

Standards of Judgement

For me trust and integrity are central to our lives as human beings and become manifest through the choices, and changes to our practice that we make on a daily and sometimes hourly or even minute-by-minute basis. In my view, there is a core morality within each of us, which can be influenced positively or negatively by changing circumstances; our morality is exercised through our values. These values, in turn, guide our thoughts and actions.

It follows that my values have influenced the content and structure of this thesis, and are clarified in the course of their emergence through the narratives. The authenticity of this research account is judged through my ontology, that is, the way I am in the world (Bullough and Pinnegar, 2001, 2004): my thoughts reflect how I interpret the world and my values, which guide my responses, prompt me to act.

If this PhD is to be distinguished or differentiated as a research process then, as examiners, you will need to consider whether the methodology is underpinned by the values I, as a researcher, bring to my practice (Hartog, 2004). Applying Habermas' standards of 'truth claims' (Habermas, 1976), the following questions need to be considered:

Is the account comprehensible?

Does it ring true? Is there congruence with what I espouse in my living theory and how I act?

Has the account been crafted in a way that promotes understanding? Is it appropriate?

In addition the following prompts might be of some help in appraising my interpretations and responses, and whether the criteria for a Doctoral thesis have been met in the research account that follows:

Is the subject matter important in relation to contemporary research in my field of inquiry?

Do I sufficiently question my interpretations and actions?

Are my values articulated?

Do I act responsibly [response-ably]?

Is the research account convincing and trustworthy?

Over time do I show the stories and images presented on the pages of this thesis affecting my life and type of person I wish to become?

Does my inquiry account sufficiently demonstrate improved practice?

Do I pay attention to explicating editorial decisions in deciding who and what is given voice?

Do I contribute to the learning of others?

Do I link my ideas to others in a way that shows both their influence in my own theorising and my critical evaluation of their limitations?

Do I show originality of mind and critical judgment?

Have my validation processes enabled me to reveal gaps and contradictions in my initial awareness?
