposed to general more universal meanings or presumptions. These same authors liken these relational realities to “local-cultural ways of ‘going on’, of praxis, and early talk of ‘communities of practice’” (p. 1021). They are clear to stipulate also that local in their understanding is “as a reference to social-historic ‘here and now’ and to ongoing qualities of relational processes and constructions” (p. 1022). In the above two excerpts of our inquiry, very distinctive language use (highlighted above in bold) is emerging in our interactions and reflective of our localised co-constructions of our preferred future.

Most striking throughout our inquiry is that it is often Lucia who speaks into being our contextual ways of languaging the practices that we choose to take forward. I believe that the reason for this is that Lucia has lived-experience of metaphorically walking in “two worlds” as tangata whenua of Aotearoa. Lucia provides us with a language that traverses and brings together concepts from Māori ways of being and relating and Te Ao Māori, with what could be categorised as Western understandings and practices. Keita and I draw towards the way Lucia beautifully encapsulate our intentions in her weave of Māori frames of understanding with more western frameworks such as *setting things up for vulnerability to be used* and *permission to hold tikanga and kawa*. The delight of the three of us in discovering this shared language for our teaching practice is reflective of our journey on Paetahi Tumu Kōrero, our bicultural counselling

programme, where Māori ways of understanding and being are sought for the foundations of our programme. Similar to van der Haar and Hosking (2004), Barge and Oliver (2003) also describe the importance of paying close attention to situated language use in appreciative inquiry as it becomes visible in the woven co-created frames of meaning. A further excerpt from Chart VIII (Appendix H) demonstrates how we intentionally pull together language used so far in our inquiry process to craft our picture of the future:

The other idea that you started Janet and we grew, was being clear with the students about what we are signing them up to and being explicit about this. (Keita)

Intentional, explicit, I'm just using your words. (Lucia)

...and what did you call these Lucia? Troubling moments, how they are signing on for troubling moments? (Janet)

Yeah. (Lucia)

Being troubled and for doing some troubling with each other. (Keita)

In this excerpt, not only can we recognise a vocabulary emerging in our appreciative inquiry that holds shared meaning *troubling* and *signing up for*, but the quality of our dialogue is standing out. Van den Nieuwenhof (2013) write of the generative nature of dialogue in appreciative inquiry “[dialogue] is much more than an abstract language game. In essence it is a profound living experience” (p. 183). Van den Nieuwenhof goes on to describe how when we are in the flow of dialogue, we honour the differences and experience the “otherness” of the other which then enables a “continuous stream of becoming in relation to” (2013, p. 183).

Plurality, Multiplicity, Divergence and a More Complex Coherence

Attention is given in appreciative inquiry to the importance of working with difference and divergence, both considered inevitable when working with collectives (Barge & Oliver, 2003; Bushe, 2013; Van der Haar & Hosking, 2004). Bushe (2013) advocated that divergence can be capitalised on to transcend the “paralysis of consensus seeking” (p. 106) and to maximise the generative potential of the dreaming stage of AI. Bushe elaborates that a successful dream phase will allow people to stand for what they hold most dear which in turn increases the level of differentiation necessary he argues, for “transformational change, [so that] a more complex, well –adapted coherence can emerge” (p. 106). In part two of focus group one, our divergent positions were utilised:

and the students' view of 'the self', we might not all agree on that, but we can have some clearer sense of what is possible. I know that I now view self as more socially constructed, but I still have a somewhat essentialist view. (Janet)

But that is what the students are grappling with as well now. Because post-modernism has come in and put that critique out there beautifully, the different counselling approaches have looked at their views and practices and questioned them. (Keita)

...and these counselling theories are bringing a far more social constructionist view of 'self' than their earlier approaches. (Janet)

Yeah and we've got some lovely literature that speaks to that. (Keita)

Yeah, I think social constructionism in that context is helping them understand themselves much more intentionally as opposed to being socially constructivist and they have learned how to use it to be much more intentional understanding the stuff. (Lucia)

Absolutely. (Janet)

So, they are quite different, it's not their way of being but it's a way of understanding. (Lucia)

They get this thing I'm totally this, you know, I'm one dimensional, they don't understand actually we are such a complex person and we need all these different ways of looking at ourselves to be really helpful. (Lucia)

Well that's what post-structuralism is about there are just multiple selves, multiple identities, multiple layers and they are all being produced as we speak. We can't define ourselves because we are constantly in the process of reproducing ourselves. (Keita)

...and we are somewhere on a continuum in our views. (Janet)

...but we should be able to make sense of who we are in that one given context. I think that is why that is so difficult. (Lucia)

and that doesn't define who I am in a totalising way? It is just saying how I am in that moment. (Keita)

Understanding who I am and having a real valuable tool to help me do that. (Lucia)

And I think we need to have a discussion around modern and post-modern pedagogy it would be helpful for us to do that. Our students come with this very, what's a way of describing it, personal approach to the world, you know, they are very me-centred and don't recognise how when things are said the 'me' gets first attention. So how can we use that in our pedagogy for them to be more understanding of the self and the discourse that sits in all of that, but also growing from that experience and transforming from that experience? (Lucia)

In the above excerpt, Keita, Lucia, and my own very different relationship to social constructionist thinking, is teased out. What emerges from the divergence of viewpoint expressed in this dialogic moment between us is a clear picture of the complexity that not only exists amongst the three of us but mirrors the complexity we and the students face on the programme. What is starting to emerge from our dialogue is not one fixed position that we need reach consensus on but rather indicators as to how we might work pedagogically within this complexity.

Concluding reflections

Bushe (2013) claimed that it is the ability to foster generativity throughout all stages of an inquiry that distinguishes a successful appreciative inquiry from a less than successful one. In our inquiry, this generative spirit was present at the outset. Keita, Lucia and I arrived at focus group one, from our one-to-one interviews prepared to share what mattered most to us in terms of our pedagogical practices and connected to the beliefs, identities and aspirations that sustained us pedagogically.

In part one of focus group one, our very succinct sharing from our one-to-one interviews enabled an equally succinct process of appreciating in response. Our way of appreciating showed our desire and capacity to understand what it was that each other deeply valued and, to allow each other's sharing to impact us at a deep level. This resonated with Buber's (1958) *making the other present* and *a call to becoming*, where not only is appreciating present, but confirmation of one another is at the heart. This was borne out in the comments we each made that we felt we had been *seen*, *accepted* and *valued* at the end of the respective appreciative processes.

There was a profound shift mid-way through focus group one from what resembled the discovering of shared meaning, to the beginning of building shared images for our future. This sudden transition may have come about as we had aligned with one another and had sufficiently discovered aspects that held shared meaning that we could now begin to take forward. The shift also spoke of the way in which genuine authentic relating, where mutual appreciation and confirmation (Buber, 1958) makes way for understanding to emerge from the "in-between" moments of inquiry. Whether it was the sharing of meaning or this mutual encounter, or both, either way, Flor (2005) cites Ricketts and Willis (2001) who maintain that through appreciative inquiry there comes an inspiration amongst those involved "to leverage their most powerful collective stories in order to dream and design a new affirmative future" (Ricketts and Willis, cited in Flor, 2005, p. 86).

In part two of focus group one, there were clearly distinct dialogic moments that focused on the co-constructing and crafting of five generative images for our collective future. These images or frames we built included: supporting students' vulnerability, working with discourses in the learning environment itself, clarity regarding post-structural theoretical influences on the programme, establishing shared foundational commitments for the programme and, establishing permission with students in relation to what they are signing up. These five images were carried forward into focus group 2. Focus group two is analysed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 7: DESIGNING FOR DESTINY

In chapters 5 and 6, I analysed the transcripts of our one-to-one interviews and focus group one, respectively. This highlighted the way our inquiry progressed through the first two stages characteristic of appreciative inquiry, the discovery and dreaming stages (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). This current chapter now presents an analysis of focus group two, which aligned with the design stage, the third stage of the traditional appreciative inquiry process.

Bushe (2013) offered a useful distinction between the dream and design stages that enabled me to recognise that this shift to the design stage had taken place as we commenced our second focus group. Bushe (2013) describes the dreaming stage as ensuring each person is fully heard, in order to increase differentiation amongst members, in order “that a more complex, well-adapted coherence can emerge” (p.106). The design stage Bushe states “on the other hand, is where some convergence is required. It is about the social architecture that will actualize those values and aspirations” (Bushe, 2013, p. 106).

In this chapter, I analyse how Keita, Lucia, Stewart and I picked up on our collective aspirations from focus group one and *converge* to further construct a “blueprint” (Bushe, 2013, p. 106) for our collective future. What was evident was the way in which as a teaching team we were able to distinguish and crystalize what we shared in common including our shared pedagogies and shared foundations whilst at the same allowing for an ever-changing pedagogical landscape to be retained. Our capacity to hold this complexity, as well as create the architecture to realise our shared dreams (Bushe, 2013) highlighted the way in which the generative nature of AI enables this. Our shared pedagogies and foundations are discussed followed by the creation of four provocative propositions that we wished to take forward to realise our dreams. The way our AI ended is also briefly highlighted.

Shared pedagogies come forward

At the start of focus group two, Keita, Lucia and I took turns to share what we were drawn to in the transcript of focus group one and the Book of Readings on Pedagogy (Appendix I) that we had been given to read prior to the group. Both Lucia and Keita highlighted the readings relating to specific pedagogies that they recognized as present in the transcript of our collective conversation:

Māori, Dialogic, Critical and Post- structural because they are the ones that personally I am most interested in, but also, I think they are the ones that came forward the most in our conversations. (Keita)

For Keita she names the pedagogical approaches she recognised as being of interest to her and that were pedagogies that held shared significance as a team. In Keita’s statement she is clearly holding awareness of the individual/collective fit of pedagogy, where for Keita both exist in relation to each other.

Lucia also identifies the readings that she is personally drawn to and that she feels represent us collectively. In addition to naming the pedagogies Lucia succinctly encapsulates the essence of what we were articulating in focus group one that connects to these formal pedagogical theories:

For the first time, as I read the readings, I have looked at experiential pedagogy and was drawn towards it and excited by what it was, as I see it in our focus group transcript. I was talking about vulnerability and experiential pedagogy is about providing real experiences in the classroom that may position students in a vulnerable way and works with the meaning that comes out this. It was really quite exciting and useful to have readings that I have never seen before that resonated with our conversations in that joint session together... it was exactly what we were talking about, the transformative and the experiential....

I am also really drawn towards the multicultural counsellor preparation pedagogy because it is about transformational pedagogy. It resonated with the necessity of insight and understanding of the client's historical and cultural context for the development of effective interventions based on their phenomenology. It talks about the context of history which made sense to me because we are doing the Treaty and looking at our colonial history and context. This fits for the students to understand context. It helps us transform our students which is what this pedagogy is looking at. (Lucia)

Lucia describes her excitement at discovering experiential and transformational pedagogical theories that she feels so aptly describe what is important to her in the way she works and that she heard in our collective conversation. Lucia was particularly encouraged by the new thinking that these readings gave her:

Yeah, I mean I'm really drawn to critical pedagogy and already have some writers that I enjoy reading. I was heartened specifically by the experiential and multi-cultural/transformative articles in their newness for me, and what they created in relation to my thinking around our teaching and learning process, so that was great. (Lucia)

Interestingly, the two pedagogies, experiential and multi-cultural/transformative that Lucia identifies become the two most visible pedagogical threads that are held and developed throughout focus group two.

My own noticing in the transcript of focus group one, in terms of formal pedagogical theory was in relation to Kaupapa Māori pedagogies:

When I read the Kaupapa Māori pedagogies, this spoke to a lot in our transcript about Tikanga and our processes that create safety for learning. And our focus on the spiritual and sacred nature of learning. I was thinking that we already have Tikanga and practices that are common across the programme that supports learning so that really excited me. (Janet)

For me, like Lucia's excitement in encountering experiential pedagogy, my enthusiasm lay in seeing in the readings many of the Māori-centered processes we had spoken of in focus group one. For me, seeing these written up as formal pedagogies reinforced the opportunity for us to

embed and articulate these not only as “cultural ways of being” or “Māori counselling practices” but also as pedagogical practices.

Higher order complexity emerging

Whilst a picture was starting to emerge of the formal pedagogical theories, experiential, transformative, Māori-centred, critical, dialogic and post-structural that have some shared meaning or resonance for us, emphasis was equally given to the importance of us retaining flexibility in terms of the shape of our collective pedagogy. Lucia acknowledged this *yes/and* stance as she appreciates the growing alignment of our collective practice with experiential pedagogy and yet also laments the need for us to remain open to a diverse contextual dimension in relation to pedagogy:

We talked about pedagogies that connected from the readings and from our initial conversations. I talked about experiential pedagogy that really resonated from the readings, and kind of fitted with what we were talking about in our discussions around the practice and where our values fit and align with practice. Also, some of the Kōrero [conversation] we had was that we don't have to be the same. That there needs to be an overarching philosophy that helps us have a focus and that we will all be using different pedagogies because actually they fit better in certain circumstances. Pedagogy can be contextualised, it makes sense for it to be contextualised, that the different things about the pedagogy that excite us can be used in different contexts. Really it is these discussions that are helping make that much clearer which is exciting in itself. (Lucia)

Keita holds a similar view of the importance of not being overly prescriptive or deterministic in deciding on a collective pedagogy:

The other thing too is that from the perspective of post-structural research, we don't have to pick a pedagogy and say this is what we do. We actually take a bit of this, that, and the other, and we say this is our pedagogical position here and here, and we can argue for that and show it uniquely. In this respect, we are shaping the discourse, aren't we? (Keita)

For Keita coming from a post-structural lens she is acknowledging that pedagogies themselves are at any one time socially constructed by those involved, and in relation to a particular context. Similarly, from a post-structural viewpoint pedagogy are themselves inevitably located in discourses. Keita is expressing a view of pedagogy as an ongoing ever-changing construction and that at any one time we have an opportunity as a teaching team, to present our own unique co-construction.

In these excerpts, Keita, Lucia and I are clearly quite comfortable tolerating a *yes/and* stance in relation to pedagogies. We are able to recognise and name pedagogies that hold shared meaning for us whilst also holding a more flexible, ever changing post-structural and pluralist position in relation to pedagogy. It is commonly considered that a characteristic of the design stage of AI is the ability of members to reach a place of a higher level of complexity in what they collectively produce (Bushe, 2013; Carter, 2006; Moody, Horton-Deutsch, & Pesut, 2007).

Moody et al., (2007) describe how dichotomous thinking is “encouraged to submerge itself and re-emerge in balance in a ‘yes/and’ rather than either/or fashion” (p. 322).

Reorganising and recognising shared foundations.

Bushe (2013) asserts that on reaching a higher level of complexity in the design stage there also comes a greater level of reorganising amongst members within the complexity. In focus group two I noticed that we moved quite seamlessly into our own form of reorganising. Whilst acknowledging our desire to retain diversity in relation to our collective pedagogical position, we also began to consider the aspects of our collective pedagogical practice that could constitute what we began calling *shared foundations*. Three particular aspects were identified as shared foundations: our set of values in common, our pedagogical goals in common, and the emergence of new ways of languaging our practice. At this stage of our inquiry Stewart re-joined.

Values in common

Our common values were first to be acknowledged as a shared foundation:

Yes, even in this diversity of pedagogies we come down to a common set of values amongst our team. Like the value of social justice and the value of diversity. All sorts of things. Although we articulate these, there is a shared foundation in our values. (Stewart)

Yes, if we respect diversity in pedagogies and think about how what we do fits with values. The fact that we can do that in a way that works, and fits, will be seen by the students in our teaching practice as a reflection of those values. (Lucia)

In the above two excerpts Stewart and Lucia regard the values that we have in common as our shared foundation to which we use as a common reference point for a diverse range of pedagogies.

Goals in common

For Lucia, myself and Stewart, we had noticed in the transcript for focus group one, the frequency of similar goals underpinning our teaching practices. We all recognised that the goals we have in common could be identified and available to us as our shared foundations:

*We talked about our shared intentions and our **shared goals**. (Janet)*

*Yes, it is quite exciting to know that we have similar ways of being and have **similar goals** in our teaching practice. The fact that we talk about them differently is also good, because it provides students with an experience of different ways of expressing shared goals. I think not being the same is a strength because it really gives us a sense of providing of variety of lenses so students can get to understand what they're learning. That **our goals** in our teaching and learning process are the same is good. They are what binds us together. (Lucia)*

*Yes, and all those things are our foundation, including our **goals**. (Stewart)*

Lucia, Stewart and I recognise that our similar pedagogical goals or intentions can be a point of commonality or a shared foundation, whilst still allowing us to express and outwork these in our

individual and different ways. We didn't go on to name specific shared goals that had become evident in focus group one, which would have been a valuable process, had time permitted.

The importance of shared language

A further shared foundation for us was our use of shared language. For myself, I was particularly drawn in the transcript of focus group one, to this particular use of language and how this could be useful to us collectively:

I was drawn to moments where there was a common language between us all. We all spoke the same language, for example around scaffolding. Then there were some very similar goals, intentions and ways of doing things but we used different language amongst ourselves to describe these, like "just practice", "treaty practice" and "social justice"...The thing that excited me even more was the new language that emerge from our conversation that seemed to bring us together, like settling, troubling, vulnerability, care and understanding. At one-point Lucia you talked about supporting students to "tell their stories, to listen to stories, the students as well as teachers supporting one another in understanding those stories and then gaining learning for their counselling practice". I thought this was a new way for us to language these processes in our teaching and also that we could use in parallel in the skills we would like students to have for their practice with clients. It could almost be a frame for students' skills development. I just love this language, it felt like accessible language somehow, real language. (Janet)

In this excerpt, I draw attention to three different forms of language that I had noticed picked up shared aspects of our pedagogical practice. Firstly, the language that we have in common to describe the way we work, for example the theoretical concept of *scaffolding* that is a common concept for us all. Secondly, I am noticing our different ways of speaking about similar or common aspects in our practice such as *just practice*, *social justice* etc. As Lucia mentioned previously, these different articulations of similar aspects offer students a diversity of experiences in their learning. Thirdly, and what most excited me in reading the transcript, was what I termed the new language that was emerging through our research conversations. Language such as *settling*, *troubling*, etc. This was exciting to me in terms of offering us ways of speaking to our practice that I felt had a greater collective resonance and that appeared to encapsulate more fully what we are endeavouring to achieve together. The new language generated in our conversations could be seen as furnishing new ways of teaching. Zandee (2013) describes the way AI helps articulate what is on the edge of our experience and surfaces new language that becomes available for to us. She writes "out of the silence ...we weave new language for understanding and creation" (Zandee, 2013, p.81). In the above excerpt, I am clearly excited by the new language for our pedagogical practice, but also see the possibility of this new language such as *settling* being used to generate new skills for the students' practice (*settling clients*); a parallel process in effect between our pedagogical practice and the counselling practice we wish to develop in our students.

Creating the social architecture to realise our dreams - provocative propositions

What emerges from the Design Stage of appreciative inquiry has been described in different ways. Moody, Horton-Deutsch, and Pesut (2007) describe designing as “determining what should be” (p. 322), Flor (2005) regards this stage as producing “strategies for realizing their dream” (p.86), whilst Bushe (2013) describes this stage as effectively creating the social architecture to materialise the ideal. Cooperrider’s “provocative propositions” (cited in Bushe, 2013, p.106) is perhaps the most compelling description of what can emerge from the design Stage. Provocative propositions, Bushe (2013) highlights were Cooperrider’s attempts to maximise generativity and to “provoke generate thinking and action” (Bushe, 2013, p. 106). The production of these provocative propositions were bold statements almost as if desired changes had already taken place.

Four provocative propositions were worked on collectively during focus group 2. Quite remarkably Keita in her opening sharing with us named the three that she wished to see created during our focus group time and I added a fourth:

1. *Being able to map and define our collective pedagogies and our individual pedagogies.*
2. *I would like to have a go at the scaffolding, I think that would be really helpful.*
3. *To redefine our relationship to theory, ours and the students’ ...and how it fits with a bicultural degree, not one from 25 years ago.*

(Keita)

Clearly resonating with the three propositions that Keita had declared, I added a fourth

4. *Do we want to also think about a core counselling frame for our programme? (Janet)*

Provocative proposition 1: Mapping our collective pedagogy/pedagogies

The desire to map our collective pedagogy/pedagogies as a team was discussed earlier in this chapter as I provided excerpts of our desire to identify shared pedagogies and retain a flexibility in relation to our collective pedagogies being ever changing. The following three provocative propositions that we worked on for the remainder of focus group two, will be analysed as follows.

Provocative proposition 2: Having a go at scaffolding

From the very beginnings of our appreciative inquiry the desire for greater scaffolding of our teaching and learning processes had been a reoccurring theme:

There was a lovely comment in focus group one, someone said our practices on the programme were a bit scattered. (Keita)

In focus group two, we suddenly took hold of a specific teaching and learning process, the development of students' ability to work with stories, and "had a go" at defining what a scaffolded approach would look like. The following interchange captures this kōrero (discussion):

Say that again. What would be an example of how we could scaffold vulnerability?
(Lucia)

For example, for Year One, when we get them to do the life timeline exercise. The reason for that is to be able to start to understand their own experience and how this relates to counselling. It also gives them the opportunity and experience of sitting with hard stories, painful stories, their own and other students. They begin to look after themselves and the other people in the process. I've been so struck by the beautiful way they do that, the vulnerable places they are willing to go and feel safe to go in the process and getting to see that in the future these are the kinds of things that are going to be happening for them four or five times in a day during their counselling sessions.
(Keita)

...and that is the 'why' we are getting students to do this. Our students can then understand why this is important in the moment of classroom so that they are able to do this in practice. (Janet)

So, we are not doing that same work in Year Two. In Year one, we are doing a lot around their ability to engage with their own lifeline, to be able to share this and this and be there for others. In Year Two, they are bringing their practice and articulating how they are working with tangata whaiora (client's) stories in practice and sitting with clients in their vulnerability. With Year Three, I think for me it is very much about that they are actually looking at the moment-by-moment practice in relation to the vulnerability of these stories. (Keita)

So, we've got Year One being with own stories, attending to one another's stories and being with vulnerability. Year Two being able to attend to stories that arise in practice with tangata whaiora. Year Three is about "working" intentionally in relation to tangata whaiora stories, 'you and me' [client and counsellor] with your story. (Janet)

Yes, I'm not just attending to it, I'm being therapeutic with your story. (Keita)

Absolutely, that's the intentionality. (Lucia)

In this interchange what is most evident is the way in which Lucia, Keita and I are incorporating ideas about storying and vulnerability that originated from the one-to-one interviews and picked up in focus group one. In the above excerpt, the language in relation to working with stories is now becoming very naturally part of our vocabulary in relation to our shared pedagogy and as Cooperrider and Srivastva (1987) contend, we begin to see how appreciative inquiry generates new metaphors and images drawing on new language to furnish better ways forward for an organisation.

During this discussion on scaffolding in focus group two, I then raise the importance of being mindful of the *world of competencies*, very much a feature of the contemporary counselling

practice climate. Stewart had joined our focus group at this point and offered a recent example where he had been referring to competencies as he designed an addictions module on our programme. Keita then excitedly builds on how we might scaffold students' competency over the three years in regard to their being able to evaluate their practice:

Something else hangs us together I think, enough to kind of hold our diversities we have been identifying. We talked about engaging in some way with the competency world of practice, which I think can also help us have shared hangers. If we keep in mind the graduated practitioner from our programme and determine that at the end of Year 1 of our programme that the students are able to do this, and by Year 2 this, and so on. So, whether it's in relation to vulnerability or something else, we can define the competencies around these processes. (Janet)

I like that. Actually, that is what I am working on now for the Year 3 Addictions paper. What we have done with the students' keeping a journal is that we have tied them directly to a number of the competencies in the competency framework for the Addiction Practitioners' Association Aotearoa New Zealand (DAAPANZ). The basis of the reflective journal is that the student rates themselves against the competencies. I have also just developed a 1 to 5 scale, and the person who is observing their practice in the agency, uses the same assessment tool and rates them based on their observation. This all becomes part of their journal reflection in Year 3. (Stewart)

Can I add to that because I was really resonating with something, I think is going to be important? I think we need also to extend those kind of evaluation practices not only self-evaluation and the agency person, but also to include the tangata whaiora [clients] in the evaluation of the student. If the students were to bring back a certain number of evaluations from tangata whaiora, some from a supervisor, some from colleagues, a 360 kind of idea. Because that is evaluating practice. It is also saying that what we are teaching and what students are taking from what we are teaching is effective in practice. (Keita)

And it models what organisations should do doing in terms of having tangata whaiora [client] evaluations in practice. (Stewart)

We could do it as part of their criteria, like their evaluation criteria when they leave the programme at the end of year 3. It is showing that they have been able to do what they need to be able to do, by the time they leave the programme and those evaluations would support that wouldn't it? It is not just us evaluating. So, in Year 2 we could get them to get them done by tangata whaiora. In Year 3 we get them to actually submit them. (Keita)

Here Keita, Stewart and I briefly construct how we might scaffold students learning in regard to developing the ability to evaluate their practice. In this instance, we also tie this specifically to the competencies that will be expected of graduates in relation to the evaluation practices in the various employing organisations.

Four further areas were flagged for scaffolding, although not fully teased out, in relation to students' learning and development in relation to: their capacity for critical reflexivity, their theoretical competence and ability to manage complexity in thinking and practice; their

competency working with Pōwhiri Poutama¹² (Huata, 1997, Drury, 2007), a Māori process of relational encounter on the marae, that could be a core frame for students' counselling practice, and, their involvement in the professional community of learning. Keita acknowledged that there wasn't time to discuss these further in focus group two:

I am not suggesting we do this right down to the nitty gritty now with all of the processes we would like to scaffold, but we have just done this one, as a guide for the scaffolding of others next year. (Keita)

However, a pertinent point was very quickly raised when discussing the scaffolding of students' capacity for critical reflection:

We also need to consider the context for scaffolding processes and how that can happen best because as we know that it can go well or not... (Keita)

. And we need to consider how to support the processes we scaffold. (Lucia)

...and so that is that receiving context isn't it, for this critical reflexivity to happen. (Keita)

Keita made a pertinent point that scaffolding of various processes cannot be considered in isolation but rather in the broader context in which our pedagogical practices sit. Keita's experience that she had shared in focus group one, where the absence of a receiving context for encouraging students' to be critically reflective, resulting in her taking up a position of silence, was echoed in her comments here.

In a similar way, I drew attention to the importance of us not only designing scaffolding processes but being clearer with the students' as to what they can expect each year and what they are *signing up to*. In relation to scaffolding students' professional development including being part of a professional community of learning/practice whilst on the programme, I suggested:

For example, in terms of the students' being in a professional community of learning/practice what does that look like in Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3? What are our processes around how and why we address issues that arise on the programme and how we scaffold that Year 1, Year 2, and Year 3? It is about articulating to students as well as ourselves what these are and getting some sign up, "this is what you are coming into and why we do it in relation to your learning for your future practice as counsellors. So, we will challenge discourses and other aspects, this is what you can expect when you sign up". This gives us permission then to step into places and engage with students in these processes. (Janet)

¹² Pōwhiri Poutama¹² (Huata, 1997) "The ritual that is most familiar to New Zealanders today is the pōwhiri, and it is enacted most commonly as a welcome on the marae. Paraire Huata (Te Ngaru Learning Systems, 1997) has developed what is called the 'pōwhiri poutama' model to represent learning or development based upon the processes contained in the pōwhiri" (Drury, 2007, p.12).

In this excerpt, I am linking scaffolding to a concern we have also carried through the inquiry regarding our need to be clearer with our students as to what they are signing up to. By linking scaffolding with signing up, we construct an even more specific strategy for our future that simultaneously addresses to areas of concern.

Provocative Proposition 3: A new relationship with theory

A recurrent collective dream during our collective conversations had been for us to find a *new relationship with theory*, both in the way we approach the teaching of theory and how students develop a theoretical base to their practice:

Theories is the big macro picture. I think maybe it is about us looking differently at theories, having a different relationship with theories. It is really important that the frameworks and the way students engage with them and how they use them on a daily basis, how they make sense of them is also a key focus of their learning around their practice. (Lucia)

Yes, we've talked a lot about wanting to have a different relationship to the theories, so instead of teaching this theory and that theory we were saying actually we were wanting to possibly move to a different relationship to theory for the students and for us. (Janet)

Yes, and these theories are all discourses, counselling discourses, that are available to them, to understand and have some knowledge of those discourses, you have to have some knowledge of the different ideas and where they come from. (Keita)

...and why we take them up and draw from them. And to consider their impact when we work from them. (Janet)

It could be one module, a theories kind of module or two modules maybe, I don't know. I know that in many, many years of doing and teaching narrative therapy I cannot do that well in this degree, and I can't do person-centered teaching well, and I can't teach CBT well, so I am feeling really unsatisfied with trying to do that and not doing it well. It is not helpful. (Keita)

So, there is a question there because teaching theories is a teaching and learning process that we are talking about, 'what does that mean for us'? (Lucia)

So, a different relationship to theory? Is that capturing it? (Janet)

Yes, and what does that mean, what does that look like? (Lucia)

Although, the question of our relationship to theory as a programme is not resolved in this short interchange, in discussing the next provocative proposition 4, finding a core frame (below) the question of our relationship to theory is again tackled. This suggests that when designing provocative propositions certain issues may pertain to a number of propositions and therefore, may not be able to be addressed in a straightforward discrete manner.

Provocative Proposition 4: A Core Frame.

A further provocative proposition that we worked on in this second focus group had also been raised repeatedly during our collective inquiry namely, whether it was possible to identify and embed some form of core structure that could serve as a reference point or integrating frame for the programme. This was wanted by us particularly in relation to teaching counselling skills and to provide a frame/process for the students for their counselling sessions:

Yes, that is what we need. Gardiner and Lang in their article in the Book of Readings use the skills framework Attend, Reflect, Collaborate, but our version might be different. (Janet)

I think it is Pōwhiri Poutama [refer above footnote 10], but that is just me...I resonate with you Janet on what you just said recently about throwing out the learning of all the different theories and skills that go with the theories. I am really valuing the idea of bicultural practice starting with the pōwhiri process as a structure of our counselling and taking it right through the counselling relationship, the counselling session and then to bring in skills and practices that support development through this process. I have a sense of how that could be good bicultural practice. What students need to know is what theories they are bringing in, why they are bringing it and where they are getting it from. For example, if they are bringing in a problem-solving approach, they need to know why are they doing that, and is that the best approach? (Keita)

It would work for the people who prefer to take a more modernist or a humanist position or more of a postmodern position. How they then read those things and what they draw from would be what we focus on. (Keita)

It is almost like an encounter framework. It is more than a skills framework; it is a relational framework isn't it? (Janet)

It is a relational process, it is inviting people in, it is a hospitable process, it is a safe process, it creates safety, it creates a space to share, to be looked after, and the Pōwhiri process seems to have everything that counselling is about. If we have a structure like the Pōwhiri process, it can guide out teaching team meetings, it can guide our classroom planning, our sessions, it can guide everything. (Keita)

Yes, and the students would meet a programme absolutely grounded in the Pōwhiri process so they actually get some confidence in that process so that they could then facilitate processes on the programme so that we're not always facilitating processes ourselves. (Janet)

That is the experiential and modelling that you talked about Janet, it is not teaching them to go out and do it, it is something they are actually doing on the programme. (Keita)

We continue

What this conversation is bringing in now for me is more about the process than having to teach all the skills and theories. (Keita)

What the processes themselves teach the students, is that what you are meaning Keita? (Janet)

The focus is on the experiential that Lucia was talking about, thinking about what that means in practice and it is a 'practising what we preach', it is a whole lot of things that really fits with my values. It is the experience thing and the modelling that you talked about too Janet, due to the experiencing and the learning about what you are

experiencing and then you talked about the modelling.....and the doing of practice now, it is not something we are teaching them to go out and do, it is something they are actually doing. (Keita)

...and we are setting them up to be able to do practice now aren't we, to kind of do these things and processes. By Year 3 it should be so familiar to them that they can just run a process, they can just facilitate a process. (Janet)

We should talk about us aligning our practice with what we are teaching in the classroom. (Lucia)

Zandee (2013) writing of generative dialogue in AI, states that it creates “new thought for action...in which thought, and action are intertwined” (p.84). In the above excerpt, Keita and I are constructing a full picture of the way in which the idea of Pōwhiri Poutama as the core frame for the programme which would then determine and provide a reference point for many different processes across the programme. This could be a reference point for: a process for students’ relating to tangata whaiora (clients), a process for the teaching team interactions and meetings with one another, and a relational framework within which other theoretical ideas could be integrated etc.

In this excerpt, we are not only considering one aspect of teaching and learning in a discrete way, rather the construction of this provocative proposition manages to connect to and encapsulate many aspects of our previous conversations. Keita and I recognise that what we were designing would fulfil our hopes for a programme that would enable students to engage uniquely and differently with theories (as mentioned above), and also would offer students an experiential learning environment where they learn through their experiencing of the Pōwhiri Poutama process throughout the three years of the programme. Our desire for a programme that is firmly underpinned in experiential learning processes is therefore, becoming stronger in our conversations. Bushe (2013) captures the way in which generative images begin to reflect not only the new ways of thinking and acting, but a much more comprehensive change towards a new order of shared assumptions and attitudes such as we see becoming embedded in the conversation between Keita, Lucia and I in respect of experiential pedagogy. Bushe writes of a generative image:

It doesn't even have to be an image no one in the group ever had before – but it does have to be one that has not been considered widely. It has to be “new”. A generative image allows people see the world anew, identify new options, formulate new strategies, even reform their identity. (2013, p. 92)

Commitments to moving forward

In the latter part of focus group two, our conversation began to shift towards what we might wish to do in relation to pedagogy arising from focus group 2. As I sensed this shift, I offered the following invitation:

I think we are moving into 3, our commitments moving forward. I wonder if it is helpful to consider whether and how we might wish to go forward from here after our focus group. (Janet)

The AI literature appears quick to highlight the challenges in fulfilling the final destiny stage of an appreciative inquiry process (Bushe, 2013; Carter, 2006). They remind of the importance of negotiating a realistic and achievable vision of destiny ensuring that “people believe they are authorized to take action based on the proposals that came out of design” (p. 108). In the following excerpts we are negotiating both how we might continue our pedagogical consideration collectively after the focus groups have finished and how we might take up some of the pedagogical changes we have identified and constructed.

Looking together at formal pedagogical theories

Having gained greater clarity regarding the pedagogies that resonate with us collectively, both Lucia and Stewart were keen to look to the relevant readings and consider what these might offer us in developing our collective pedagogical practice further:

It is still very broad what we have got here and it would be good for us to ‘put more meat on the bones’ and help each other in our envisioning process, I think it is a really good opportunity from the readings and what we have talked about, as we have got these very broad ideas, and they are very broad, if we can do some more work on it, it would be great and have a bicultural discussion. (Lucia)

Lucia recognises the importance of building on what we have started to become more specific in our understandings of our pedagogies. She flags the critical importance of considering our programme’s bicultural underpinnings as part of this. Stewart was also excited that having identified meaningful pedagogies we have the opportunity now to look to more formal pedagogical theory in the readings to deepen our understanding and practice:

I mean there were some great readings there. I was thinking of our process, and the role of theory forming and shaping practice. If we are saying transformational pedagogy is something we identify with, the readings you are offering us suggest it could look like this and we could consider what it would they look like for us here, what it means for the NZQA [New Zealand Qualifications Authority] expectations around how we language and structure the courses. (Stewart)

Stewart raises an important point with respect to the relationship between pedagogical development collectively for the programme and the importance of considering the parameters of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA), the accrediting body for our programme. Both Stewart and Lucia take a somewhat pragmatic view of this:

I’m not thinking that there would be an issue because at the moment we are doing a pedagogy, but we haven’t named it, the fact that we are naming it won’t make any changes in the way that we do things. (Lucia)

It won’t. In fact, what it will do is that for an organisation like NZQA if we are very clear about why we are doing what we are doing, and how we are doing it and that we have taken the care to rigorously consider the frameworks in which we are supposed to operate and still maintain the integrity they will rate this highly. (Stewart)

Rolling with Reservations

As the excitement regarding our future commitments was voiced, so too were the reservations:

I am started to get deflated as we are doing this because it is so exciting, and I am just about in tears because the time... I'm just not getting my work done. I so want to do this, but it is that resources thing again. (Keita)

And this process is so good. (Lucia)

A recurrent theme throughout the research had been available time for this research process. Time limits had also been a factor in determining that our formal focus group process would not extend beyond two groups. By now in our collective conversation there appears to be an ease in the flow of our conversation in regard to our ability to raise reservations, concerns or potential constraints. Twice in focus group two, Keita expresses feeling overwhelmed with her existing workload and her inability to commit to anything else. The impact of Keita's raising her concern led us to be very realistic in our consideration as to how our collective conversations could be part of our existing meetings as opposed to requiring extra time that it was very evident, no one had available:

I think it is really important for the team and we can do it in our counsellor tutor team meetings every other week as a team process of working together and visualising together. We don't have to do every topic every week, we can pick one and then capture that and that would be beneficial for us but also for you and your research Janet. (Lucia)

This suggestion from Lucia appeared to settle Keita:

I mean, we have that space and for me that seems a really, really valuable use of that space which we have to put a placeholder there. That is being extremely proactive about how to use it. (Keita)

Realistic Commitments

Lucia continued to offer a manageable and a realistic picture of what going forward might require:

I think Stewart is probably right, we have it all here it is just we just have to add the skills and find the way to articulate it. (Lucia)

Yes, from what I have heard from these conversations we are actually doing these things, we just haven't named them for ourselves and we haven't articulated them for students. (Keita)

Both Lucia and Keita began to recognise that through our conversation that we were much further ahead in relation to pedagogy than we might think, and they began to suggest ways to draw from what we had already achieved together:

Janet, I think we can use that transcript because a lot of it's there, pulling out the key words, putting them on a page. My way of reading is to highlight key words, if we just take one task like 'what are the students signing up for' and put all those words on the

page, we could shape them into some kind of statement and the same with our pedagogies, the shared and the different. We could probably do this quite quickly. (Keita)

Throughout the appreciative inquiry process, Keita had given particular cognisance to the potential held in our transcripts concerning language used in our conversations. In the above excerpt Keita is again drawing our attention as a realistic and easily accessible starting place for further pedagogical development as a team.

Lucia also offers a starting place that is at her/our 'fingertips' also:

Well I am really keen to start just a small article on describing what bicultural practice is. I have been thinking about it and wanting to jot some ideas down and have a think about what some of our ideas are and start that process. It is not a big thing. (Lucia)

So, when we have that bicultural discussion, why don't we think about it in the context of an article? (Keita)

Lucia offers a further journal article possibility in relation to pedagogy and assessments:

Actually, it would be helpful for us too aligning our pedagogy around assessment and that will be an article. (Lucia)

Actually, it is an important part of what we do for our teaching and learning process because assessment is such a key part of what we do and there are so many pedagogical positions inherent in our assessments. (Janet)

...and actually, that is a helpful process further down the line in relation to what we are doing, not just in the classroom but in the language that we use in all our documentation and our assessments, all those sorts of things as well. (Stewart)

. that will also potentially generating some research outputs as my research outputs for the last years have been ghost outputs as I am so busy (Stewart).

...we are making these statements and I think we need to start committing to this somehow and reading the articles is a good first step. (Lucia)

Does that feel doable, not overwhelming for anyone, does it feel doable? (Janet)

Stewart, Lucia and I are again constructing ways in which are commitments going forward can be woven into existing programme requirements such as incorporating pedagogical considerations into our existing documentation processes and making any additional work on pedagogy count for research outputs required of tutors.

Concern was also expressed as to the actual feasibility of implementing our preferred collective pedagogy. Two key pedagogies, experiential and bicultural, were perceived as needing greater levels of resources in order to do justice to working in these ways:

Yes, but we also need to have... there needs to be some... discussion is good, but we need the action. (Lucia)

The biggest challenge is resources and money because our ideal pedagogy will require resources. If we are talking experiential pedagogy ideally, we would need more resources for that and that is something we are going to be tripped up by. (Lucia)

One thing you raised, I think is important to mention it too, Lucia, is that really, really refining and articulating what bicultural counselling practice is. (Keita)

...and that will require resourcing as well for us to rebuild that capacity and be confident in what we do. (Stewart)

I always felt we needed two full years of doing our new bicultural degree to get us on the way without having staff cuts and we got 10 months. It's a bit sad because these are some of the people resources needed and we could be doing much more. Yes, Lucia resources is going to be a big problem. (Keita)

We could argue for it, for more people to develop the degree. (Keita)

We could put that budget out. (Janet)

It is about creating an argument for it. (Stewart)

Reservations are expressed here regarding the staffing capacity to progress in making changes towards working more intentionally and extensively from experiential pedagogies and addressing the centrality of biculturalism in our degree. Whilst raised as an important concern as with the other reservations expressed during focus group two, we seem able to easily reach for possible strategies to continue moving forward rather than these reservations been considered as insurmountable and/or derailing our progress in the design stage.

Concluding thoughts

The most striking feature of focus group two is the apparent ease with which Keita, Lucia, Stewart and I very quickly established the key areas of focus for our conversation that appeared to be of importance for us all. So too, the way in which we effectively began working together to design how we might go forward in making the pedagogical changes and commitments that we had begun dreaming of in our previous conversations. Resonant with Bushe's (2013) observation that the design stage is characterized by convergence, in this focus group we very organically converged on four areas of work along the lines of the construction of provocative propositions (Cooperrider cited in Bushe, 2013, p. 106).

Four provocative propositions were designed collectively: clarifying our shared and ever-changing pedagogies as a team, scaffolding learning processes and outcomes across the three years of the programme, finding a new relationship with theories for ourselves and students, and developing a core relational framework for the programme. Closer analysis of these provocative propositions reveals the way in which ideas, concepts and language reoccurring through all phases of our research had become naturally embedded in these propositions or constructions. It was as if we had now found a way of conversing through the use of language and ideas that held shared understanding and meaning.

In the latter part of focus group two, again with apparent ease, Keita, Lucia, Stewart and I considered and negotiated commitments we could realistically make going forward in relation to pedagogy collectively for our programme. Attention was given to the reservations that surfaced during focus group two in relation to the lack of resourcing to achieve our hopes. Most striking here, is the way in which the reservations appeared to propel us to think about how we might build any forward commitments into existing practices and to be very creative and strategic in this regard.

Throughout focus group two, the extent to which particularly Keita and Stewart felt at maximum workload capacity becomes evident and indeed both had resigned from their teaching positions at Wintec within weeks of our group (see Chapter 8). Whilst as a teaching team we had very competently designed realistic strategies for going forward, on reflection Bushe reminds us of the importance in appreciative inquiry to ensure that participants “believe they are authorised” (2013, p. 108) and indeed one could argue are *actually* authorized and resourced to carry out the commitments made in the design stage of the inquiry.

CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has engaged one team of counsellor educators, my teaching colleagues and I, in an appreciative inquiry process of sharing and considering pedagogy collectively. The aim was to investigate how counsellor education teaching teams more broadly might effectively consider pedagogy from a collective viewpoint, through this in-depth analysis of our teams' experience. The findings of the three phases of our appreciative inquiry were presented in chapters 5, 6, and 7, respectively.

The design of this study

Embarking on this doctorate I had a sense that there could be far greater possibilities for shared conversations about pedagogy in counsellor education teaching teams than were currently taking place. A preliminary search of the literature confirmed that I was not alone in my views and that there was a growing call for more in-depth attention to pedagogy (Barrio Minto, Watcher Morris & Yaites, 2014), for the scholarship of teaching and learning to be a more collective endeavour (Boitshwarelo & Vermuri, 2017) and, for the link between pedagogy and curriculum to be given greater credence (Boitshwarelo & Vermuri, 2017; Brackette, 2014). Given that others held similar concerns, this provided impetus to undertake research that would effectively "have a go" at responding to the call. I looked to research methodologies that were concerned with both *acting for change* and at a *collective* rather than individual level. Participatory Research (PR) methodologies focused on collective and co-operative knowledge construction (Higginbottom & Liamputtong, 2015), were ideal for this project. However, I was mindful that it is not possible to suddenly manufacture a shared concern amongst a group of people so the genuine enthusiastic response of my three teaching team colleagues to jointly take ownership of an inquiry into pedagogy, was a joy. My three teaching colleagues, all experienced educators, were adept at jointly managing an inquiry that was both true to participatory aspirations and, was led by me for my doctorate. One of the significant personal impacts of this research was learning in a greater capacity to take leadership of a process that required trusting my own knowing, and at the same time, trusting the knowing of my colleagues. I learnt to listen at new levels.

As this research process was taking shape, our teaching team was undergoing significant staff cuts due to policy changes in organisational staff/student ratios. Following these cuts, the remaining four educators involved in this study were grappling with resultant increased workloads and low morale. Appreciative Inquiry (AI) with its hopeful and generative underpinnings (Bushe, 2013; Zandee, 2013), offered itself to us as a way in which to undertake research that would bring some much-needed encouragement and uplift to the team.

AI by its nature lends itself to an emergent process shaped by the locality and context (Barge & Oliver, 2003; Van der Haar and Hosking, 2004). This AI process was jointly shaped by myself

and my three teaching team colleagues as a three-phase process: Phase one involved one-to-one interviews involving individual pedagogical reflections and phases two and three each comprised a focus group. The first three of the characteristic 4D, discover dream, design, destiny (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005) stages of AI are evidenced across the three phases of our inquiry. The fourth stage, destiny, took place after our formal AI process had ended.

Phase one: Revealing the constitution of pedagogy and the implications

This study has highlighted the unique and deeply personal nature of pedagogy. For those involved in this study, pedagogy was very individually determined even though we were committed to delivering a shared programme curriculum. Even more significant, this research has revealed how for these educators' pedagogy is being *produced* or *constructed* in moments of teaching practice (Whitehead, 1999, 2018; Whitehead & McNiff, 2006). This is in contrast to what I had previously thought that our pedagogy is a largely fixed framework of ideas, concepts and practices that we then enact in our teaching practice. For the four educators in this study (myself included), how pedagogy was being produced in our teaching moments was of interest, as it presents the possibility of a greater understanding of the constitution of pedagogy for counsellor educators, and for educators more broadly in higher education. Similarly, it offers insight into how pedagogical reflection and development might more effectively be enabled.

There were striking similarities amongst all four participants in this study in the way we articulated our pedagogies, and the particular aspects of our pedagogical practice that were most important to us. This drew me to Whitehead's view of pedagogy as educators' living educational theories (Whitehead, 1999), a body of work that has been influential for decades in bringing a different lens to the understanding of pedagogy. Relatedly, Wright and van Eck's (2018) differentiation between ontic and epistemic conceptions was also useful in determining how pedagogy was understood by participants in this study, which revealed our understandings resembled ontic rather than epistemic conceptions. This resonance with pedagogy as living educational theories and with an ontic bias is considered here. The implications of these findings are discussed.

Accessing pedagogy - the importance of stories of lived-experience

The stories told of our teaching experiences gave important insight into how we were constructing or producing our pedagogies in moments of teaching practice. This very much aligns with Whitehead's living educational theory view that we access the nature of shape of our pedagogies through considering our lived-experiences. In our inquiry, an invitation was given to our four educators to share stories of both peak and dissonance teaching moments as in my view what is most important and meaningful to us, can be revealed in both. However, Whitehead holds a strong view that it is in moments where we experience ourselves as contradictory (similar to my dissonance moments), that we access what is most important to us and that

propels us to seek after who we want to be. It remains my contention even more as a result of this study, that both dissonance moments where we are at odds in ourselves, and optimum moments where all that we hoped for is experienced, are access points into how we are constructing and or producing our living educational theories. One of the central theses of Whitehead living theory viewpoint is that our explanatory principles “are expressed in terms of flows of life-affirming energy with the embodied values” (2009, p. 88). I do wonder therefore, if it is in peak or optimum experiences where this life-flowing energy is uninterrupted and at its greatest. And therefore, that these moments are as significant as dissonance ones.

The constitution of pedagogy

The way in which we storied our experiences also resembled Connors and Sharar’s (2016) description of pedagogy as a complex interplay of factors. The similarity amongst us all regarding the form of this interplay was striking. This included: brief descriptions of instructional activities and the ideas behind these, detailed observations of the nuanced way in which students engaged with these practices and, whether our pedagogical intentions and goals for students’ learning in these moments had been realised. Reference was also continuously made not only to the hopes for students’ learning in *particular* moments, but how each moment was linked to our well-articulated broader educational aspirations for the students as future counsellors e.g. as *socially just practitioners*, as *skilful and competent practitioners*, as *practitioners adept in relational practice*. In this regard, it was these broad educational aspirations that appeared to be the reference point for determining the direction of pedagogical practice for each of us, as opposed to any guiding pedagogical directive at programme level. The perceived fulfilment, or not, of these aspirations also seemed to determine for our educators the extent to which our pedagogical practice was judged as successful.

As well as the continual reference to our pedagogical goals and broad educational aspirations what came to light also was how our practice was predicated on our deeply held personal values and beliefs regarding what we deemed important in life, such as authenticity, justice, caring for one another, transformation etc., and closely related, our deeply held relational values such as authentic relating, respectful relating, co-operative relationships. These ontological values and relational values were frequently translated into their meaning and application for the educational context, i.e. the nature of relating that was considered necessary for students to achieve the learning and transformation needed to become counsellors. For example, for Lucia *this involved creating learning experiences similar to the collective relational processes of engagement on a Māori marae that enabled students to learn to be deeply empathetic towards one another as they shared and listened to one another’s stories of vulnerability*, and for Keita, *her deeply held value of justice and relational responsibilities towards all in the learning environment, meant that she invited one student to consider the way she had “spoken on behalf of” others as a learning opportunity to recognise the ways it is possible to marginalise people*.

One of the key revelations from this study is the centrality of values to educational practice and therefore pedagogy. Whitehead (2018) quite simply states “the reason that values are fundamental to educational theory is that education is a value-laden practical activity” (p.14). Whitehead usefully describes values as “the human goals which we use to give our lives their particular form. These values that are embodied in our practice, are often referred to in terms such as freedom, justice, democracy” (p 14). These values, Whitehead contends, are often used as reasons for action.

Whitehead and McNiff (2006) describe how these ontological, relational, epistemological and pedagogical values “act as explanatory principles” (p.85) for practice and derive from *within* practice. These ontological values, our embodied tacit knowledge, transform into ontological standards of judgement and our ontological values transform into epistemological values and standards of judgement. Whitehead and McNiff describe this as the process of forming pedagogical or educational commitments “our ontological values transform into our educational commitments” (p. 86). In the stories of practice in this research, our frequently expressed concern as to whether our educational aspirations had been realised in our teaching moments, and therefore whether we considered them successful, resonates with Whitehead and McNiff’s assertion that these explanatory principles also are “the standards by which we judge our theories” (2006, p. 85).

A living theory viewpoint of pedagogy – the implications

Considering pedagogy from the viewpoint that our pedagogical knowledge is an enactment and translation of our deeply held personal and relational values could explain why pedagogy has been given limited in-depth attention in counsellor education (Barrio Minton, Watcher Morris & Yaites, 2014). Not least, it is often difficult to know for oneself what we value deeply, given it is often so embedded and intricately part of our identities. Whitehead and McNiff (2006) also contend that our educational knowledge is ever changing and created from *within our* practice (rather than being a fixed pre-determined body of knowledge), I would suggest therefore that it is not immediately accessible to us.

The deeply personal nature of our pedagogical commitments may also mean that there is a lot at stake when we share our deepest values with others. It can be difficult to do in conversations that are not framed well to enable this and could be one reason why pedagogy is largely an individual practice (Kahn, Goodhew, Murphy & Walsh, 2013). If pedagogy is such a unique and personal phenomenon, could it be that at some level for counsellor educators that the metaphorical “elephant in the room” is that it is known that it would not be straightforward to define a shared pedagogy or pedagogies given the potential diversity of views regarding what is deemed of most value? My experience as a professional counsellor working with people experiencing relational conflict is that it takes a level of skill to establish safe processes to

enable differences stemming from diverse and deeply held core values to be managed and negotiated, in order to find points of shared interest.

These possible difficulties lend weight to the need for educators to have a clear sense of their own pedagogical practice and pedagogical commitments if they are to come together in any form of collective inquiry with certainty, confidence and/or capacity to share at a meaningful level. If pedagogy is not a static and fixed phenomenon and is created by educators from *within their practice*, I believe that it is important for individuals to have ways of discovering for themselves the shape of this pedagogy prior to then engaging in a collective process and to have ways of speaking to this in dynamic, ever changing terms.

There are many ways to go about constructing our living educational theory. From the revelations of the four educators in this study, and my putting together my own living theory excerpt (see later in this chapter), I have developed the following guide for educators to use in reflecting and constructing pedagogy, in preparation for sharing with others. In this guide, I have invited consideration of a peak moment rather than dissonance or contradictory one. In Appendix J, a fuller guide I have also developed, draws on both peak and dissonance moments.

Guide 1: For Producing Our Living Educational Theory

1. Consider a story of a peak experience in your teaching practice whereby all that you hoped for pedagogically was realised, and/or where there was a sense of synergy and/or life-affirming energy in the experience.
2. Pay attention to the very specific nuances in your own and students' behaviours that speak to the fulfilment of your pedagogical goal(s) having been realised in this moment. Allow for this to connect you to your broader educational aspirations for the kind of counsellors you wish to graduate, capable of making a difference to society.
3. Notice what was at the heart of the moment for you, and what this speaks to in terms of what you value in life, in relationships and for humanity more broadly.
4. Notice the influences (people, experiences, ideas, and formal theories of teaching and learning and/or pedagogical theories) that have informed how these values are expressed in your educational practices.
5. Identify the directions in which you are travelling in your ongoing pedagogical journey...including new and/or alternative ideas that are presenting themselves to you to consider.

Phase two: Crucial relational and co-constructional processes

This research has revealed the extent to which values lie at the heart of our pedagogical/educational endeavours. Appreciative inquiry with its focus on appreciating what is deeply valued and meaningful to participants and organisations, turned out to be a fortuitous choice for researching pedagogy. I had not specifically selected AI for this reason. What had been a strong pull to AI methodology was that it centered relational processes as foundational to inquiry (Zandee, 2013).

In AI literature there appears to be much discussion on the nuances of the relational processes underpinning the inquiry, characterised by appreciating in the initial stages (Grant & Humphries, 2006; Moody, Horton-Deutsch & Pesut, 2007; Zandee, 2013). In Chapter 6, I presented an analysis of the particular way of relating between the four participants in this study as we began the first focus group, and what was most enabling of us.

The importance of individual preparation for pedagogical sharing

As we began for our first focus group, we took turns to share our pedagogies which was a succinct yet full capture of what was important to each of us. This was skilfully done, enabled I believe by the preparatory work of the one-to-one interviews. This sharing of *what was most meaningful to us* in relation to our pedagogy included: sharing stories and experiences of teaching, pedagogical goals, broad educational aspirations for our students, processes of teaching and learning, the ways of relating with students and between students that enabled learning and, our deeply held life and educational values that were foundational to us. I believe that the clarity of this sharing opened the way for equally intentional processes of appreciating to take place between us, characteristic of AI.

Understanding, appreciating and encounter

Barge and Oliver (2003) point out there are multiple possibilities regarding what becomes the subject of appreciation in an inquiry and is most effective when determined collaboratively, which is what ensued in this study. For us, appreciation was offered by way of offering back full accounts of what stood out as meaningful to the other. This conveyed that there was genuine depth of understanding about the complexity in another's accounts rather than a selecting of singular ideas or values. Our appreciations also contained reflections of our sense of what was aspirational to the other and what they considered as excellence in their practice. Barge and Oliver (2003) regard this as the tapping into what was life-affirming for one another. One of the striking features of our appreciative process was how we each enabled one another's sharing of pedagogy to impact on ourselves, thus our appreciations were not only offerings back but served to connect us in deeper ways to each other.

Barge and Oliver (2003) also emphasise the way in which appreciating enables the finding of shared meaning and then from this, alignment. In our study, this very clearly took place as we

were emotionally drawn to one another's sharing and often selected ideas and language that was meaningful for us in another's' sharing such as *wanting a greater degree of scaffolding in students' learning*. Barge and Oliver (2003) also advocated that individuals can simultaneously embrace appreciating whilst at the same time search for new future possibilities in conversation. In the example of *scaffolding students' learning*, as Barge and Oliver suggest, this language was taken forward through the rest of the inquiry.

Amongst many AI proponents there appears to be considerable emphasis on the role of appreciation as part of a wider concept of relational encounter. For example, Grant and Humphries (2006) talk of appreciation as meaning "to know, to be conscious of" (p. 408). In a similar vein, Moody, Horton-Deutsch and Pesut (2007) emphasise how "the language of appreciation is the language of understanding" (p. 321) and involves "the capacity to express positive sentiments and to listen and give deeply of oneself in order to achieve unity of understanding and being with others" (p. 321). However, it is Zandee (2013) that for me encapsulates the full potential of relational encounter that can lie at the heart of an appreciative inquiry. Zandee (2013) incorporates Buber's (1958) concept of true dialogue, where genuine encounter is in "moments in which we meet the other and otherness with open, undivided attention" (Zandee, 2013, p. 77). This she claims is where we truly affirm, confirm and *become* in our relationship with one another. Zandee writes "inquiry as meeting invites a more intuitive and embodied approach, that stimulates knowledge creation through connection" (2013, p. 77). There were significant moments in our first focus group that cause me to join Zandee in viewing a successful collective inquiry as one that achieves this level of encounter. In our study, for example, Keita spoke of the way she often did not feel understood in relation to her pedagogy and yet in our meeting she felt there *was understanding and valuing of what she held dear*. Witnessing this in our study, suggests to me that it is not only affirmation through appreciating that is needed, but also a full understanding of the dialogical process that includes "imaging the real, making the other present, and confirming the other" (Brown, 2017, p. 426) to truly experience relational encounter where the *between* takes place. Brown takes up Buber's' image of meeting on the *narrow ridge*, a somewhat precarious place of simultaneous deep longing and mistrust, and where we avoid stepping off the ridge to places of certainty. Brown (2017) writes "the *between* or a dialogical moment happens when both parties are mutually present on the narrow ridge" (p. 426), or in Buber terms "when deep calls unto deep" (1947, p. 204). For our team of trained counsellors and helping professionals, the capacity for such depth of relational encounter are familiar ways of relating in our profession of counselling. For teaching teams in other fields of higher education where these ways of relating may be less familiar, there may be the need for greater orientation to these relational processes and specifically the skill of appreciating. This could include orienting to what might be the focus of appreciation and, how to go about appreciating to enable a depth of connection to occur. I have developed the following guide therefore which has many dialogic principles (Buber, 1958; Zandee, 2013) and

ways to encourage appreciating. It encompasses affirmation of the other, understanding of the other, conveying this understanding, acknowledgement of diverse perspectives and ways to discover the values held by one another. I weighed up whether to suggest the specific noticing of pedagogical goals, aspirations, deeply held values etc., however in order to hold to Barge and Oliver's (2003) assertion that *what* becomes appreciated is best determined collectively, I have left these out.

Guide 2: For Sharing, Understanding, Appreciating and Aligning in Collective Pedagogical Inquiry

Consider what is important to share with your team from your living educational theory jottings/writing (Guide 1: For Producing Our Living Educational Theory). Share what you would like them to know, in the way that best speaks to this for you. Take turns to share. As each other is sharing consider the following:

1. Notice and appreciate aspects of your colleagues sharing that are important to them.
2. What picture is this forming that you might offer back to them?
3. What stands out as important to your colleague in what they are sharing?
4. What sense are you getting of what lies at the heart of their pedagogical practice and/or what they consider to be excellence for their practice?
5. What is the impact for you of their sharing?
6. What has resonance for you from their sharing?
7. What new possibilities has their sharing offered you individually or your team as a collective?
8. Are there any new ways of speaking about or languaging pedagogical ideas and/or pedagogical practice that you have noticed and valued?

Co-constructing processes

There was definite shift mid-way in focus group one, from us finding shared meaning towards co-constructing. In Chapter 6, I describe how there was a sense that the task of appreciating had been accomplished sufficiently, and more significantly that we had met one another in genuine encounter or “the between” for us to begin co-constructing new meaningful images for the future or as van den Nieuwenhof describes “organisational realities” (p. 159).

The analysis of this moment of transition in our study revealed several key points that are important in answering this research question regarding how teaching teams might collectively consider pedagogy. The first, is the importance of continuing to hold appreciative inquiry’s underpinning constructionist viewpoint that holds the locus of knowledge is in the relationship rather than within individuals (Zandee & Cooperrider, 2008). In this respect, it is the in-between moments that are looked for. As Carter (2006) describes we seek to work with the “convergence zone” (Carter, 2006, p. 56). Understanding the nature of this convergence, I believe is also important. Van de Haar and Hosking (2004) usefully point out that we are not looking for “universal meanings or presumptions” (p. 1022) rather the co-construction of “relational realities” (p. 1022). In this respect, convergence is not the looking for sameness of ideas rather it is the capacity to allow both shared meaning and divergence to be capitalised upon in order for what Bushe (2013) describes as the emergence of a more complex coherence.

Our study highlighted the importance of the facilitator and/or inquiry group to notice when the shift from finding shared meaning to co-constructing is taking place. In our study there was a pause that I capitalised on as I said *what is standing out to us, what don’t we want to forget, or do we want to make a record of?* Keita’s response to this *I’m not sitting with many differences, I’m sitting with mostly shared stuff...* Keita’s response suggested to me that even though I had heard many different experiences and viewpoints expressed that these were considered meaningful contributions to an overall and full picture of similarities and divergence, from which we could now find shared future images and interests.

The following guide has been developed to support the shift from the discovery to the dreaming stage of appreciative inquiry. This guide seeks to move away from the simple notion of sameness/similarities and differences, to sharing and divergence as being equally useful in co-creating complex future realities.

Guide 3: For Co-constructing Our Future Pictures in Collective Pedagogical Inquiry

As we have been understanding and appreciating what is meaningful for each of us and between us. Together consider...

1. What is standing out to us that we wish to capture and record?
2. What do we clearly share that we wish to take forward?
3. What divergent viewpoints do we also hold that could be useful for us to acknowledge, sit with, allow as part of the complexities of our situation?
4. What are our common interests and or shared concerns?
5. What pictures or images are forming of how we would like our shared future to be?

Phase three: Designing bold and realistic pedagogical blueprints

Bushe (2013) provides a useful capture of how the design stage of appreciative inquiry differs from the previous dreaming stage. In the former dreaming stage, he states there is an interest in each person being fully acknowledged to increase differentiation amongst members in order for a more complex coherence to emerge. The design stage Bushe describes as being where some convergence is required to design a “blueprint” (2013, p. 106) for a collective future that can be actualised.

Preparation for collective designing

The design stage of our appreciative inquiry began with focus group two. Prior to the group, we each had a copy of the transcript of focus group one, and the Book of Readings on Pedagogy (Appendix I). These were provided to look closely at our previous focus group inquiry and to consider our shared pedagogies in light of formal pedagogical theory in the literature. Informed by Bushe’s (2013) view of the focus of the design stage being on the *hoped-for future* and *commitments going forward* I had also given three questions to consider 1) *What are you drawn to in the transcript/or readings?* 2) *What is our hoped-for future for us collectively?* and 3) *What would we like to commit to as ways forward?*

In our study, this preparation appeared to focus us immediately on naming the pedagogies that we had noticed our transcripts and readings as being ones that we shared. These were identified as *it was exactly what we were talking about, the multicultural/transformational and the experiential* (Lucia), *then I read the Kaupapa Māori pedagogies that spoke to the processes in our transcript around tikanga and creating safe processes for learning and the spiritual sacredness of learning...* (Janet), *...Māori, dialogic, critical, and post-structural because these are the ones that personally I am most interested in, but also I think they are the ones that came*

forward the most in our conversations (Keita). It was noteworthy that even though we named these we didn't linger there, suggesting yet again, that we were not so much interested in settling on universal ideas or propositions rather we were interested in the unique construction of pedagogies for ourselves as a collective. Keita then reminded us that from a post-structural viewpoint, pedagogies themselves are a social construction that are located in discourses, and it was important to her that we did not fix a pedagogical approach (es) for our programme.

Naming shared foundations and designing bold blueprints

Despite not “fixing” on a shared pedagogical theoretical position collectively, what we were keen to agree on in focus group two, were some aspects that we did share. These included values we held in common, goals we held in common (e.g. *social justice, honouring diversity*), common language for teaching and learning processes (e.g. *scaffolding*) and new language for our practice (e.g. *settling and troubling processes for students*). These three aspects we began calling our *shared foundations* rather than shared pedagogies. Particularly exciting was the newness evident that Zandee (2013) describes as surfacing from the “edge of existence” (p. 81). In Chapter, 7, I presented literature that looks at what happens in this design stage (Bushe, 2013; Cooperrider & Whitney, 1999; Flor, 2005; Moody et al., 2007). As I discuss in this previous chapter, Cooperrider's provocative propositions (cited in Bushe, 2013, p. 106) were most resonant with what took place in the design stage of our inquiry. These authors describe these provocative propositions as attempts to maximise generativity and provoke thinking and action. A feature of these was that they are bold statements almost as if changes had already occurred. In our study, I noticed the way in which we organically began converging upon and naming four provocative propositions *defining our collective pedagogy, scaffolding process in the programme, redefining ours and our students' relationship to theory, developing an integrative core counselling frame as a reference point for all aspects of our programme*. One question this raises for me is whether the “boldness” that I observed in our team with regards to this architecture of provocative propositions is something that should be invited, or alternatively, whether this should be viewed as an indication of a successful appreciative inquiry in its previous stages if a team grabs these boldly for themselves?

Making commitments to move forward is an important feature of the design stage for Bushe (2013). In our inquiry, I ushered us towards this as I noticed a shift in this direction taking place, *I think we are moving forward...how we might wish to go forward after our focus group?* As a team, we identified a desire for us to *continue our pedagogical discussion and explore formal pedagogical theories in greater depth for what they might offer us*. What also came to light was an important naming of what could be difficult going forward which for us was that we were at workload capacity. Time was taken to explore these concerns in depth and to develop realistic commitments which included making commitments to ongoing pedagogical discussion into our existing collective activities such as our regular staff meetings etc.

From this one experience of a design stage in appreciative inquiry, insights and learnings regarding what could be suggested to teaching teams regarding pedagogical reflection can be tentatively offered. Perhaps the most significant is to invite our teams to stay very close to what had been identified in previous discussions rather than to engage in a more abstract discussion of designing future possibilities and commitments. For example, providing the actual transcripts from the previous focus group which included the discovery and dreaming stages of AI, enabled us to identify shared pedagogies and notice that we also had shared values, goals and language, including the new language that had emerged from our inquiry. The following guide is offered as ways in which to encourage a successful design stage:

Guide 4: For Designing a Future Blueprint for Our Programme and Making Realistic Commitments in Collective Pedagogical Inquiry

1. What were you drawn to from our pedagogical discussions to date (including transcripts if available) ?
2. From your knowledge of formal pedagogical theories, which stand out as influences that we share among ourselves as a teaching team?
3. What shared values, goals, and/or language (including new language) might we wish to establish as foundations for our programme?
4. What changes can you easily envisage taking place for us collectively?
5. What might be realistic commitments we would like to make for our immediate future together? How might these commitments be incorporated into existing activities?

Destiny...and beyond....

The destiny stage of AI is acknowledged to have its challenges (Bushe, 2013; Ludema & Fry, 2008; Reed, 2007). There is a close association of AI with action research which I wonder tends to position the AI researcher as needing to ensure planned action in order to follow through on the design stage. Bushe offers an alternative view that “if the first 3D’s [discover, dream, design] are generative, and people are encouraged to take personal action, people will step forward to champion proposals that come out of the design stage” (2013, p. 107). He describes the results of a meta-case analysis study of teams using AI (Bushe & Kassam, 2005) where they compared teams using traditional action-phase approaches in the destiny stage to those using what he termed improvisational approaches where innovations were encouraged rather than actions planned, the latter proving far more successful. These innovations he advocates include realistic commitments being made ensuring, even before the AI process begins that people feel authorised to act, ensuring that images created in the design stage are widely shared and, making sure that the energy released through the AI process is widely absorbed.

Since the completion of the three phases of our AI, I have reflected extensively on the impacts of this AI for my colleagues, for our counselling programme, our students and for me personally. Along the lines advocated by Bushe, the design stage of our inquiry was an open ended one given that the two members of this appreciative inquiry, Keita and Stewart, left Wintec soon after focus group two. Despite this, there have been key impacts that I believe continue to have momentum. These include the effects on our programme curriculum and secondly, insights through this study that have been able to be implemented in parallel for the students on our programme.

Curriculum developments – work on our provocative propositions

Since completing our AI process, with two of the AI participants leaving, new teaching staff have joined Paetahi Tumu Kōrero. What has been striking is the way in which one particular new staff member joined myself and Lucia (who has remained), and the three of us have implemented almost all of the provocative propositions that were boldly constructed in focus group two.

Most interesting is that Lucia and I did not articulate these to the new staff member or even discuss them intentionally. Rather there has been a quiet momentum for change in this area that has continued. With regards to these four propositions, Lucia, myself and the new staff member have *scaffolded* the development of theories, skills and relational processes intentionally across three years of the programme, time and again checking if what we are intending to teach in different modules, and how we will propose to teach, is in relation to this scaffolding. One of the key areas we have focused on is the development of a set of practice

competencies scaffolded across the three years (see below List of Trans-theoretical Practice and Skill Competencies). Generating these was a priority as we were experiencing students passing years one and two without having achieved minimum levels of competence in their counselling skills practice. We entitled these transtheoretical practice competencies as we needed a set of markers that would enable our students to meet these competencies drawing on a range of skills specific to their chosen theoretical approaches and philosophical influences. Curriculum developments including teaching content and assessments within the key practice modules HSCO501, HSCO502, HSC601, HSCO602, HSCO701 and HSCO702 (see Appendix A) were designed to ensure these were taught and assessed.

Paetahi Tumu Kōrero	<u>List of Trans-theoretical Practice and Skill Competencies</u>
Year 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Settle the tangata whaiora (client) and yourselves in to a session 2. Facilitate and support the tangata whaiora to fully share their story/concerns 3. Create a connection to the tangata whaiora and their story 4. To recognise and articulate the skills and interventions being used to accomplish 1-3. 5. To recognise and articulate the cultural context for tangata whaiora and of your relationship.
Year 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To understand the meaning of the tangata whaiora story for themselves 2. To appropriately develop a shared understanding with the tangata whaiora 3. To establish a shared and/or intentional focus or mahi for the session 4. To recognise and account for improvements in their practice.
Year 3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To articulate how your identity and practice as a bi-cultural and/or Māori-centered or kaupapa Māori practitioner is beneficial to the session with tangata whaiora 2. To articulate how practice moments during the session are relevant to the client's hopes and therapeutic aims 3. To demonstrate appropriate encouragement of client's self-direction through attuned therapeutic initiatives and /or interventions 4. To demonstrate capacity to be self-critiquing of a counselling session

In addition, the teaching team has also incorporated input to the programme that scaffolds conversations with students more explicitly discussing our expectations of them in respect of the teaching and learning processes “what students are signing up for” effectively. This is tailored for different levels of the programme including pre-selection interviews, induction day with new students in year one, and at the start of years two and three. These conversations cover expectations of students' involvement in a professional learning community with peers who will become their colleagues, expectations that students will be engaging in continuous personal and professional development and the experiential and transformational nature of learning that

requires critical reflexivity and vulnerability at times. These expectations are introduced at each level by way of professional conversations between students and tutors and seeks also to model the contracting of relational processes and expectations they will engage in with clients.

Very recently, *a core underpinning frame and a different relationship with theory for our students* has been articulated for Paetahi Tumu Kōrero that draws on the work of Professor Mason Durie who distinguishes between Māori-centred counselling approaches and bicultural counselling approaches (Durie, 2003). The former approach is available for tangata whenua (Māori) students on our programme who wish to claim a Māori-centred approach to counselling, where Māori concepts, values, ways of relating and “being Māori” are at their core. For other students, a bicultural counselling position is available where western (and other theories) are used in partnership with Māori theories and concepts. This distinction has provided a core frame for the programme as a reference point for the teaching team and students in relation to all aspects of the programme, such as skills development etc.

One of the most exciting discoveries of this research has also been the way in which the new language that emerged in our appreciative inquiry in relation to our pedagogical practice such as *settling, vulnerability*, has also become part of students’ descriptions of processes they are using in their counselling practice i.e.: *working with vulnerability, settling clients in to counselling*. Lucia, who remains in our teaching team, describes this as “*the language of our context*” – a phrase we now carry forward on our programme too.

Personal impacts of this research

This research has been a multilevel study. It has been a journey of discovery of ways of engaging collectively with pedagogy (the primary aim of this study), a personal journey of discovery about the nature of pedagogy itself, and a journey of greater understanding of the many and varied pedagogical positions that are continuously being created and published. Two further significant areas of personal impact that will be discussed in this section: a rethink and discovery of my own pedagogy in living educational theory terms, and a parallel subtle shift in my work with students’ development in relation to counselling theories to incorporating a more living theory viewpoint rather than their development of a personal theory of counselling.

Given the nature of living educational theories that are ever-changing, the following is a moment in time articulation of my living educational theory constructed within one teaching experience. This is offered here as an example of a living theory account. I also used my own experience of writing my living account to test out and refine the above *Guide 1: For Producing Our Living Educational Theories* that I had created for educators to use in crafting their own in preparation for collective inquiry.

A personal example of pedagogical construction; a glimpse into my living educational theory. An excerpt...

In a final year module, with a small group of students, our focus was on research methodologies. I had chosen a research article to look at together written by well-known commentators on pluralist counselling, Thompson and Cooper (2012). I had deliberately chosen this article as I knew these same students were grappling to articulate the theoretical influences in their practice, including the differences between working in an integrative way, to working from a pluralist position. Mindful, of my adult education training that adults learn best when there is a need to know (Knowles, 1984), I had chosen an article that would not only be informative in terms of research methodologies but would be relevant for their very particular and immediate learning needs around articulating their own theoretical influences. Furthermore, I hoped it would give the students an experience of how exciting reading contemporary research can be, given its relevance to developing our counselling practice. My early training as an educator in experiential learning theory (Dewey, 1938; Kolb, 1984; Schön, 1983) influencing me to provide these students with an “experience” of research on which they could reflect, integrate, and learn about the value of research for their future practice; hoping it would be a transformative experience in this regard.

Each student had printed a copy of the article. After carefully considering how we might approach reading (knowing that there may be varying degrees of comfort in this), I invited us to each read a paragraph out loud, with the proviso that students could elect to pass if they wished. All students took part, including one student for whom English was not their first language. When it was her turn for reading, I looked over to see another student tucked in by her shoulder assisting with the unfamiliar words. Frequent sideways looks passed between them, and when help was needed no words were exchanged, just an unspoken ease taking place between them. The spontaneity, attunement and respectful care in this moment was heart-warming for me as an educator who constantly looks for opportunities in the “here and now” of the classroom to encourage students to try out ways of attuning relationally with one another, much like they would with a client in a counselling session. Observing this seemingly small moment (and other moments within this particular final year group), happening now without my prompting, spoke to me of the way in which these final year students were engaging relationally with one another. Engaging in ways that I had aspired for them as graduate counsellors competent in relational practice. As I sat watching this tender

moment, I flashed back in my mind to the same group of students who two years previously struggled to find points of commonality amongst themselves, a seemingly disparate and disconnected group now capable of deep and authentic levels of engagement amongst themselves.

At its heart, counselling is I believe, a relational practice. To become a counsellor, I believe there is a need to develop the capacity and ability for intentional and effective relationships. From this, to offer relational spaces for clients where they are able to experience themselves, make any changes they desire and, to experience the healing that can occur from such intentional relational connections. Whilst I acknowledge there are many views on the nature of relationship that is needed to enable this, I believe as counsellor educators the greatest way for students to develop their own relational competency and style is for our learning environments to be places where relational practice is modelled and experienced, developed through relationships with other students and with ourselves as educators. It has been my commitment to person-centered and experiential counselling practice over decades that has been the greatest influence in viewing the primacy of the relationship in my teaching and learning environments. Years of involvement on humanistic counselling programmes in the United Kingdom, firstly as a student myself, and later as a tutor has positioned me strongly to work in relational ways as an educator; relational ways underscored by humanistic principles of authenticity, and the concept of the I-thou relationship.

Returning to my story...as we jointly read each paragraph of the contemporary research article, I held two strands of discussion, the researchers' choice of methodology, and the rich research findings in the article in relation to pluralist counselling practice. In respect to the latter, a quote in the article made by one of their research participants, a counsellor who said, "I believe that the client is the theory", was read out by one of our group and stopped us all in our tracks...With absolute delight, one student in our group yelled "I've got it, I get what pluralist practice means! I've had one of those 'aha' moments you talk about clients' having Janet!" Pennies began dropping around the room for other students who shared what these words offered them in being better able to grasp what it means to work from a pluralist position in practice. In this moment, I realised that I too had a new discovery in finding a phrase that appeared to encapsulate the heart of pluralist practice that I could use with students in the future. We were all swept up with excitement given the clarity that had come in this moment. A moment that we truly shared as co-learners and co-teachers with one another.

This experience in my teaching practice encapsulates two shifts in my pedagogical development over recent years. The first, the influence of dialogic theory (Buber, 1958;

Mearns & Cooper, 2005) and the second, my valuing of communities of practice in learning. The first, the influence of dialogic theory, has seen my growing belief in the place of dialogical encounter in teaching (as well as counselling and other practices) as being the site for the construction of self-identities and the production of knowledge and learning. In this excerpt here, previously, I would have prepared the research article, drawing attention to the aspects of the reading that I felt would offer the students the most understanding, and of what I considered mattered. Instead, I provided the article, trusting that something (if anything) might be valuable, and would emerge in our process. Unbeknownst to me, despite having read it myself many times, a new discovery lay in its pages for us all.

The second shift in my pedagogical practice is towards a genuine belief that learning is a communal practice. One of the defining moments in my shift towards this position pedagogically came through our collective process in our appreciative inquiry in this research, as my colleague named Lucia, spoke intimately of her communal processes of learning. She described how in her teaching, much like on a Māori marae, the learning comes through communal processes where she has an expectation that students will share responsibility for this learning and care for each other when there is vulnerability in these processes. Something of her belief that learning requires a communal process, and her expectation that the students' have a responsibility to each other (that it is not only her responsibility), has enabled a very significant shift in my practice. This shift was a subtle one, from my longstanding valuing of the learning group as an experiential setting, to a trust in learning as a communal activity where it is the community of practice that enables an even greater depth of learning to take place. In this story of practice, my trust in the students to collectively discover new knowledge and to care for one another in authentic ways, rather than for me to orchestrate these aspects, were telling moments.

This articulation of my living educational theory is a story of my pedagogical experience and a weave of noticing of actions (mine and students), a noticing of processes of being, relating and learning, and the identification of philosophical and theoretical influences spanning decades. As I wrote this, there were definite theories of learning and teaching such as adult learning theory (Knowles, 1973, 1984) and experiential learning processes (Dewey, 1938, Kolb, 1984, Schön, 1983, 1987) that have become embedded in my teaching and learning processes. There are also theoretical ideas that have become influential in my practice more recently, such as dialogic theory (Buber, 1958; Mearns & Cooper, 2005), and communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Students' production of living theories of counselling practice

A major focus of counsellor education is students' development of a knowledge base for counselling practice often termed a personal theory of counselling (Manthei, 2012). Counsellor education has engaged in extensive discussion and debate regarding how best to facilitate this for students including whether to teach students one single counselling, an integration of two or more approaches and in recent decades to embrace pluralism as a theoretical position. In addition to what and how many counselling approaches to teach, debate has also ensued as to the best way to teach "theory". My own approach spanning decades has been to teach the four main theoretical traditions espoused by our programme from a position of encouraging students to develop an integrative or pluralistic framework that aligns with their personal views and relational style and allows them to work with a diverse range of people and contexts. Within this, I have encouraged students to be able to articulate for any counselling practice, the main theoretical approaches they are drawing from, the shape of this fit together (knowing why they have chosen these given their personal world views, philosophies and values). Over the years, the students I have worked with have engaged with varying degrees of success.

As a consequence of this research I have taken a different view of how best to support students' development of the theoretical basis for their practice. Parallel with my own development of a living educational theory I have extend this notion to students developing a living theory of counselling practice. This has involved a very subtle but significant shift in my understanding of how best for students to position themselves or relate to formal propositional theories. With my students' I am now giving even greater emphasis to the development of their understanding of the life-enhancing and relational values that they hold as practitioners and the way in which these are informing them. This includes becoming very clear regarding their ontological view of "wellness" and the nature of the counselling relationship that they consider enables healing or wellness to be achieved for clients. I then encourage students to consider the ideas that are present for them in moments of counselling practice that speak to both the way these values are being transformed in their practice and the theoretical propositions that are influencing their thinking. I have used the following guidelines to support this process across all three years. In the first year, as they are beginning to encounter counselling theories, the second-year students are beginning their counselling practice with 'real' clients, and the third-year students are in their final year of the programme and preparing to graduate as competent beginning counsellors.

Guide 5: A scaffolded guide for students' for producing living theories of counselling practice

Year One: Identifying our ontological and relational values

To identify your core values about humankind and relationships and to recognise the connection with core counselling theories

1. What are your beliefs about human-kind/human nature (e.g. we connected to people in generations past and future, we are spiritual beings, we need to be loved and valued etc.?)
2. What matters most to you in life? What do you value most?
3. What are your beliefs about what constitutes wellness for human-kind?
4. What do you believe is a relationship that is healing (in your life in general)?
5. Which counselling theories have you been introduced to that may have similar underpinning values?

Year Two: Identifying our ontological and relational values in practice

To identify the core values being lived-out in moments of practice, what you are seeking to establish in your relationships and why you believe this is important for healing/change/therapeutic value. This will then enable you to begin to recognise the theoretical influences you are being drawn to

1. Share a story of your counselling practice where you consider the way in which you and your client were working and relating was optimum and/or all that you hoped?
2. What took place that speaks to this being an optimum moment?
3. What was at the heart of this moment and or your relationship?
4. What was important about this for your clients' healing?
5. What ideas and/or formal theories speak to this?

Year Three: Identifying our living theory of counselling practice

Choose two experiences in your counselling practice, a peak and dissonance one. Use the guidelines to reflect on each in turn to identify the counselling theory you were producing in these moments. After you have completed both, notice the core aspects that are common to each that speak to the foundations of your living theory of counselling practice.

Peak Moment: Recall a peak moment in your counselling practice, which you would consider as a moment when you had a heightened sense that what you believe in re counselling, was present in what you were doing. Please

be free to choose how you wish to capture in a format and flow that makes sense for you.

The following questions are to guide further self –reflection

1. What was it about this memory that drew you?
2. What was at the heart of this moment for you?
3. What were your priorities in this moment?
4. What were your hopes in this moment for your tangata whaiora (client) ?
5. What was the response/ impact for your tangata whaiora (what might they say about this moment and its impacts?)
6. What counselling ideas/strategies were you employing? What was it that you considered of value in these strategies?
7. What were your beliefs counselling? What ideas were informing you here?
8. What particularly enabled you to practice as you did in this moment?
9. What experiences (past or present), skills, and/or knowledge were you calling on in this moment?
10. What is your understanding of this moment now?
11. What does this reflection offer you now e.g.: for future inquiry and/or practice?

Dissonance moments: Recall a counselling moment, which was difficult or challenging either in the moment or on reflection afterwards. The aim is to bring this moment to life in a format and/or flow that makes sense to you.

The following questions are to guide further self–reflection

1. What was it about this memory that drew you?
2. What was at the heart of this moment for you?
3. What were your priorities in this counselling moment?
4. What were your hopes in this moment for your tangata whaiora (client) ?
5. What was supporting and/or hindering you in this moment?
6. What other voices or ideas different to your own were you aware of in this moment?
7. What was influencing/impacting your decision–making regarding counselling in that moment?
8. What did you do to manage in this moment? What ideas were informing you here?
9. What experiences (past or present), skills, and/or knowledge were you calling on in this moment?
10. What is your understanding of this moment now?

11. What does this reflection offer you now e.g.: for future inquiry and/or practice?
12. What alternative/additional ways of practice and /or theories might be available to you?

Using these different exercises over the three years of our counselling degree, I have noticed a very particular response from students. Rather than the familiar sense of overwhelm and confusion that students' express in relation to engaging with counselling theories, not knowing which they "should" be aligning with, students are alternatively reporting an understanding of themselves and how they are drawn to particular theories, that has led to a sense of feeling "settled". They also seem more open to critiquing what it means to take up particular ideas rather than defensive of the theories they are working from.

Limitations of this research

What began as a collective appreciative inquiry into pedagogy, midway through this project simultaneously developed into an exciting autoethnographic journey of discovery of my own pedagogy; in the form of my educational living theory (Whitehead, 1989). Given the strength of this autoethnographic dimension, it could be argued that this would have been an alternative methodological choice for this study from the outset. From years of involvement in research however, it has been my experience that there are often unanticipated outcomes (sometimes the most exciting), which are very much unforeseen.

The strongly autoethnographic dimension was not considered as a methodological choice at the start of this project as my research aim was to explore pedagogy from a *collective* rather than individual viewpoint. I was certain that I wished to engage in a collective change project and an appreciative inquiry (AI) methodology was selected from the range of methodologies with a participatory focus. AI was chosen given it's hopeful generative focus and it's fit for the available energy and time of my participating team. As our small team began to share our stories of teaching we revealed how we understood our underpinning pedagogical ideas and practices. From this sharing, it was the resonance with Whitehead's (1989) living educational theory approach that was so striking which then led to exploring my own pedagogy in living educational theory terms. As I developed an extract of my living educational theory (outlined above) this then informed the production of the Guides 1-5 (also outlined above) for use by teaching teams and counselling students in the consideration of their living theories of teaching and/or counselling practice, respectively.

Wellington and Sikes (2006) highlight that most postgraduate study takes place in a researcher's own institution as insider research, and tends to be by a "researching professional" rather than a "professional researcher" (p. 725). As an insider researcher in my own community of teaching colleagues it was not surprising therefore, that this autoethnographic dimension became

significant. Kirpitchenko and Voloder (2014) suggest the inevitability of there being an autoethnographic dimension for insider researchers:

conducting research that effects one's own life, researchers can directly draw upon their own thoughts and experiences as informants and ethnographic tools...as autoethnographers, insider researchers are writing the stories of social life through the lens of their personal stories, circumstances and experiences. (p. 8)

There are some definite advantages to being an insider-researcher such as bringing one's own experiences into "data analysis and presentation of results" (Kirpitchenko & Voloder, 2014, p.8). Similarly, insider researchers often have access to stories that might otherwise not be told, and or have insider knowledge that allows them to understand the nuances of situations to an extent that a researcher outside of the researched community, may not (Atkins & Wallace, 2012). However, there are also some definite limitations to being an insider researcher that need to be acknowledged in this study. Most obvious in this research was the way in which as four experienced colleagues who had been teaching alongside one another for a number of years we shared a lot of unspoken understandings and taken for granted assumptions (Atkins & Wallace, 2012). It became evident in reviewing the transcripts of the one to one interviews and focus group discussions that all four participants would often introduce a theoretical concept (e.g.: post-structural pedagogy), the meaning of which would not be clarified but assumed to have a shared meaning amongst us. In addition, there were moments in the pedagogical conversations that an outsider researcher may have come from a more naïve inquiry position to conversations which could have offered the research participants a further opportunity to deconstruct or unpack the meaning in some of their statements. Whether this impacted the outcomes of this study is debatable given that what was of most importance in the findings of the research was not so much the epistemic theoretical concepts used by participants to talk about their pedagogies, rather the way pedagogies were articulated in rich stories of lived teaching experiences and the nuanced descriptions of ideas and influences that they take up in moments of teaching practices. I would suggest that these were refreshingly unique and authentic to myself as insider researcher as they would have been to an outsider researcher. Perhaps a more important consideration in the insider/outsider debate is whether this study from an insider perspective could be replicated easily by a researcher exploring pedagogy collectively with a team of educators which they were an "outsider". This would need further consideration.

A further limitation of this researcher was the particular composition of our team which was made up of four counsellor educators who had each been involved in higher education for decades. Throughout this thesis, I have endeavoured to highlight that this level of experience of our team may have meant that certain relational and/or reflective processes may not be so familiar for some educators. In this regard, the Guidelines 1-5 developed above were constructed to assist educators of all experience levels. It is also important that these guidelines are not necessarily used as isolated activities rather considered within guided and facilitated

relational process appropriate for the experience level and particular team dynamics and composition.

This study was carried out at a time when our teaching team was undergoing restructure which both changed the study from intending to involve seven educators to four. The effects of this restructure can be heard in the accounts of the four remaining educators who were experiencing the impact of greater workloads as well as having to teach larger classes on their own etc., moves that were impacting directly on their pedagogical practice. During the study, the impacts of neoliberalism on higher education were identified by participants as the drivers for the restructure and what was being experienced as a harsher teaching context. The pressure staff were experiencing was a limitation of this study given that two of the staff decided to seek alternative employment and/or resign from Wintec immediately after focus group 2 and therefore the collective activities that we had planned for the destiny stage did not go ahead. However, as discussed above there is a sense that the work achieved in the inquiry was of a generative nature that continued with momentum and energy long after the conclusion of our AI process. This potential limitation has offered insight that I may not have gained had we soldiered on with planned action activities. There is a beautiful Māori concept in relation to time “*ma te wa*” which is a phrase we often use on our programme and in relation to the counselling process. This concept loosely means that time is immeasurable and that things “take the time they take”. From an AI perspective, Carter (2006) offers one of the most realistic accounts of the challenges of moving forward and achieving change in appreciative inquiry suggesting that “some AI literature is very upbeat in its reporting of achieving destiny” (p 57). Carter instead proposed that change through AI is far more along the lines of “relational healing” (p. 57) within organisations that in terms of action strategies. Such a view was borne out in this study.

This also speaks to the discussion in chapter three of the critique of positivity of AI. For this study, AI’s more contemporary emphasis on generativity (Bushe, 2013) rather than the traditional AI binary of positivity and negativity, was favoured. This enabled inviting participants to not only share peak moments of their pedagogical practices but also to share dissonance moments. This latter invitation revealed their tensions and pedagogical struggles. Whilst these tensions were acknowledged and considered in the findings, it eventuated that greater emphasis in the research findings was given to the generative aspect of collectively sharing and considering pedagogy. On reflection, this was due to the way in which participants mostly aligned with one another in a generative and constructive nature. A different methodology would undoubtedly reveal alternative findings which may have highlighted more challenging or negative experiences of a collective consideration of pedagogies. Whilst this would also be a valuable contribution to the field, it was not the purpose of this study to bring a more critical lens.

Opportunities for further research

1. **Research weaving Māori-centered and/or bicultural processes with AI, as processes to consider pedagogy collectively in teaching teams in the Aotearoa New Zealand context.**

The appreciative inquiry process with its concern for what matters most to people, lends itself beautifully to the study of pedagogy, which this study has shown is deeply personal to educators. Appreciative inquiry has proven in our study that as well as the focus on deeply held values, it provides the structure for levels of relating that allows what is deeply personal to be shared, and for diversity within teaching teams to be honoured, valued and embraced.

Aotearoa is a bicultural nation predicated on Te Tiriti o Waitangi, an increasingly pluralistic and diverse nation with an indigenous people that generously offer profound ways of living and working in partnership together. As this appreciative inquiry took place, I noticed relational processes that were resonant with Māori processes of engagement such as in a pōwhiri (see footnote 11, Chapter 5, p. 105). In our inquiry we opened our focus groups with whakatauki¹³ and shared our journeys or stories of our pedagogies including where they had originated from and who had influenced us, much like the sharing of whakapapa¹⁴ and the whakawhanaungatanga¹⁵ processes in Māori encounter processes. Given this resonance, it would be exciting to engage with research that looks at how we could weave Māori processes within AI to develop ways of considering pedagogy collectively.

2. **Research is much needed in relation to how best to position the collective consideration of pedagogy in relation to curriculum development.**

This study has offered some insights into one particular process of sharing and considering pedagogy and the way this impacted our programme. As discussed in the section on limitations, focus ended up being more heavily weighted on the first stages of our inquiry which provided a much clearer understanding of the nature of pedagogy and how we initially engaged with one another around this. Greater explicit attention to the destiny stage of AI in our study was not possible due to time constraints on the teaching team involved in the study. As suggested above in the limitations section the greater focus on the earlier stages of our AI may also have been

¹³ Whakatauki meaning: “proverb, significant saying, formulaic saying, cryptic saying, aphorism”. Retrieved from <https://maoridictionary.co.nz>

¹⁴ Whakapapa meaning: “genealogy, genealogical table, lineage, descent”. Retrieved from <https://maoridictionary.co.nz>

¹⁵ Whakawhanaungatanga meaning: “process of establishing relationships, relating well to others”. Retrieved from <https://maoridictionary.co.nz>

important in order to first understand pedagogy in much greater depth before then considering its potential for curriculum development. Either way, I suggest that further research is now needed to continue to explore the relationship between what is happening at ground level pedagogically and the possibility that this may be akin to the concept of implicit or hidden curriculums at work. From the brief glimpse that this study has provided, the potential for harnessing the shared momentum when considering and developing pedagogies collectively in order to develop our more formal curriculum seems vast.

3. Further research into the value for counsellors of a living counselling theories approach

There are exciting possibilities to include current students and programme graduates in research into counsellors developing living theories for practice. Offering this approach to students' theoretical development to the counsellor educator community in Aotearoa New Zealand for critique would be a valuable endeavour. So too, tracking a cohort of students through the programme using a living theories approach to theoretical development and researching two or more years post-graduation to determine how this has impacted and/or progressed, would be invaluable.

4. Researching how publications on pedagogy would be most useful for counsellor educators

Throughout Chapter 2, in the literature review, I questioned whether the preponderance of pedagogical writing was in some ways inaccessible and/or lacking relevance for counsellor educators. Having completed this research and witnessing first-hand how the educators in this study view pedagogy and what is most important to them in their pedagogical practice, it would be timely to now consider what would be most useful for counsellor educators from research studies and publications to support their teaching practice and ongoing pedagogical reflection and development. My sense at the conclusion of this study is that what is needed is a far greater focus in publications on the "how" and "process" of pedagogical reflection and development and/or development of one's living educational theory as a counsellor educator, rather than particular pedagogical approaches in themselves. This would be an important starting point to then follow with the contribution from this study regarding how teams might consider pedagogy most effectively from a collective viewpoint.

Final concluding thoughts...

This study set out to investigate how teaching teams might effectively consider pedagogy collectively. The imperative for this was particularly pressing as the teaching contexts of counsellor educators and higher educators are characterised by a rich and diverse plurality

amongst educators themselves, students and the communities that we are preparing our graduates for practice.

Using AI with its concern for what is most meaningful to participants was a somewhat fortuitous choice of research methodology, given that it allowed for the rich discovery that for these participants pedagogy itself is deeply personal and value laden. This being increasingly confirmed in literature. In this study, AI processes of appreciating and relating deeply with one another saw participants affirmed and confirmed in our own pedagogical practice. We were able to align ourselves around aspects of pedagogical practice that held shared meaning. The way in which momentum gained to co-construct dynamic, realistic and complex images for our future practice together full of rich aspects and language from our inquiry, spoke to the ease in collective change when generativity is encouraged throughout. From this study possibilities were glimpsed also for harnessing the potential of pedagogical development within our formal curriculums. Maybe as we begin to consider pedagogy as being a collective as much as an individual endeavour, this relationship between pedagogy and curriculum will become closer and our programmes will see a more seamless flow of the two.

I am particularly excited in Aotearoa New Zealand to have experienced a collective inquiry in relation to pedagogy that has seen us dialogue in respect to a diverse range of pedagogies currently held by educators in this nation. As we came together, new unchartered possibilities opened up and excited us for our practice alongside one another as educators. Even more exciting we recognised the parallel processes that our own reflections could offer students in developing their counselling practice ensuring our programmes are relevant in the nation and are cutting edge for contemporary times.

I conclude this research believing even more strongly that pedagogy matters, but more aware of its dynamic, living, synergistic nature. When we attend to 'what is going on' the insights enable us to flourish.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, R., & Komattil, R. (2017). Heutagogic approach to developing capable learners. *Medical Teacher*, 39(3), 295-299. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.1270433
- Alexander, R. (2008). What is pedagogy? In P. Hall, & J. Soler (Eds.), *Pedagogy and practice: culture and identities*. London, England: Sage.
- Argyris, C., Putnam, R., & Smith, D. M. L. (1985). *Action science*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Atkins, L. & Wallace, S. (2012). Insider research. In L. Atkins, & S. Wallace (Eds.), *Research Methods in Education: Qualitative research in education* (pp. 47-64). London: Sage Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781473957602
- Atkins, L. & Wallace, S. (2012). Introduction. In L. Atkins, & S. Wallace (Eds.), *Research Methods in Education: Qualitative research in education* (pp. 1-10). London: Sage Publications Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9781473957602
- Avital, M., Cooperrider, D., Zandee, D., Godwin, L. & Boland, B. (2013). Preface. In M. Avital, D. Cooperrider, D. Zandee, L. Godwin, & B. Boland (Eds.), *Organizational Generativity: The Appreciative Inquiry Summit and a Scholarship of Transformation* (pp. xi-xx). Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Banks, J. (1981). *Multiethnic education: Theory and practice*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Barge, J., & Oliver, C. (2003). Working with appreciation in managerial practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(1), 124-142. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2003.8925244
- Barrett-Lennard, G. T. (2005). *Relationship at the centre: Healing in a troubled world*. London, England: Whurr.
- Barrett-Lennard, G. T. (2007). The relational foundations of person-centred practice. In M. O'Hara, M. Cooper, P. Schmid, & G. Wyatt (Eds.), *The handbook of person-centred psychotherapy and counselling* (pp.127-139). Hampshire, England: Palgrave Mc Millan.
- Barrio Minton, C. A., Wachter Morris, C. A., & Yaites, L. D. (2014). Pedagogy in counselor education: A 10-year content analysis of journals. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 53(3), 162-177. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014. 00055.x
- Barrio Minton, C. A., Watcher Morris, C. W., & Bruner, S. L. (2018). Pedagogy in counselor education: 2011–2015 Update. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 57(3), 227-236. doi: 10.1002/ceas.12112
- Beck, A. T. (1976). *Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders*. New York, NY: International Universities Press
- Beck, J. (2011). *Cognitive behavior therapy: Basics and beyond* (2nd edn.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Benjamin, J. (1990). An outline of intersubjectivity: The development of recognition. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 7(Suppl.), 33-46.
- Biggs, J. B., & Tang, C. S. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does* (4th edn.). Maidenhead, England: McGraw-Hill.
- Black, T., Murphy, H., Buchanan, C., Nuku, W., Ngaia, B., & Staff NZQA (2014). *Enhancing matauranga Māori and global indigenous knowledge*: New Zealand Qualifications Authority.
- Blades, G., & Bester, L. (2013). Relationships within the shattered rainbow: A search for a pedagogy of attunement. *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education*, 17(1), 4-16.
- Boell, S. K. & Cecez-Kecmanovic, D. (2014). A Hermeneutic Approach for Conducting Literature Reviews and Literature Searches. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 34, Article 12. doi:10.17705/1CAIS.03412
- Boitshwarelo, B., & Vemuri, S. (2017). Conceptualising strategic alignment between curriculum and pedagogy through a learning design framework. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 22(1), 1-15. doi:10.1080/1360144X.2017.1367298

- Borg, M., Karlsson, B., Kim, H. S., & McCormack, B. (2012). Opening up for many voices in knowledge construction. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 13(1), 1–16.
- Bovill, C., & Woolmer, C. (2019). How conceptualisations of curriculum in higher education influence student-staff co-creation in and of the curriculum. *Higher Education*, 78(3), 407–422.
- Brackette, C. M. (2014). The scholarship of teaching and learning in clinical mental health counseling. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 139, 37–48. doi: 10.1002/tl.20103
- Brandenburg, R. (2008). *Powerful pedagogy: self-study of a teacher educator's practice*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- British Association for Counselling (1990). *The recognition of counsellor training courses* (2nd edn.). Rugby, England: British Association for Counselling.
- British Association for Counselling (1993). *The recognition of counsellor training courses scheme: Guidelines for integrative and eclectic courses*. Rugby, England: British Association for Counselling.
- Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, J. M. (2015). Wherefore art 'thou' in the dialogical approach: The relevance of Buber's ideas to family therapy and research. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, 36(1), 188–203. doi: 10.1002/anzf.1100
- Brown, J. M. (2017). A dialogical research methodology based on Buber: intersubjectivity in the research interview. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 39(3), 415–436. doi: 10.1111/1467-6427.12174
- Buber, M. (1947). *Between man and man*. (R.G. Smith Trans.). London, England: Kegan Paul Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd.
- Buber, M. (1958). *I and thou* (2nd Edn. R. G. Smith Trans.). New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Bullock, S. M. (2012). Creating a space for the development of professional knowledge: A self-study of supervising teacher candidates during practicum placements. *Studying Teacher Education*, 8, 143–156. doi: 10.1080/17425964.2012.692985
- Bushe, G. R. (2010). Commentary on "Appreciative inquiry as a shadow process." *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19 (3), 234–237.
- Bushe, G. (2011). Appreciative inquiry: Theory and critique. In D. Boje, J. Hassard, & G. Bushe (Eds.). *The Routledge companion to organizational change* (pp.87–103). Oxford, England: Routledge.
- Bushe, G. (2012). Stepping cautiously past 'the positive' in Appreciative Inquiry. *AI Practitioner*, 14(4), 49–53.
- Bushe, G. (2013). Generative process, generative outcome: the transformational potential of appreciative inquiry. In M. Avital, D. Cooperrider, Sr., D. Zandee, L. Godwin, & B. Boland (Eds.), *Organizational Generativity: The Appreciative Inquiry Summit and a Scholarship of Transformation*, 4, 89–113. Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald.
- Bushe, G., & Kassam, A. (2005). When is appreciative inquiry transformational? A meta-case analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 41, 161–181.
- Carter, B. (2006). 'One expertise among many'-working appreciatively to make miracles instead of finding problems: using appreciative inquiry as a way of reframing research. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 11(1), 48–63.
- Connell, R. (2013). The neoliberal cascade and education: An essay on the market agenda and its consequences. *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(2), 99–112. doi: 10.1080/17508487.2013.776990.
- Connors, B., & Sharar, B. (2016). *Emergent Pedagogy in England: A Critical Realist Study*. London, England: Routledge.
- Cooper, M., & Bohart, A. (2013). Experiential and phenomenological foundations. In M. Cooper, M. O'Hara, P. Schmid, & A. Bohart (Eds.), *The Handbook of Person-Centred Psychotherapy and Counselling* (pp.102–117). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cooper, M., & McLeod, J. (2011). *Pluralistic Counselling and Psychotherapy*. London, England: Sage.

- Cooper, M., O'Hara, M., Schmid, P. F., & Bohart, A. (2013). Person-centred therapy today and tomorrow: vision, challenge and growth. In M. Cooper, M. O'Hara, P. Schmid & A. Bohart (Eds.), *The Handbook of Person-Centred Psychotherapy and Counselling* (pp. 1-23). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cooperrider, D. (1985). *Appreciative inquiry: A methodology for advancing social innovation*. Ph. D dissertation. Cleveland, Ohio: Case Western Reserve University.
- Cooperrider, D., Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 1: 129–169.
- Cooperrider, D., Whitney, D. (1999). Appreciative inquiry: a positive revolution in change. In P. Holman, & T. Devane (Eds.), *The change handbook: group methods for shaping the future* (pp. 245-261). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Cooperrider, D., & Whitney, D. (2005). *Appreciative inquiry: a positive revolution in change*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Cowan, J., George, J., & Pinheiro-Torres, A. (2004). Alignment of developments in higher education. *Higher Education*, 48(4), 439-459.
- Craig, C. J. (2010). Reflective Practice in the Professions: Teaching. In N. Lyons (Ed.), *Handbook of reflection and reflective inquiry: Mapping a way of knowing for professional reflective inquiry* (pp. 189-214). Boston, MA: Springer US.
- Crocket, K., & Kotzé, E. (2012). Counsellors becoming counsellor educators: a New Zealand example. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 40(3), 247-260. doi: 10.1080/03069885.2012.678288
- Cronin, P., Ryan, F., & Coughlan, M. (2008). Undertaking a literature review: a step-by-step approach. *British Journal of Nursing*, 17(1), 38-43.
- Crowther, S., Ironside, P., Spence, D., & Smythe, L. (2017). Crafting stories in hermeneutic phenomenology research: A methodological device. *Qualitative Health Research*, 27(6), 826-835. doi: 10.1177/1049732316656161
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs Standards. (2015). *CARCEP 2016 Standards*. Retrieved from Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs Standards. (2015). *CARCEP 2016 Standards*. Retrieved from <https://www.cacrep.org/for-programs/2016-cacrep-standards/>
- Davies, B., Gottsche, M., & Bansel, P. (2006). The rise and fall of the neo-liberal university. *European Journal of Education*, 41(2), 305-319. doi:10.1111/j.1465-3435.2006.00261.x.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the education process*. Boston, MA: Heath.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Downey, C., & Clandinin, D. (2010). Narrative inquiry as reflective practice: Tensions and possibilities. In N. Lyons (Ed.), *Handbook of reflection and reflective inquiry: Mapping a way of knowing for professional reflective inquiry* (pp. 333-350). Boston, MA: Springer. 10.1007/978-0-387-85744-2_19.
- Drury, N. (2007). A pōwhiri poutama approach to therapy. *New Zealand Journal of Counselling*, 27(1), 9-20.
- Dryden, W., Horton, I., and Mearns, D. (1995). *Issues in professional counsellor training*. London, England: Cassell.
- Duffey, T. (2006). Promoting relational competencies in counselor education through creativity and relational-cultural theory. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*, 2(1), 47-59.
- Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora Māori health development* (2nd edn.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2001). *Mauri ora: The dynamics of Māori health*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2003). *Ngā Kahui Pou: launching Māori Futures*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.
- Egan, T. M., & Lancaster, C. M. (2005). Comparing appreciative inquiry to action research: OD practitioner perspectives. *Organization Development Journal*, 23(2), 29-49.
- Elbaz-Luwisch, F. (2013). *Auto/biography & pedagogy: Memory & presence in teaching*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Inc., International Academic Publishers.

- Elliott-Johns, S. E., & Tidwell, D. L. (2013). Different voices, many journeys: Explorations of the transformative nature of the self-study of teacher education practices. *Studying Teacher Education*, 9(2), 91-95. doi: 10.1080/17425964.2013.808043
- Ellis, A. (1991). The revised ABC's of rational emotive therapy. *Journal of Rational-Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy*, 9(3), 139-172.
- Embleton Tudor, L., Keemar, K., Tudor, K., Valentine, J., & Worrall, M. (2004). *The person-centred approach: a contemporary introduction*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Erlam, G. (2015). *Improving pedagogical practices of undergraduate nursing students in high-fidelity simulation*. A Thesis Submitted to Auckland University of Technology in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Health Science, 2015. Auckland: Doctor of Health Science, Auckland University of Technology.
- Faris, A., & van Ooijen, E. (2011). *Integrative counselling & psychotherapy: A relational approach*. London, England: Sage.
- Fife, S. T. (2015). Martin Buber's philosophy of dialogue and implications for qualitative family research. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 7(3), 208-224. doi: 10.1111/jftr.12087
- Finfgeld-Connett, D., & Johnson, E. (2013). Literature search strategies for conducting knowledge-building and theory-generating qualitative systematic reviews. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(1), 194-204. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2012.06037.x.
- Fitzgerald, S. P., & Oliver, C. (2012). Embracing the shadow through appreciative inquiry. *AI Practitioner*, 14(4), 4-7.
- Flintoff, V. J., & Rivers, S. (2012). A reshaping of counselling curriculum: responding to the changing (bi)cultural context. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 40(3), 235-246. doi: 10.1080/03069885.2012.678290
- Flor, R. (2005). Book review of "Experience AI: A practitioner's guide to integrating appreciative inquiry with experiential learning. *Journal of Experiential Education* 28(1). 84-87.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York, NY: Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. (1984). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum
- Friedman, M. (1996). *Martin Buber and the human sciences*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Friedman, V., & Rogers, T. (2008). Action science: linking causal theory and meaning making in action research. In P. Reason, & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of action research* (2nd edn., pp. 252-265).
- Gadamer, H. G. (1976). *Philosophical hermeneutics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gendlin, E. (1981). *Focusing (Revised edn.)*. London, England Bantam New Age Books
- Gibbs, C. (2006). *To be a teacher: Journeys towards authenticity*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education.
- Giddens, A. (1981). Modernism and post-modernism. *New German Critique*, 22, 15-18. doi: 10.2307/487860
- Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Grant, S., & Humphries, M. (2006). Critical evaluation of appreciative inquiry. Bridging an apparent paradox. *Action Research* 4(4), 401-418.
- Guiffreda, D. A. (2005). The emergence model: An alternative pedagogy for facilitating self-reflection and theoretical fit in counseling students. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 44(3), 201-213.
- Hase, S., & Kenyon, C. (2000). From andragogy to heutagogy. *Ultibase Articles*, 5(3), 1-10.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.)* Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Henriksen, R. C., Jr. (2006). Multicultural counselor preparation: A transformational pedagogy. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education & Development*, 45(2), 173-185.
- Henschke, J. A. (2011). Considerations regarding the future of andragogy. *Adult Learning*, 22(1), 34-37.

- Hermans, H., & Hermans-Konopka, A. (2010). *Dialogical self-theory: Positioning and counter-positioning in a globalizing society*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 9780-521-76526-8.
- Hermans, H. J. M., Hermans, H., & Lyddon, W. J. (2006). Moving through three paradigms yet remaining the same thinker. *The dialogical approach to counselling theory, research, and practice* (1), 5-25.
- Heron, J. (1996). *Co-operative inquiry: Research into the human condition* London, England: Sage.
- Higginbottom, G., & Liamputtong, P. (2015). What is participatory research? Why do it? In G. Higginbottom, & P. Liamputtong (Eds.), *Participatory Qualitative Research Methodologies in Health* (pp.1-21). London, England: Sage. doi: 10.4135/9781473919945
- Huata, P. (1997). *Pōwhiri poutama*, Te Ngaru Learning Systems.
- Hushes, G., Shaw, S.E. & Greenhalgh, T. (2020). Rethinking Integrated Care: A Systematic Hermeneutic Review of the Literature on Integrated Care Strategies and Concepts. *The Milbank Quarterly*. doi:10.1111/1468-0009.12459
- Hughes, K. (2017). Transition pedagogies and the neoliberal episteme: What do academics think? *Student Success*, 2, 21-30.
- Huygens, I. (2016). Pākehā and tauīwi treaty education: an unrecognised decolonisation movement? *Kotuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(2), 146-158. doi: 10.1080/1177083X.2016.1148057
- Hyun, E. (2006). Transforming instruction into pedagogy through curriculum negotiation. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 3(1), 136-164.
- Ingleby, E. (2015). The house that Jack built neoliberalism, teaching in higher education and the moral objections. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20(5), 518-529.
- Jančec, L., & Vodopivec, J. L. (2019). The implicit pedagogy and the hidden curriculum in postmodern education. In J. Vodopivec, L. Jančec, & T. Štemberger (Eds.), *Implicit pedagogy for optimized learning in contemporary education* (pp. 41-59). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. doi:10.4018/978-1-5225-5799-9.ch003
- Jacobs, M. (1985). *The presenting past: An introduction to practical-psychodynamic counselling*: Buckingham-Philadelphia, Open University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1947). *On the nature of the psyche*. London, England: Ark Paperbacks.
- Kahn, P., Goodhew, P., Murphy, M., & Walsh, L. (2013). The scholarship of teaching and learning as collaborative working: A case study in shared practice and collective purpose. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 32(6), 901-914. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2013.806439
- Kidman, J., & Chu, C. (2017). Scholar outsiders in the neoliberal university: Transgressive academic labour in the whitestream. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 52(1), 7 -19. doi: 10.1007/s40841-017-0079-y
- King, M. (2003). *The Penguin history of New Zealand*: Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- King, M. (2004). *Being pākehā now: Recollections and reflections of a white native (2nd Edn.)*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Kirpitchenko, L., & Voloder, L. (2014). Insider research method: the significance of identities in the field. *Sage Research Methods Cases* (pp. 1 - 18). London, England: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Knowles, M. (1973). *The adult learner: A neglected species*. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Knowles, M. (1984). *Andragogy in action*. San Francisco, C.A: Jossey Bass.
- Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kotzé, E., Crocket, K., & Waititi (Ngāti Porou), C. (2016). Meeting the wharehū shapes teaching/learning therapy: Place pedagogy, new materialism, and whakaaro Māori. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, 37(3), 317-326. doi: 10.1002/anzf.1172
- LaBoskey, V. K., & Hamilton, M. L. (2010).” Doing as I do “: The role of teacher educator self-study in educating for reflective inquiry. In N. Lyons (Ed.), *Handbook of reflection and reflective inquiry: Mapping a way of knowing for professional reflective inquiry* (pp. 333-350). Boston, MA: Springer. 10.1007/978-0-387-85744-2_19.

- Lang, S. K. W., & Gardiner, B. D. (2014). As they like it – culture-centred counsellor education in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand: a play on bicultural pluralism. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 42(1), 73-85.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning. Legitimate peripheral participation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leafgren, S., DeBenedictis, D. C., Keller, D., & Kesson, K. (2004). Curriculum and pedagogy: An evolving, proliferating conversation. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 1(1), 81-98. doi: 10.1080/15505170.2004.10411486
- Lewin, K. (1946) Action research and minority problems. In G.W. Lewin (Ed.), *Resolving social conflicts*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Loughran J. (2004) A history and context of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. In J. Loughran, M. Hamilton, V. LaBoskey, & T. Russell (Eds.), *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp.7-39). Springer International Handbooks of Education, Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Ludema, J., & Fry, R. (2008). The practice of appreciative inquiry. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of action research* (2nd edn., pp. 280-296). London, United Kingdom: Sage. doi:10.4135/9781848607934
- Liu, M. (2017). “Contesting the cynicism of neoliberalism”: A corpus-assisted discourse study of press representations of the Sino-US currency dispute. *Journal of Language & Politics*, 16(2), 242–263.
- Macaskie, J., Meekums, B., & Nolan, G. (2013). Transformational education for psychotherapy and counselling: a relational dynamic approach. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 41(4), 351-362. doi: 10.1080/03069885.2012.726348
- Malott, K. M., Hall, K. H., Sheely-Moore, A., Krell, M. M., & Cardaciotto, L. (2014). Evidence-based teaching in higher education: Application to counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 53(4), 294-305. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00064.x
- Manthei, R. (2012). Counsellors’ choice of a preferred therapy as autobiography. *New Zealand Journal of Counselling*, 32(1), 1–12.
- Martin, G. (2017). Scaling critical pedagogy in higher education. *Critical Studies in Education*, 58(1), 1-18. doi: 10.1080/17508487.2015.1115417
- McAuliffe, G., & Eriksen, K. (Eds.), (2002). *Teaching strategies for constructivist and developmental counselor education*, Westport, CT; Greenwood Press.
- McAuliffe, G., & Eriksen, K. (Eds.), (2011). *Constructing counselor education. Handbook of counselor preparation: Constructivist, developmental, and experiential approaches*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McDonough, S. (2013). Learning to think like a teacher educator: Pedagogy, practice and performance. In R. Brandenburg & J. Wilson (Eds.), *Pedagogies for the future: leading quality learning and teaching in higher education* (pp. 61- 73). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense.
- McTaggart, R. (1997). 16 tenets of participatory action research. In Y. Wadsworth, *Everyday Evaluation on the Run*, London, England: Allen and Unwin.
- May, J., (1996). *Achieving internal consistency in counsellor training: A case study of the University of Bristol Diploma in Counselling*. MSc. (counsellor education and supervision) unpublished thesis. Bristol, England: University of Bristol.
- Mearns, D. (2003). *Developing person-centred counselling* (2nd edn.). London, England: Sage.
- Mearns, D., & Cooper, M. (2005). *Working at relational depth in counselling and psychotherapy*. London, England: Sage.
- Mearns, D., & Thorne, B. (2007). *Person-centred counselling in action* (3rd edn.). *Counselling in action*. London, England: Sage. ISBN 978-1-4129-2855-7
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Moody, R. C., Horton-Deutsch, S., & Pesut, D. J. (2007). Appreciative inquiry for leading in complex systems: Supporting the transformation of academic nursing culture. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 46(7), 319-324.
- Moon, P., & Biggs, P. (2004). *The Treaty and its times: the illustrated history*. Auckland, New Zealand; Resource Books.

- Negru, I. (2010). Plurality to pluralism in economics pedagogy: the role of critical thinking *International Journal of Pluralism and Economics Education*, 1(3), 185 - 193.
- Neimeyer, R. (1993). Constructivism and the problem of psychotherapy integration. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 3(2), 133-157.
- Nelson, M. L., & Neufeldt, S. A. (1998). The pedagogy of counseling: A critical examination. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 38(2), 70.
- New Zealand Association of Counsellors (2016). *Counsellor Education Standards*, 2016. Retrieved from www.nzac.org.nz/counsellor_education_standards.cfm
- New Zealand Government Tertiary Education Strategy (2014-2019). Retrieved from New Zealand Government Tertiary Education Strategy (2014-2019). Retrieved from <http://www.education.govt.nz/further-education/policies-and-strategies/tertiary-education-strategy/>
- Norcross, J. (1987). Toward a common language for psychotherapy. *Journal of Integrative and Eclectic Psychotherapy*, 4, 165-205.
- Norcross, J. (2005). A primer on psychotherapy integration. In J. Norcross & M. Goldfried (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy integration Oxford series in clinical psychology* (2nd edn, pp.3-23). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Norcross, J. C., & Goldfried, M. R. (2005). The future of psychotherapy integration: A roundtable. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 15(4), 392-471.
- O'Malley, V. (2014). *Beyond the imperial frontier: the contest for colonial New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- Onyett, S., & Hill, M. (2012). Integrating shadow work and appreciative inquiry reflections on structural inequalities, polarities and hurt. *AI Practitioner*, 14(4), 17-22.
- Orange, C. (1987). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Allen & Unwin. ISBN 0868616346.
- Penetito, W. (2009). Place-based education: Catering for curriculum, culture and community. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 18, 5-29.
- Pere, R. R. (1994). *Ako: Concepts of learning in the Māori tradition*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Kohanga Reo National Trust Board.
- Pihama, L., Smith, K., Taki, M., & Lee, J. (2004). *A literature review on kaupapa Māori and Māori education pedagogy*. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland, International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education.
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2001). Introduction. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds), *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice*. (pp. 1-10). London, England: Sage.
- Reed, J. (2007). *Appreciative inquiry: Research for change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rogers, C. (1951). *Client-centred Therapy*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rogers, C. (1961). *On becoming a person* London, England: Constable
- Rogers, C. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the 80's*. New York, NY: Merrill.
- Rogers, C. (1980). *A way of being*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Roper, B. (2018). Neoliberalism's war on New Zealand's universities. *New Zealand Sociology*, 33(2), 9-39.
- Russell, T. (2018). A teacher educator's lessons learned from reflective practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(1), 4-14. doi: 10.1080/02619768.2017.1395852
- Sanders, P. (2013). The 'family' of person-centred and experiential therapies. In M. Cooper, M. O'Hara, P. Schmid, & A. Bohart (Eds.), *The handbook of person-centred psychotherapy and counselling* (pp. 46-65). Basingstoke, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Savaya, R., & Gardner, F. (2012). Critical reflection to identify gaps between espoused theory and theory-in-use. *Social Work*, 57(2), 145-154. doi: 10.1093/sw/sws037
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action*: New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Scotland, J. (2012). Exploring the philosophical underpinnings of research: Relating ontology and epistemology to the methodology and methods of the scientific, interpretive, and critical research paradigms. *English Language Teaching*, 5(9), 9-16.

- Sibley, C. G., & Liu, J. H. (2007). New Zealand - bicultural? Implicit and explicit associations between ethnicity and nationhood in the New Zealand context. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37(6), 1222-1243. doi:10.1002/ejsp.459
- Skidmore, D. (2006). Pedagogy and dialogue. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(4), 503-514.
- Smith, D. (2015). Action science revisited: building knowledge out of practice to transform practice. In H. Bradbury, *The SAGE handbook of action research* (pp. 143-156). London, United Kingdom: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781473921290
- Smythe, E., & Spence, D. (2012). Re-viewing literature in hermeneutic research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 11(1), doi: 10.1177/160940691201100102
- Somerville, M. J. (2010). A place pedagogy for 'global contemporaneity'. *Educational Philosophy & Theory*, 42(3), 326-344.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London, England: Heinemann
- Strasser, A. (2015). The relational world of existential therapy and counselling. In E. Day, *Psychotherapy and counselling* (pp. 100-127). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Stowell, F. (2013). The appreciative inquiry method: A suitable candidate for action research? *Systems Research & Behavioral Science*, 30(1), 15-30. doi: 10.1002/sres.2117
- Thompson, A., & Cooper, M. (2012). Therapists' experiences of pluralistic practice. *European Journal of Psychotherapy & Counselling*, 14(1), 63-75.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples*. London, England, Zed Books.
- van den Nieuwenhof, R. (2013). The language of change: Generativity in dialogical processes. In M. Avital, D. Cooperrider, Sr., D. Zandee, L. Godwin, & B. Boland (Eds.). *Organizational Generativity: The Appreciative Inquiry Summit and a Scholarship of Transformation*, 4, 159-188. Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald.
- van der Haar, D., & Hosking, D. M. (2004). Evaluating appreciative inquiry: A relational constructionist perspective. *Human Relations*, 57, 1017-1036.
- van Manen, M. (2016). *Phenomenology of practice: meaning-giving methods in phenomenological research and writing*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- von Glasserfeld, E. (1984). An introduction to radical constructivism. In P. Watzlawick, (Ed.), *The invented reality* (pp.17-40). New York: Norton.
- Vontress, C. (1979). Cross-cultural counseling: An existential approach. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 58(2), 117-122. doi: 10.1002/j.2164-4918.1979.tb00363.x
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press..
- Waikato Institute of Technology (n.d.). *Te Ngāwhā Whakatupu', Māori capability framework*.
- Walker, M. (2006). *Higher education pedagogies*. Berkshire, United Kingdom: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Ward, A. (1999). *An unsettled history: Treaty claims in New Zealand today*. Wellington, New Zealand. Bridget Williams Books. ISBN 0908912978
- Warner, M. S. (2000) Person-centered psychotherapy: One nation, many tribes. *The Person-Centered Journal*, 7(1), 28-39.
- Wellington, J. and Sikes, P. (2006) A doctorate in a tight compartment: why students choose to do a professional doctorate and its impact on their personal & professional lives, *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(6), 723-734.
- White, M. (1995). *Re-Authoring Lives: Interviews and Essays*. Adelaide, South Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications. ISBN 0-646-22735-1
- White, M. & Epston, D. (1990). *Maps of narrative practice*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Whitehead, J. (1999). *How do I improve my practice? Creating a discipline of education through educational enquiry*. Ph. D thesis. Bath, United Kingdom: University of Bath. <http://www.actionresearch.net/living/living.shtml>
- Whitehead, J. (2009). Generating living theory and understanding in action research studies. *Action Research*, 7(1), 85-99. doi: 10.1177/1476750308099599
- Whitehead, J. (2018). *Living theory research as a way of life*. Bath, England: Brown Dog Books
- Whitehead, J., & Huxtable, M. (2013). Living educational theory research as transformational continuing professional development. *Gifted Education International*, 29(3), 221-226.

- Whitehead, J., & Huxtable, M. (2016). Creating a profession of educators with the living-theories of master and doctor educators. *Gifted Education International*, 32(1), 6-25.
- Whitehead, J., & McNiff, J. (2006). *Action research: living theory*: London, United Kingdom: Sage.
- Whitman & Beeson (2018). Developing a personal philosophy of teaching. In L. Haddock, & J. Whitman (Eds.), *Preparing the educator in counselor education* (pp. 14-34). New York: Routledge.
- Wilkinson, B., & Hanna, F. (2016). New horizons in counselor pedagogy: The intersection of constructivist concepts and phenomenological awareness. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling*, 55(1), 2-19. doi: 10.1002/johc.12021
- Winnicott, D. (1971). *Playing and Reality*. London, England: Routledge.
- Wright, C. & van Eck, D. (2018). Ontic explanation is either ontic or explanatory, but not both. *ERGO – An open access journal of philosophy*, 5(38). p.997. doi 10.3998/ergo.12405314.0005.038.
- Wright, J., & Lang, S. (2011). Counsellor education moving towards change. *New Zealand Journal of Counselling*, Special Issue, 22-39.
- Yalom, I. D. (2002). *The gift of therapy: an open letter to a new generation of therapists and their patients*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Zandee, D. (2013). The process of generative inquiry. In M. Avital, D. Cooperrider, Sr., D. Zandee, L. Godwin, & B. Boland (Eds.), *Organizational Generativity: The Appreciative Inquiry Summit and a Scholarship of Transformation*, 4, 69-88. Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald.
- Zandee, D. & Cooperrider., D. (2008). Appreciable worlds, inspired inquiry. In P. Reason, & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of action research* (pp. 190-198). London, United Kingdom: Sage.
- Zhu, P. (2018). Experiential growth group in counselor education: A review of its pedagogy, research, and ethical dilemmas. *The Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 43(2), 144-165. doi: 10.1080/01933922.2018.1451581

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Paetahi Tumu Kōrero Programme Details

Paetahi Tumu Kōrero (PTK) is an undergraduate bachelor's degree programme, comprising 360 credits at level 7 on the national qualification framework of the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA). The programme is designed for those wishing to become a professionally qualified counsellor in Aotearoa New Zealand. Successful graduates enter the workforce at a beginning practitioner level.

PTK is one of a range of programmes delivered by the Centre for Health and Social Practice at the Waikato Institute of Technology (Wintec) in a range of professional disciplines including counselling, mental health support work, midwifery, nursing, occupational therapy, physiotherapy, and social work. These programmes vary from certificates (level 4), bachelor's degrees (level 7), postgraduate certificates and diplomas (level 8) and masters qualifications (level 9).

Whilst counsellor registration is not mandatory in Aotearoa, graduates of the programme are able to apply for professional membership as relevant with various professional bodies in Aotearoa including the New Association of Counsellors (NZAC), New Zealand Christian Counsellors Association (NZCCA), and/or optional professional registration with the Addiction Practitioners Association Aotearoa-New Zealand Inc. (DAPAANZ), if wishing to become a Problem Gambling and/or Alcohol and other Drug Practitioner. The membership of these organizations and adherence to their ethical codes and professional guidelines is considered a baseline for practice in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Graduates of the programme take up positions as school counsellors, prisons, government and not-for-profit drug and alcohol services and a range of not for profit social service agencies such as rape crisis, family counselling agencies, women's refuge etc. Intake numbers for the programme range between 20 – 35 students each year.

PTK is located within the Centre for Health and Social Practice (CHASP) which has a focus on preparing practitioners for interdisciplinary health and social service professional contexts. The Centre holds a commitment to health, social justice, and partnership between Tangata Whenua (Indigenous Māori) and Tauīwi (non- Māori) peoples under commitments to Te Tiriti of Waitangi (the founding treaty) in Aotearoa. CHASP espouses a commitment to “compassionate action” (Paetahi Tumu Kōrero Bachelor of Counselling, Curriculum Document, 2015, Vol. 2., p. 28), and views transformative, critical, and inquiry-based pedagogies as fundamental to educating students capable of this.

The philosophy of PTK specifically echo's the philosophy of CHASP. The programme was the merger of two previous endorsements of a Bachelor of Applied Social Science, Te Whiuwhiu o te Hau (Māori counselling) and Counselling and a Māori whakatauki (proverb) was selected to mark the intention. This whakatauki and philosophy statement of the programme is as follows:

Kotahi te kohao o te ngira e kuhuna ai te miro ma, te miro pāngo, te miro whero. There is but one eye of a needle, through which white, black, and red cotton are threaded. (Waikato Iwi Tainui tongi/proverb)

Paetahi Tumu Kōrero Bachelor of Counselling values relational, collaborative, and critically reflexive counselling practice. The degree emphasises students developing their cultural and professional identity and counselling practice for the bicultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand (Tangata Whenua and Tangata Tiriti). The degree draws from a range of theories including Māori, modernist and postmodernist perspectives, and approaches. The degree actively addresses the impacts of colonisation in the Aotearoa New Zealand context. It develops practitioners that engage in decolonizing processes to work within shared spaces for transformative counselling practice. (Paetahi Tumu Kōrero Bachelor of Counselling, Curriculum Document, 2015, Vol. 2., p. 28).

PTK draws on a blended delivery of teaching methods including face- to-face teaching, wānanga (block teaching underpinned by Māori-centered teaching processes and pedagogies), directed online activities, self-directed online learning activities and supervised practicum as is best suited for the particular modules. There is a strong focus on inquiry based learning whereby students engage in self-directed inquiry learning activities that links their practicum experience, personal/professional development and academic learning to bring an integration of theory and practice uniquely individually and transformative of each student, and cognizant of post- treaty based bicultural context of Aotearoa.

PTK takes three years to complete for students enrolled fulltime and up to six years for those part-time. The programme comprises 15 compulsory modules and two elective modules (see schedule of modules below). In year three, students choose to specialize either in mental health and addictions (necessary for DAPAANZ registration), Māori-centered practice, or counselling families and children.

PTK is an applied degree with practicum placements a large part of the programme and in line with expectation and guidelines from the professional bodies mentioned above. In year one, students undertake a small placement of 10 hours providing a beginning experience in the counselling community. Over years two and three, students complete a total of 200 supervised counseling hours (1:1 and may comprise some group work) and 200 hours of agency activities (such as meeting attendance, note writing, admin work etc.). For students taking the two mental health and addictions elective modules, at least one placement needs to be in an Alcohol or Other Drug (AoD) context.

Students attend regular supervision during year two and three placements, this is with an external supervisor additional to any supervision received within their placement. They are required to attend a minimum of 10 external supervision sessions per year, a ratio of 1-hour of supervision to 10 hours of counselling with clients, as stipulated by NZAC. It is not mandatory for students to undertake personal counselling during their time on the programme rather strongly recommended. It is undertaken up by most students.

The curriculum aims to promote both horizontal and vertical integration of learning with integral concepts being revisited and reviewed across years and modules. Assessments are also designed to integrate and scaffold student learning across the three years. In year one, students engage in an exploration of foundational concepts in counselling and are invited to apply these to their own experiences. They are assessed at an introductory level on this knowledge and skill base. In year two, students begin counselling practice and analyse knowledge and concepts for their application in their practice setting. Assessments in this year are more practice- focused supporting the application of theory into practice. In their final year, students engage at a higher level of integration and critical reflection of knowledge and concepts. Students focus on a practice context, articulating their unique underpinning theoretical framework for counselling, and establishing a professional identity. Assessments are strongly practice-focused and require critical reflection of their own counselling practice. Successful presentation of practice accounts to a final panel comprising course tutors and an independent counselling practitioner is required to pass the programme including an assessment of the student's achievement of a level of competency as a bicultural counselling practitioner.

Schedule of Modules for Paetahi Tumu Kōrero

Year 1	Module Number	Module Name	Level	Credits	Total Learning Hours
	HSCO501	Te Timatanga / Introduction to Counselling	5	30	300
	HSCO502	Te Pikinga / Introduction to Professional Counselling Practice	5	15	150
	HSCO503	He Tangata / Human Development and Psychology	5	30	300
	HSCO504	Te Hāpori o Aotearoa / Introduction to Society	5	30	300
	HSCO505	Te Pū: Foundations of Treaty Based Practice	5	15	150
	Total Year 1 credits			120	1200
Year 2	HSCO601	Kaupapa Akoako / Counselling Theory and Practice	6	30	300
	HSCO602	He Oranga Tinana / Counselling Change and Wellbeing in Practice	6	15	150
	HSCO603	He Oranga Tangata / Foundations of Practice in Mental Health and Addictions	6	30	300
	HSCO604	Te Whānau / Working with Whānau	6	15	150
	HSCO605	Te Ture / Law, Ethics and Policy	6	15	150
	HSCO606	Te Weu: Developing Treaty Based Practice	6	15	150
	Total Year 2 credits			120	1200
Year 3	HSCO701	Kaupapa Arotake / Development of Counselling Practice	7	30	300
	HSCO702	Ngā Pou Kōrero / Presentation and Review of Counselling Practice	7	30	300
	HSCO703	Rangahau Māori / Research and Professional Practice	7	15	150
	HSCO704	Te More: Transforming Treaty Based Practice	7	15	150
Electives (Choice of Two)	HSMH701	Hauora-ā-Hinengaro / Complex and Long-Term Support in Mental Health and Addiction	7	15	150
	HSMH702	Te Hunga Wairangi / Acute and Complex Care in Mental Health and Addiction	7	15	150
	HSCO609	Te Hunga Rangatahi / Working with Children and Young People	6	15	150
	HSCO707	Ngā Iwi Taketake / Indigenous Liberation Studies	7	15	150
	FSIN713	Kaupapa Tirohanga / Developing Issues focused Practice	7	15	150
	FSIN714	Te Whakaruruhau / Care and Protection	7	15	150
	HSCO607	Ngā Rongo 1	6	15	150
	HSCO608	Ngā Rongo 2	6	15	150
Total year 3 credits				120	1200

Adapted from: Paetahi Tumu Kōrero Bachelor of Counselling, *Curriculum Document*, 2015, Vol. 2., p. 14. Waikato Institute of Technology, Centre for Health and Social Practice, Approved by the Academic Approval Committee (AAC) | (7 July 2015)

Appendix B: Sample of Contemporary Pedagogical Publications in Counsellor Education

Contemporary Pedagogical Publications in Counsellor Education N.B References in thesis main reference list.		
	Underpinnings	Aims
Emergence Pedagogy (Guiffrida, 2005)	Radical Constructivism (von Glasersfeld, 1984) Transformative Learning (Mezirow, 1991)	Emergence pedagogy focuses on the real world of students' practice. "Instead of using theory to guide students' initial practice, instructors using the Emergence Model introduce theoretical concepts to students after they have begun to observe and understand their instinctual interventions with clients...the instructor encourages students to compare their interventions to existing theories to assist students in understanding themselves better and improving the natural modes of helping" (Guiffrida, 2005).
Relational Dynamic Approach (Macaskie, Meekums, Nolan (2013)	Intersubjectivity Theory (Benjamin, 1990) Attachment Theory (Winnicott, 1971) Embodied attunement and relating Transformation	A recognition that transformation of self and other occurs in reciprocal relationships in communities of learning in a way that mirrors the counsellor/client relationship. Students will become critical practitioners who can consider theories contextually and partially, "a plurality of truths seen from a variety of perspectives, continually co-constructed through embodied 'participatory sense making' "(De Jaegher & Di Paulo cited in Macaskie et al. 2013).
Relational-Cultural Theory (Duffey, 2006)	Relational Competencies Relational Dynamics Relationally responsive use of power Growth fostering connections	A pedagogical goal is to develop students capable of growth fostering connections or relationships. "... we to become more relationally competent as we represent ourselves authentically in our relationships and as we negotiate the relational ruptures we experience (Duffey, 2006, p. 50).

Multicultural Transformational Pedagogy (Henriksen, 2006)	Existentialism (Yalom, 2002) Humanism (Rogers, 1961) Cross-cultural Counselling (Vontress, 1979) Multiethnic Education Pedagogy (Banks, 1981)	The focus is to help “counsellor educators and students develop a more in- depth understanding of the lived experiences of people from diverse backgrounds...Understanding the client’s historical, cultural consciousness provides counsellors the insight necessary for the development of effective interventions based on the client’s phenomenology” (Henriksen, 2006, p. 176). Henriksen stresses the importance of being conscious of the embodiment of history in individual’s psychologies as well in cultures as a whole.
Phenomenological Awareness in Pedagogy (Wilkinson & Hanna, 2016)	Phenomenology (Heidegger, 1962)	A “radical departure” (Wilkinson & Hanna, 2016, p. 9) from constructivist and transformational (Guiffreda, 2005; McAuliffe and Eriksen, 2002) approaches to students’ theory development in which students take a reflexive stance towards considering multiple theoretical perspectives in a situation to a phenomenological perspective. “This involves bracketing, or identifying and setting aside, theory-based and commonsense preconceptions of a phenomenon to explore it from within the first-person experience” (Wilkinson & Hanna, 2016, p. 9).
Culture-centred counsellor education ethos (Lang & Gardiner, 2014)	Collaborative pluralism Bicultural pluralism	An educational framework that honours Te Tiriti o Waitangi obligations in bicultural Aotearoa, and produces counsellors who are “deconstructed from positions of cultural dominance and reconstructed as pluralists” (p. 74)
Place Pedagogy (Kotzé, Crocket, Waititi (Ngāti Porou), 2016)	Place-learning (Somerville, 2010) Place-based education (Penetito, 2009)	Pedagogy that “reflect[s] the counselling programme’ connections to the land, history and people of Aotearoa New Zealand, when a place learning is embodied

		<p>and local relationships to place are constituted in narrative and other representations” (Kotzé et al. 2016). The emphasis is on being cognisant in learning contexts of place-space a concept for Māori where interactions are not only between peoples but between peoples and their connectedness to the unseen and seen non-human elements of their world, of critical importance in students being and learning.</p>
--	--	--

Appendix C : Participant Information Sheet



Participant Information Sheet

23 February 2017

Project Title: Participatory Action Research with a Team of Counsellor Educators Collectively Considering Pedagogy.

Kia ora Teaching Team Colleagues

This participatory research project has emerged from our many conversations as the teaching team for Paetahi Tumu Kōrero regarding our shared interest in researching the pedagogical base of our programme and our collective teaching practices. It is with great pleasure I formally invite you to participate in this research project.

Purpose of this research

This research takes up the call-in contemporary literature for more explicit attention to be given to the relationship between pedagogy and curriculum on our higher education programmes (Brackette, 2014)

The broad question for this research is how do we best consider our pedagogical theories and practices alongside those of our team-teaching team colleagues and within the aims of a programme curriculum?

This research will use a participatory action research (Reason & Bradbury, 2001, 2008) approach with our team of counsellor educators delivering our Wintec Institute of Technology's Paetahi Tumu Kōrero, bicultural counselling programme. The research will engage our team in an exploration of the pedagogies underpinning our programme curriculum, and the relationships of the collective pedagogies of the team of educators involved.

This research is for my study for a Doctor of Health Science at Auckland University of Technology (AUT) (Programme Code: AK3664). It is hoped that this research will also support us as a team as we intentionally reflect on the delivery of our new venture and continue to go forward in our development of Paetahi Tumu Kōrero.

What will happen in this research?

This participatory action research involves you in three of four phases. The first phase involves me as researcher and yourselves as research participants in a self-reflection as to what underpins and drives our pedagogical theories and practices. You are invited to carry out this self-reflection in a way that best suits you which may include video recording, oral testimony, or written reflection, guided reflection or interview. As researcher, I offer support in whatever way preferred, including interviewing and/or providing resources relating to pedagogy if required.

On completion of our self-reflections, all participants including myself as researcher-participant will then take part in two consecutive focus groups (phase two and phase three), drawing from a critical appreciative inquiry orientation to provide a generative aspect to our

collective exploration of pedagogical theories and practices of the teaching team. Here we will share our self – reflections and explore the impacts of one- another’s pedagogies on us as individuals and as a team delivering our programme. We will then determine what this may mean for us as a team and how we may wish to use this understanding as we continue the delivery of the programme.

1. What are the benefits?

The final outputs from this research will include a doctoral thesis and journal publications. It is also hoped that the benefits to our students and to the teaching team will be significant through having a much clearer understanding of our pedagogies collectively.

2. How will my privacy be protected?

Our Paetahi Tumu Kōrero, bicultural counselling programme will be identified in the research. We will jointly negotiate issues pertaining to individual participants’ privacy and confidentiality at the outset of the research and on a continuing basis through the research.

You will have a choice in the level of anonymity you would prefer. This may include using a pseudonym and being anonymised and/or the use of quotes or reference to your contributions in a non-identifiable manner. Alternatively, you may prefer to be identified and can indicate this on the consent form.

Concerning confidentiality, participatory research is considered one of the more difficult research methods to ensure confidentiality by virtue of the fact that participants are closely involved as a group with one another. All interactions between researcher and individual participants, and/or between participants will be kept confidential to our group. As a teaching team, we already have an agreed working kawa and this will form a baseline for this research.

Care and consultation will be carried out in the collaborative data analysis regarding Te Ao Māori considerations. Additional consultation will be sought from a Māori academic consultant should our team consider this appropriate. Funds have been set aside for this.

3. How will my data be stored?

The data gathered during this research will stored digitally with all hard copy data being digitised. All data will be stored on AUT’s One Drive in a password-encrypted file, which will be erased after six years. Consent forms will also be stored digitally (separate from the research data) and will be encrypted, and then erased after six years. Hard copies of the Consent Forms will be destroyed after digitisation.

Original data from your participant self-reflection will be handed back to you (after being digitised) for your own future use. You will be asked to indicate on the consent form if you wish to have your self-reflection data returned to you, if you do not wish to have your self-reflection data returned it will be destroyed. All other hard copy data will be destroyed immediately after digitisation.

4. What are the costs of participating in this research?

There will be no financial costs to you being involved in this research. The time commitment will involve time engaged in a self –reflection (minimum of 4 hours) and two focus groups (maximum 6 hours each). There will be further shorter time commitments to check over any transcripts or data analysis or research discussion to ensure your views and experiences are well represented. Wintec’s Centre for Health and Social Practice management have approved participants’ involvement in the research during work time.

5. Participation in the Research

All permanent members of our Paetahi Tumu Kōrero teaching team are invited to take part in this research. Your participation in this research is voluntary and whether or not you choose to participate will neither advantage nor disadvantage you. You are able to withdraw from the study at any time by notifying the Centre for Health and Social Practice’s Research Leader, Julie Thorburn (see details below). Alternatively, you can inform me directly. No reason for declining need be given. If you choose to withdraw from the study, then you will be offered the

choice between having any data that is identifiable as belonging to you removed and allowing it to continue to be used, although it may not be possible to remove all records of the focus group discussions. In addition, once the findings have been produced, removal of my data may not be possible.

6. What opportunity do I have to consider this invitation?

It would be appreciated if you could return the attached consent form indicating if you are willing to participate within 10 days. Forms can be emailed or given to the Centre for Health and Social Practice Leader, Julie Thorburn. Julie.Thorburn@wintec.ac.nz

7. Will I receive feedback on the results of this research?

As this is a participatory action research you will be involved in the analysis of the data during the project.

Findings from the study will also be made available through professional conference presentations (e.g. to New Zealand Association of Counsellors Counsellor Educator Conference), national and international journal publications, and a thesis available in the AUT library.

8. What are the discomforts and risks?

There is a minimal chance that as participants you may feel some vulnerability sharing your self – reflection with teaching colleagues during the focus groups.

To ameliorate this, a critical appreciative inquiry process has been selected to ensure as participants we take up an inquiry role in relation to one another rather than an evaluative or critiquing role. We also have recently re-established our kawa as a teaching team that will be a baseline in our interactions in this research. Any concerns can also be addressed with one another during the research phases, individually with myself as researcher and/or the Centre for Health and Social Practice Research Leader, Julie Thorburn if preferred (contact details below). The Project Supervisor, Dr Tony MacCulloch is also available to be contacted if needed (contact details below).

9. What do I do if I have concerns about this research?

Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor, Dr Tony MacCulloch (contact details below).

Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary of AUTECH, Kate O'Connor, ethics@aut.ac.nz, Ph. 921 9999 ext. 6038.

10. Whom do I contact for further information about this research?

Please keep this Participant Information Sheet for your future reference. The hard copy of your Consent Form will be returned to you after digitisation.

Contact details for the research team:

Researcher Contact Details:

Janet May

Senior Academic Staff Member,
CHASP
Wintec
Ph. 07 83400 Ext. 8974
Janet.May@wintec.ac.nz

Project Supervisor Contact Details:

Dr Tony MacCulloch

Senior Lecturer - Nursing
School of Clinical Sciences (HH)
Nursing (HH1202)
Ph. 921 9999 Ext. 7116
tony.macculloch@aut.ac.nz

WINTEC, CHASP RESEARCH LEADER DETAILS:

Julie Thornburn
Research Leader
CHASP
Wintec,
Ph. 07 8348800 Ext. 3177
Julie.Thornburn@wintec.ac.nz

Thank you for considering this invitation.

Ngā mihi

Janet

Appendix D: Preliminary Ideas for Teaching Team

Doctoral Research Janet May - Preliminary Ideas for Teaching Team, March 2016

Pedagogy

The educational philosophy that underpins teaching and learning (Parker, & Myrick, 2009). It includes beliefs about the nature of knowledge, what is selected to be taught, how it is taught, what we consider comprises learning (learning theories), beliefs about how students and educators learn. (Horsfall, Cleary, & Hunt, 2012).

“Pedagogy is rarely made explicit in curricula and is often assumed or taken for granted” (Erlam, 2015, p. 97).

Examples of different pedagogies:

Constructivist pedagogies (McAuliffe, & Eriksen, 2011).

Māori pedagogies – relational ontological, kaupapa Māori etc. (Stucki, 2010)

Emergence pedagogy - radical constructivist and transformational pedagogies combined (Guiffida, 2005).

Critical race theory pedagogy (Haskins, & Singh, 2015).

Dialogic pedagogy (Gill, & Niens, 2014).

1. My interest, assumptions and starting place

- We all teach from an underpinning pedagogy however there appears to be little focus collectively on the way in which our pedagogical beliefs and practices relate to each other's (support and or hinder one another) and how our range of pedagogies support and achieve our programme aims and enhance student learning.
- In our current educational climate, my experience has been that there is now less focus on pedagogy than in past decades rather there is an emphasis on evidence, outcomes, products etc. and less on the pedagogical practices that will achieve those outcomes.
- Pedagogy/pedagogies is not always well understood, or in depth, and the relationship between pedagogy and curriculum appears to take less attention.
- We are teaching and equipping students to work in particular areas, we have a responsibility to critique the pedagogies that best support this e.g.: trauma. Taking care re our pedagogies mindful of secondary traumatisation of students etc.
- As a new programme venturing into new territory, we have an opportunity to more define our pedagogies and consider what might be important to us pedagogically more clearly.

2. Possible Shape of Doctoral Research

Research Question

How do we best consider the pedagogies underpinning our programmes collectively with regards to our collaborative teaching relationships and the aims of our programmes and our students' learning needs?

Interview Questions

I. What guides us individually and collectively with regards to pedagogies?

- II. **What is important to us pedagogically and what has informed us?**
- III. **To what degree are our pedagogies congruent with the institutions pedagogical visions and does this matter?**
- IV. **Does our programme hang together sufficiently from a pedagogical viewpoint and/or does it matter?**
- V. **Is there an opportunity for us to develop a way of considering our pedagogies collectively with regards to our collaborative working relationships and the aims of our programmes and our students learning needs?**

3. Methodology

I am considering possibly a participatory appreciative inquiry or a cooperative inquiry methodology. My reasons for this are:

AI - focuses on appreciation and identifying what is working well underpinned by generative theory that change comes when we do more of what is working well. This would mean we are not critiquing one another's teaching practice but supporting each other to identify our best practice moments in teaching and consider the underpinning pedagogies in greater depth.

My hope would be that the process of appreciation would enable us to deepen our collective ability to reflect on pedagogical considerations and we might discover useful processes and frameworks for future conversations in teams around pedagogy.

AI – may resonate as a process with the core underpinning values of our programmes of supporting recovery (vs deficit), strengths focused practice etc.

AI – can cater for a range of levels of participation by the team in the research process whereas cooperative inquiry needs a far greater level of cooperation and engagement with the research question and inquiry.

I do wonder how this would fit as a research approach for considering pedagogy from a Te Ao Māori lens.

4. Counselling Tutor Team Involvement and Outputs

Whether there would be interest from the team and/or individuals in the team to be involved.

Possible format:

- Preparatory one-to-one interview with tutors.
- Invitation to participate in videoing a teaching session and the reflecting one to one or as a team on pedagogical practices and theories in use.
- Focus group - sharing our teaching videos and/or pedagogical reflections through a structured appreciative inquiry process.
- A focus group with managers re. our institution's pedagogical visions.
- Focus groups with students who were in the particular teaching sessions that were videoed to reflect on learning moments.

5. Whether my research could dovetail into some outputs for us collectively (textbook) and or individually (articles re your own pedagogies)?

6. References Used in Team Information.

- Erlam, G. (2015). *Improving pedagogical practices of undergraduate nursing students in high-fidelity simulation*. A Thesis Submitted to Auckland University of Technology in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Health Science, 2015. Auckland: Doctor of Health Science, Auckland University of Technology.
- Gill, S., & Niens, U. (2014). Education as humanization: a theoretical review on the role of dialogic pedagogy in peacebuilding education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative & International Education*, 44(1), 10-31.
- Guiffrida, D. A. (2005). The emergence model: An alternative pedagogy for facilitating self-reflection and theoretical fit in counseling students. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 44(3), 201-213.
- Haskins, & Singh, A. (2015). Critical race theory and counselor education pedagogy: Creating EquiChart training. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 54(4), 288-301.
- Horsfall, J., Cleary, M. & Hunt, G. (2012). Developing a pedagogy for nursing teaching-learning. *Nurse Education Today*, 32, 930-933.
- McAuliffe, G., & Eriksen, K. (Eds.), (2011). Constructing counselor education. *Handbook of counselor preparation: Constructivist, developmental, and experiential approaches*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Parker, B., & Myrick, F. (2009). A critical examination of high-fidelity human patient simulation in the context of nursing pedagogy. *Nurse Education Today*, 29, 322-329.
- Stucki, P. (2010). *Māori pedagogy, pedagogical beliefs and practices in a Māori Tertiary Institution* Unpublished thesis for Doctor of Education, New Zealand; Massey University.

Appendix E: Participant Consent Form



Consent Form

Project title: ***Participatory Action Research with a Team of Counsellor Educators Collectively Considering Pedagogy.***

Project Supervisor: Dr Tony MacCulloch Senior Lecturer – Nursing School of Clinical Sciences (HH)
Nursing (HH1202), AUT.

Researcher: Janet May, Senior Academic Staff Member, Wintec, Hamilton.

This consent form applies to all phases of the research including the self -study and focus groups. Please tick all circles you agree to:

- ☐ I have read and understood the information provided about this research project in the Participant Information Sheet dated 12 December 2016 and have had an opportunity to ask questions and to have them answered. I understand that the participant and/or the researcher will produce a record or notes during the self- reflection and focus groups. Any self –reflection interviews and focus groups will also be audiotaped and transcribed for accuracy and I will have the opportunity to check any transcripts for accuracy of my contributions. I understand that the identity of my fellow participants and our discussions in the focus group is confidential to the group and I agree to keep this information confidential. I understand that if I withdraw from the study then, while it may not be possible to destroy all records of the focus group discussion of which I was part, I will be offered the choice between having any data that is identifiable as belonging to me removed and allowing it to continue to be used. However, once the findings have been produced, removal of my data may not be possible. I understand that taking part in this study is voluntary (my choice) and that I may withdraw from the study at any time without being disadvantaged in any way.

With regards my identity in any research publications, please indicate which you prefer from the following three options:

- ☐ I prefer to remain as anonymous as possible throughout the research and would like the following pseudonym to be used I do not wish to be identified in the findings.
- ☐ I would like only my Christian name to be used during the research and in the findings
- ☐ I am happy for my full name (Christian name and surname) to be used in the research. I wish to be identified in the findings and acknowledged appropriately.

Participant Signature :

.....
.....

Participant Name :

.....
.....

Date :

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee on 12 December 2016AUTEC Reference number 16/400.

*Please sign a hard copy or email copy of this form and return to Julie Thorburn,
Julie.Thornburn@wintec.ac.nz CHASP research leader. After digitisation, a copy will be
returned to you for keeping.*

Appendix F: Self-reflection Guide

Self-reflection guide

Pedagogical/Teaching Reflection 1

Recall a peak moment in your teaching practice on Paetahi Tumu Korero which you would consider as a teaching moment when all had a heightened sense that what you believe in pedagogically was present in what you were doing.

Please be free to choose how you wish to capture in a format and flow that makes sense for you.

The following questions are to guide further self -reflection

1. What was it about this memory that drew you?
2. What was at the heart of this moment for you?
3. What were your priorities in this teaching moment?
4. What were your hopes in this moment for your students learning and development as counsellors?
5. What were the responses/ impacts for your students (what might they say about this moment and its impacts?)
6. What teaching strategies/activities were you employing? What was it that you considered of value in these strategies?
7. Was there any content knowledge that formed a part of this teaching moment and what was it that you valued in this knowledge? What ideas were informing your choice here?
8. What were your beliefs about teaching and learning that students need in their learning as a Counsellor? What ideas were informing you here?
9. What particularly enabled you to practice as you did in this moment?
10. What experiences (past or present), skills, and/or knowledge were you calling on in this moment?
11. When did you learn these and/or from/with whom?
12. Were there any past or present people influencing you in this moment (in the room with you metaphorically)?
13. What broader aspects were supporting you in this moment (curriculum, programme, organisational aspects)?
14. What was or might have been at stake for you in this moment?
15. What is your understanding of this moment now?
16. How do you make sense of this moment in terms of pedagogy?
17. What is it you value about these specifically for educating and preparing counsellors?
18. What does this reflection offer you now e.g.: for future inquiry and/or practice?

Pedagogical/Teaching Reflection 2.

Recall a teaching moment when what you were having to do was difficult or challenging given that it was counter to your pedagogy. The aim is to bring this moment to life in a format and/or flow that makes sense to you.

Please use these questions for further self-reflection

1. What was it about this memory that drew you?
2. What was at the heart of this moment for you?
3. What were your priorities in this teaching moment?
4. What were your hopes in this moment for your students learning and development as counsellors?
5. What was supporting and/or hindering you in this moment?
6. What other voices or ideas different to your own were you aware of in this moment?
What was impacting on your decision-making regarding teaching and learning in that moment?
7. What do you think might have been the impact for your students in this moment?
What were the responses/ impacts for your students (what might they say about this moment and its impacts?)
8. What did you do to manage in this moment? What ideas were informing you here?
9. What were your beliefs about teaching and learning that students need in their learning as a counsellor? What ideas were informing you here?
10. What experiences (past or present), skills, and/or knowledge were you calling on in this moment?
11. When did you learn these and/or from/with who?
12. Were there any past or present people influencing you in this moment (in the room with you metaphorically)?
13. What broader aspects were supporting/hindering you in this moment (curriculum, programme, organisational aspects)?
14. What was or might have been at stake for you in this moment?
15. What is your understanding of this moment now?
16. How do you make sense of this moment in terms of pedagogy?
17. What does this reflection offer you now e.g.: for future inquiry and/or practice?

Appendix G: Charts I-III, Excerpts of Appreciating Dialogue, Focus Group One.

<p>Chart I: 1) Keita's Sharing</p> <p><i>There were strong themes I was noticing in my transcript through both examples. What I call a just practice that real close sense of justice. I feel a responsibility to address anything that is jarring or seems unjust. So, I have to take up, to question, to interrupt, to disturb, to deconstruct, and to invite critical reflexive practice those are strong drivers in my teaching. I am working hard to always try to find best ways to do this, but because of the dominant discourses around, people often don't understand that position taking that I take up. I see a strong theme about the importance for me of addressing issues directly so in the classroom I'm always wanting to seek out opportunities where professional relationships can be enhanced by speaking to each other and addressing the issues with each other in a respectful way. I just believe that is what takes you to more generative rich counselling and professional relationship. The other thing that came through was the silencing effect and I'm taking care of myself by not speaking. I see the misunderstanding as a discursive thing I don't see that as anybody's kind of fault it is very understandable. I think as I read my transcript there seemed to be a real consistency with a post-structural teaching pedagogy and I'm happy with that, but often I don't think it's understood and I think that is possibly because it is a bit of a paradigm shift for a lot of people, it goes into very postmodern paradigms. It is risky practice, but it fits with me personally. (Keita)</i></p>	<p>2) Lucia and My Appreciations</p> <p><i>What stood out for me was just practice having that position of passion for justice and to be supporting professional practice development of counselling from that philosophy of just practice. Also, the discourses that students bring to the teaching learning environment and how that challenges your goals of just practice, the goals of having a voice to that discourse and how to address that discourse in the moment and the challenges that have come across from that. And that resonated with me because teaching the Treaty is all about that and trying to find ways in which to recognise the learning environment. The students bring all those ways of viewing the world and how they language those ways into the classroom setting. How we encourage them to be noticing that and then critiquing it and then changing it is what I'm hearing from your practice which resonates for me because that is my passion too. Critical reflection is part of that process and your post-structural, post-modernist pedagogy is really important, and something I agree with and appreciate too, I think actually it is a plus. (Lucia)</i></p> <p><i>I think what stood out for me is about the responsibilities as an educator that you hold coming from a post-structural position and sometimes not feeling you have the permission to take up those positions fully. The value you place on respectful relating, the power of language and the importance of that as a professional and in counselling, and you are much attuned to interruptions to this that you notice. That resonated for me from my pedagogical position because I think at times, I don't fully take up my pedagogical positions either on the programme. I don't feel we have the permission or the contract with students to take up those positions and sometimes we have our hands tied behind our back or our wings clipped. For us collectively, I wonder how we can address these issues so that we can fully take up those positions that our pedagogies invite us to as educators. (Janet)</i></p>
<p>3) Impact for Keita of Hearing Our Appreciations</p> <p><i>Gosh, well you know I'm sitting there saying it's not understood and what I experienced was some understanding and some valuing of what I hold dear in my teaching. That was really actually quite moving for me, because I do notice a lot of silencing and it seems to be getting more, so yeah, I just feel like there is a lot more silencing. ...That was a very, very rich moment thank you both for appreciating that.... Yes, it is just becoming more and more clear for me that by having these conversations I often have these little ideas you play with, but you don't really do much more with and it has been about us sitting as a panel the tutors and actually talking together like a panel but maybe in a bit of conversation about our pedagogies. I like that idea too going forward of creating a receiving context for the students be able to be in that learning space, and for us to be able to not have to have our wings clipped and I think part of that receiving context is setting up a "what are you signing up to". (Keita)</i></p>	

Chart II: 1) Lucia's Sharing

I noticed that I'm very process orientated in my teaching learning environment that my goal is to understand the students' understanding of what they are learning and to provide a vehicle for that to happen. My peak example was when we used the paepae [speaking platform] where just one person spoke at a time and we all listened to their stories. I noticed in that kind of methodology of teaching it requires me as the tutor to be listening really intently and to be capturing and not interrupting those stories and remembering the stories in a way that is helpful for the processing element of the learning, and that can be quite challenging. Through this to teach the students too to be appreciating each other's story, to be able to articulate their own story because there is some vulnerability in that process, and to help each other to support each other around understanding themselves. It was just so lovely, a magical moment, so spiritual, and for me the spirituality came from the genuine caring that they had for each other's stories. They are quite diverse stories because they are all coming from different personal backgrounds, different discourses that they sit in. It was such a genuineness and care and I am really wanting to kind of investigate that more so I can bring that more into the teaching and learning process. So, how do we provide the tikanga in the classroom so that they are looked after, and they understand the practices that are required for that to happen and my role is to help facilitate that support that safety in that process? So, it was good to have that opportunity to recognise actually a lot of my pedagogy sits in being Māori and what I've learned around being in a Māori setting it keeps me safe. It helps me know that this may be challenging, but I know what I'm doing these are the practices that keep me safe and if I do this, I'll be all right, I'll be looked after. I'm very passionate about social justice, passionate about Māori and what has happened to Māori in the colonisation process and want to help students transform their practice as well, so looking at the teaching learning process and how can I achieve that in that environment. My pedagogy is very much critical transformative, and Māori centred. (Lucia)

3) Impact for Lucia Hearing Our Appreciations

Listening to your connection to my story was really helpful. It is one of the things I really appreciate that we are different, but there are some common ways and common beliefs that we have and when we share those stories there's this richness that happens, because you took a lot of what I talked about and then added such lovely layers to it around discourse, vulnerability practice and processing that I really appreciate because these are different ways of then enriching my practice giving me lots of little ideas of what I could do, I really appreciate that. I also get excited that now we are making these connections of our own stories to our vision for the programme.

2) Keita and My Appreciations

I just witnessed congruence as I've been in the classroom with you Lucia and seen your weaving of teaching and your processing and the passionate way you spoke about that came across strongly now. You spoke of a commitment to understand the students' understanding, and then later in the conversation you said I asked myself what was it that enabled that to happen and that had me add that you have a commitment to understand the students understanding, but also understand your own understanding. The spiritual and magical aspect to your practice stood out to me. I wonder if we give enough attention to some of that. The fact that you gave attention to that was really moving and to appreciate those spiritual moments. And this creating a context to look after and invite students to look after each other that just stood out to me as something really important to you. But you also spoke about how your Māori centred practice supports you in feeling safe and knowing you've been looked after. The idea of vulnerability in the way of not stilling it, but to look after ways to do it, to facilitate it safely and supportively, that really struck me as well as being important to you. Vulnerability is hard for people to go into. (Keita)
You have a lovely way of speaking to your goals ensuring the students have space to share their personal reflections on their experiences and then you talk a lot about appreciating each other and the students reaching understandings. These are my words, but you talked about almost like an embodiment in your listening, and then a stepping back. I also heard you receiving the students with care, the background of the student, their experiences they bring, and the discourses that they operate from. Your valuing those discourses as a starting place from which they can move and appreciating who they are in relation to those starting places. The thing that I really liked is your expectation of the students' capacity to take on board not only their own learning, but the responsibility jointly for one another and together for the collective learning process and I would like to grow that more. (Janet)

Chart III: 1) My (Janet's) Sharing

It took me into some new understandings of how I'm realising my pedagogy. I know that I teach from an experiential place, but I hadn't realised quite how I'm doing it now. I look for ways the students can realistically experience e.g., research in the classroom because they can't experience the doing of research, but I realised what they could do that was real for them was hold a research question all the way through the module. I realised too that I am constantly looking for the real value in their learning, I keep talking to the students about why the need to know research for the practice context that is strongly focused on outcomes, evaluation, research and evidence-based practice. I try to make the value of learning visible as a way of inspiring them to get excited and passionate in the moment of the class, and to bring understanding of why the learning is important. With critical reflection I try to emphasise why this is so important for practitioners. I do emphasise modelling the counselling process through the learning process so that my strong belief is that if they are experiencing collaborative relationships in a learning environment then they are going to parallel that hopefully in their practice. We collaborate as much as we can in the space of what we've got. One of the words you fed back to me in our conversation Lucia was that we have a scattered approach at times on the programme and I thought it does feel like that. We have some amazing practices, but it feels a bit scattered. I like the diversity of our practice and I like the fact that some of the students love narrative practices, some love kaupapa Māori practice, and some love different practices. However, the intentionality, scaffolding and the coherence is not clear to me at times. I'm not saying it's not there, but it is just not clear and especially around skills and I don't know what we are assessing competency wise in such a pluralist field. I kind of struggle with that. Also, I'd like the students to know what they are signing up to as well. I wrote down that I think my pedagogy is a relational experiential possibly dialogical pedagogy with a critical edge, a transformative kind of critical edge verses being a critical pedagogy. I think that is where I'm sitting. (Janet)

3) Impact for Me Hearing the Appreciations

It was lovely to listen to you describing what you are noticing as it consolidates what I'm intending. Things like I am not doing this for students one day practice it is for their future practice and that I am engaging the students in personally meaningful ways, creating and modelling a learning environment that reflects the way of engaging in the counselling process. I just loved hearing you state what it is raising for us collectively and as you were talking; I was thinking how do we explicitly invite the students into that right from day one? What they are signing up to right from the moment they walk in the door? (Janet)

2) Lucia and Keita's Appreciations

I appreciated the value you place on students experiencing the learning, in a personally meaningful way for them. It is not just coming up with an exercise for them to do. It was really intentionally thinking about how this might be most meaningful for them in a personal way. In your experiential teaching there is always a purpose to it, it's all linked to practice and holding the intentionality and value of that for their future practice. The idea of scaffolding and competencies, not only where do they need to be at the stage, but how do we best scaffold them to that stage resonated for me when you were speaking because it is something that I wonder too. And what kind of learning strategies can we put in place to do that scaffolding so that there is a flow and that there isn't a dissonance which is what you named a bit later. Critical reflective practice seems to be a key for both of us too. So not only did you speak or define your practice as relational experiential dialogical with a critical edge, but that is what you were describing in your talking about it, so you didn't just name those things you actually showed them in your talk. (Keita)
You talked a lot about the experiential space, the relational aspect of being in that space and the modelling of the skills in that space that you encourage in the students and for them to reflect on the way that you engage with them as part of their learning. There is a collaborative relationship, modelling relationship, a reflective relationship in that process and that you create a learning environment that is experiential and encourages the student to be passionate about the topic and to be engaged in the topic and to value the topic. And there in an intentional plan of where students should be. From year one to year two to year three, what that means for our vision around the learning is becoming clearer and from that, this notion of scaffolding where do we start and what do we start with, and where do we want to be at the end of it all. What binds that altogether is your critical edge allowing students to learn how to have a critical eye on their skills. (Lucia)

Appendix H: Charts IV-VIII Excerpts of Co-constructing Dialogue, Focus Group One.

Chart IV:	Key Moment of Co- Constructing (1)
<p>1) Vulnerability</p> <p>Structuring care-full safe collective processes for fostering and supporting vulnerability</p>	<p>Lucia We talked about vulnerability as one of the things that we want to explore further.</p> <p>Keita How we facilitate it and lay the foundation for vulnerability</p> <p>Janet Recognising that the learning process is a vulnerable process and how the programme might hold that. Is that what are you thinking?</p> <p>Lucia Recognising that there are some topics that are more vulnerable than others and our goal is to be noticing that and setting the scene for a space to be nurturing and safe, all those words that we've been talking about for students...</p> <p>Janet And, the tutors...</p> <p>Keita Sacred, safe, trusting, careful as care-full.</p> <p>Lucia Yeah that's a good word I like that.</p> <p>Keita The question that you asked yourself Lucia is a very, very rich question. "What was it that enabled that the vulnerability in her peak teaching moment to happen?" You actually identified that it was about the students appreciating supporting and understanding each other. So, it is fostering that in the students. It is still a good question, your words were appreciating, support and understanding of each other.</p> <p>Lucia Trusting each other to look after each other, to me that is how what we have to set up in order for vulnerability to be able to be used.</p> <p>Keita How do we set up a structure for that to happen? The Pōwhiri Poutama process is going through my mind.</p> <p>Lucia That makes sense too because you've got the Whakatau which is about settling, feeling settled before you begin your work and also the paepae approach within pōwhiri poutama.</p> <p>Lucia So that storytelling, the emotions that come with it and challenges. That is why Pōwhiri Poutama plays such a part and is such a good model.</p> <p>Lucia Is this what we are taking forward?</p> <p>Janet I think so.</p> <p>Keita We don't want to lose this.</p>

Chart V:	Key Moment of Co- Constructing (2)
<p>2) Discourses</p> <p>Recognising and working explicitly with discourses as part of the transformative learning for students</p>	<p>Lucia I think discourse, we need to put that in there. It is about us recognising those stories that will come into the learning environment and what we do to help them make sense of it in year one and to grow it in year two and be really critical in year three.</p> <p>Keita And I think that lifetime line assignment in year one is a good place to do that. I think we have got the flexibility to do it there.</p> <p>Lucia But, also that is not just the only moment. They've got the theory of discourse, and they have the discourse in the different areas. This helps to scaffold an understanding of the self, how the self was formulated by understanding the wider societal challenges that influenced them and where they come from.</p> <p>Janet Look there is our scaffolding, I need to put that down scaffolding</p> <p>Keita And, you said something to add to that which is appreciating the usefulness of the discourse.</p> <p>Lucia Yeah that's right.</p> <p>Keita And, the value of those discourses, as well as the implications.</p> <p>Janet Noticing, valuing and owning the implications,</p> <p>Lucia And I think we need to have a discussion around modern and post-modern pedagogy it would be helpful for us to do that. Our students come with this very, what's a way of describing it, personal approach to the world, you know, they are very me-centred and don't recognise how when things are said the 'me' gets first attention. How can we use that in our pedagogy for them to be more understanding of the self and the discourse that sits in all of that, but also growing from that experience and transforming from that experience?</p>

Chart VI:	Key Moment of Co- Constructing (3)
<p>3) Theoretical Clarity:</p> <p>Having greater clarity as to how we are drawing on social constructionist and post- structural ideas to support students in their understanding of self and others</p>	<p>Keita And I think there is more like I think within our programme we have got romantic, modernist, post-modernist and indigenous paradigms that we are working with and I sometimes get very confused about how we work with all of those in a way that is honouring with everything.</p> <p>Lucia And with one another. I think there are layers to that to. So, there is the theory and the practice, but for me also when we are developing the critical student there is their own way of critiquing themselves.</p> <p>Janet And their notion of self too and whatever and we might not all agree on that, but we can have some clearer sense of.</p> <p>Lucia Is it about me or is about the other person it's all about that other person.</p> <p>Janet And I know that I view self as more socially constructed but I still have a somewhat essentialist view</p> <p>Keita But that is what the students are grappling with as well now. I mean I think because post-modernism has come in and put that critique out there beautifully the different approaches have looked at their own practice and questioned that.</p> <p>Janet And are bringing a far more social constructionist influence on self than those earlier practices.</p> <p>Keita Yeah and we've got some lovely literature that speaks to that.</p> <p>Lucia Yeah I think social constructionism in that context is helping them understand themselves much more intentionally as opposed to being socially constructivist and they have learned how to use it to be much more intentional understanding the stuff.</p> <p>Janet Absolutely.</p> <p>Lucia So they are quite different, it's not their way of being but it's a way of understanding.</p> <p>Janet Understanding verses being</p> <p>Lucia They get this thing I'm totally this, you know, I'm one dimensional, they don't understand actually we are such a complex person and we need all these different ways of looking at ourselves to be really helpful.</p> <p>Keita Well that's that post-structuralism is about there are just multiple selves, multiple identities, multiple layers and they are all being produced as we speak. We can't define ourselves because we are constantly in the process of reproducing ourselves.</p> <p>Janet And we are somewhere on a continuum in our views</p> <p>Lucia But we should be able to make sense of who we are in that one given context. I think that is why that is so difficult.</p> <p>Keita And that doesn't define who I am in a total who being it is just saying how I am in that moment.</p> <p>Lucia Understanding who I am and having a real valuable tool to help me do that.</p>

Chart VII:	Key Moment of Co- Constructing (4)
<p>4) Foundational Commitments:</p> <p>Making commitments to our foundations, sharing and understanding these to enable a greater weaving, threading and scaffolding through the programme.</p>	<p>Janet Shall I put down something about the scaffolding of feedback processes.</p> <p>Lucia Yeah.</p> <p>Keita Absolutely and the other one I've got here is how do we each understand and do critical reflective practice? It's about sharing our understanding of reflection.</p> <p>Janet And can I put something about competency, I know those are contentious words but...</p> <p>Keita Yeah put them all in.</p> <p>Lucia It will be helpful for us to remember what we meant.</p> <p>Lucia And I think in there is some discussion of our theoretical commitments, do you understand what I mean by that?</p> <p>Keita Yeah, I like us to have a review of all of that.</p> <p>Janet Do you mean as a programme or personally?</p> <p>Lucia No as a programme, I don't mean that we all have to be the same. I think there are some commitments of foundational theories that we all need to you know like outsider witness I need you lot to teach me how to do that because I've not experienced it,</p> <p>Keita It is coming from a different theoretical place is witnessing, witnessing experience.</p> <p>Janet Where does it fit as I like it as a practice?</p> <p>Keita Well that is more of a post-structural idea that is from Kaethe Weingarten that idea of witnessing and outsider witnessing. Well that outsider witnessing has come from the post-structural really.</p> <p>Janet I think so and I think to hear you talk about post-structural origins is really helpful. I know it is a practice and I've watched it over the years, and we do a version of it here and everywhere, but to really understand it from its underpinnings.</p> <p>Keita That outsider witnessing.</p> <p>Janet Yes.</p> <p>Keita It's come from the work of Barbara Myerhoff as a researcher and Michael White picked it up and grew it into something.</p> <p>Janet So if we understand it more, we can also share this with the students too.</p> <p>Lucia I think we need to share with ourselves otherwise there are big gaps in classes, and we are not threading through because I want to put that there threading. We are not threading; we are not weaving.</p> <p>Janet We are not weaving and scaffolding.</p> <p>Lucia And all that it requires us to make some commitments around our foundation and us all helping each other learn those foundational kinds of aspects to the programme.</p> <p>Keita And to me it needs having these conversations.</p>

Chart VIII:	Key Moment of Co- Constructing (5)
<p>5) Establishing Permission/What Signing Up To:</p> <p>Being intentional and explicit with students as to what they can expect as a necessary part of the learning. To establish permission for us to maintain tikanga and kawa to enable the enactment of our various teaching and learning processes.</p>	<p>Keita The other idea that you started Janet and we grew was what are we signing them up being explicit about this</p> <p>Lucia Intentional, explicit, I'm just using your words.</p> <p>Keita Scaffolding, modelling.</p> <p>Janet Scaffolding, modelling, clear expectations.</p> <p>Keita Collaboration.</p> <p>Janet Collaboration which all models intentionality and collaborative counselling practice.</p> <p>Keita Appreciating and reflexivity.</p> <p>Janet What did we call the troubling moments? How they are signing on for troubling moments.</p> <p>Lucia Yeah.</p> <p>Keita Being troubled and for doing some troubling with each other.</p> <p>Janet What they can expect from our roles.</p> <p>Keita Difference is what they're signing up for, different teaching practices and styles.</p> <p>Janet Yes, different teaching practices.</p> <p>Keita As well as some shared expectations as well.</p> <p>Janet And something about the permission for us to be fully in our role.</p> <p>Keita Yeah not having our wings clipped.</p> <p>Lucia Well I think permission for us to maintain tikanga.</p> <p>Janet Yes that's a nice way of putting it to be able to maintain tikanga...</p> <p>Lucia And kawa in this particular context we are talking about.</p> <p>Janet Kawa and tikanga that's really nice Lucia that is a nice way of putting it I like that.</p> <p>Keita It's something about our relationships with each other, you worded that really nicely Janet about how there's times when we might have different ideas, but we respect each other's different ideas and there are times when we will challenge each other and challenge you as students and it is in the interest of learning and that we ask that you, I don't like to say...trust us.</p> <p>Janet I'm going to put down your panel idea Keita. I'm going to put that just to remind us about finding some way of sharing with the students our pedagogies.</p>

Appendix I: Book of Readings on Pedagogy

Book of Readings on Pedagogy

Chart of Contents

Learning Theories

1. Hean, S., Craddock, D., & O'Halloran, C. (2009). Learning theories and interprofessional education: a user's guide. *Learning in Health & Social Care*, 8(4), 250-262.

Māori Pedagogies and Aotearoa Cultural Context

2. Pihama, L., Smith, K., Taki, M. & Lee, J. (2004). *A literature review on kaupapa Māori and Māori education pedagogy*. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland, The International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education.
3. Lang, S. K., & Gardiner, B. D. (2014). As they like it – culture-centred counsellor education in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand: a play on bicultural pluralism. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 42(1), 73-85.

Relational, Relational- Cultural, Relational as Transformational Pedagogies

4. Bergum, V. (2003). Relational pedagogy. Embodiment, improvisation and interdependence. *Nursing Philosophy*, 4, 121-128.
5. Hall, K., Barden, S. & Conley, A. (2014). A relational-cultural framework: emphasizing relational dynamics and multicultural skill development. *The Professional Counselor*, 4, (1), 71 -83.
6. Duffey, T. (2006). Promoting relational competencies in counselor education through creativity and relational-cultural theory. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*, 2(1), 47-59.
7. Macaskie, J., Meekums, B., & Nolan, G. (2013). Transformational education for psychotherapy and counselling: a relational dynamic approach. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 41(4), 351-362.
8. Henriksen, R. C., Jr. (2006). Multicultural counselor preparation: A transformational pedagogy. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education & Development*, 45(2), 173-185.

Experiential and Constructivist,

9. Warren, J. A., Hof, K. R., McGriff, D., & Morris, L. B. (2012). Five experiential learning activities in addictions education. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*, 7(3), 272-288.
10. Giordano, A. L., Stare, B. G., & Clarke, P. B. (2015). Overcoming obstacles to empathy: The use of experiential learning in addictions counseling courses. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*, 10(1), 100-113.

11. Wilkinson, B., & Hanna, F. (2016). New horizons in counselor pedagogy: The intersection of constructivist concepts and phenomenological awareness. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling*, 55(1), 2-19. doi: 10.1002/johc.12021

Dialogic, Critical and Post- Structural Pedagogies

12. Skidmore, D. & Murakami, K. (2016). *Dialogic pedagogy: The importance of dialogue in teaching and learning*. [N.P.]: Multilingual Matters.
13. Pittard, E. (2015). Who does critical pedagogy think you are? Investigating how teachers are produced in critical pedagogy scholarship to inform teacher education. *Pedagogies*, 10(4), 328-348.
14. Wendt, S., & Seymour, S. (2010). Applying post-structuralist ideas to empowerment: Implications for social work education. *Social Work Education*, 29(6), 670-682.
15. Manis, A. (2012). A review of the literature on promoting cultural competence and social justice agency among students and counselor trainees: Piecing the evidence together to advance pedagogy and research. *The Professional Counselor*, 2, (1), 48-57.

Counselling and a Signature Pedagogy

16. Brackette, C. M. (2014). The scholarship of teaching and learning in clinical mental health counseling. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, 139, 37-48. doi: 10.1002/tl.20103

Appendix J: A Five Stage Guideline for Individual Pedagogical Reflection

1. Storying Lived– Experiences of Practice:

- Provide an account of or story a teaching experience that you consider to be a peak teaching experience, an experience of dissonance for you, and/or an experience that feels significant for you as an educator.
- What is it about this moment that draws your attention?

2. Actions, Interactions and Interplays:

- Describe what took place and/or unfolded in this moment?
- What do you consider was at play in this experience?
- Describe the teaching and learning processes you recognise as occurring, and the relationship between these aspects?

3. Pedagogical Goals and Educational Aspirations:

- What was your hope and/or goals in this moment?
- In what ways and to what extent were they realised?
- How does the hope and/or goals in this instance connect with your broader aspirations for the students as future practitioners?

4. Embedded Values:

- What did you most value in this moment?
- How does this connect with your ontological and or epistemological core values?
- What were your hopes for the relationships between those involved in this learning situation?
- How does this connect with the way(s) of relating that you consider is most significant for the students learning? (between you and students, and students with one another)
- What is it about this that you value?

5. Explanatory Principles:

- What ideas are you bringing to bear on these moments?
- What formal educational and/or pedagogical theories are influencing you and support you in explaining your practice?