

Editorial

The present (2nd) issue of *Action Researcher in Education* includes papers chosen by an anonymous review process. It brings out the complex and multi-faceted character of action research and the variety of sectors it can be implemented in. It also marks an increased interest in this approach in our country, in different contexts and venues.

The first paper of the 2nd issue addresses a theoretical issue, seeking the links between action research and other qualitative approaches. In his paper “Aspects of anthropology in education and possible correlations with action research”, Leonidas Sotiropoulos studies the relationship between Anthropology and Action Research, in the light of educational theory and practice. The author views the two approaches as complementary, and presents anthropological research attempting to link and correlate it with educational action research. Focusing on education, he reveals the importance of combining the two approaches for educators seeking to investigate, understand and therefore improve the educational process.

The next two papers refer to the implementation of educational action research by educators and students with explicit reference to the theory latent in each educational action, in an interactive framework.

In her paper “Actively involving young children in participatory research: The case of the Mosaic approach”, Eustratia Sofou discusses the particularly interesting issue of children participating in research processes. She presents a theoretical framework that grounds the participation of children in two different ways. On the one hand, it offers the potential of enriching the research and expanding the meaning and the understanding of the world for the children. On the other hand, this participation reinforces the children’s confidence to express their opinions and develops their skills (communication, social, research). In this context, the role of the adult researchers and the children is modified and redefined through the research process. The author then uses specific implementation examples to present the “Mosaic approach”, while at the same time seeking common features between multi-method participatory research and action research. The paper is completed with a brief presentation of implementing the “Mosaic approach” in Greek kindergartens during school year 2010-2011. She stresses the objectives of the intervention, the indicative collected data, and the first findings of this project.

In her paper “Theory and practice of producing written texts for the Greek Language course: The case of action research”, Aikaterini Skia presents and an educational action research project on teaching written discourse with a communicative approach in the Greek Language course in secondary education. The author focuses mainly on the contribution of research to the students’ understanding of the complex nature of written communication in school reality, as expressed in the process and the products of writing, and on the need for more insightful ways of assessment. She also stresses the importance of educational action research for educating and training educators in scientific issues regarding writing in terms of the curriculum.

The next three papers refer to implementing educational action research in tertiary education, either in the context of school-university cooperation aiming at linking theory to practice, or in light of improving the educational process at the university.

In her paper “Utilising journals in educational action research: Conditions and processes”, Sofia Augitidou presents a cooperative action research and brings out various ways of using and utilising journals in cooperative action research. She stresses the significance of having educators

researchers using journals, its contribution to the process of challenging, redesigning and evaluating educational practices and its importance for understanding dialogue and instigating reflection in educational action research. The results of the cooperative action research demonstrated that journals can offer an important framework for knowing the self and understanding the other, critically challenging existing educational practices, systematically designing and evaluating educational work, and engaging in cooperation and practical knowledge development.

In his paper “Establishing a ‘safe’ framework for the development of self and peer assessment”, Rob Creasy presents the action research he conducted in order to enrich his practice in higher education in terms of self and peer assessment. The main objective of Creasy’s research was to create an assessment process / strategy which includes students (instead of taking place in their absence) and eliminates their stress and insecurities. For this purpose, he designed a process involving students in self-assessing their projects and assessing the projects of their peers in a “safe” way, that is, he offered explicit instructions on what they were supposed to do, helping them focus on editing issues and develop mutual support among the students. After using relevant literature to substantiate the need to adopt self and peer assessment, Creasy presents the empirical study he conducted to investigate how the assessment strategy he designed worked in practice. The paper concludes with a reference to the findings of this study, demonstrating that although students were hesitant towards the assessment strategy under study, they consider it useful and fruitful.

In the last paper of the issue “Dancing with the ‘other’: An action research project in an children’s social care institution”, Kostas Magos and Maria Tsouvala present an educational action research project they conducted to investigate the extent to which students / future preschool teachers can develop critical reflection to transform previous attitudes and beliefs towards a different ‘other’, through the experiential teaching of free creative dancing. This research programme aimed at encouraging the spontaneous creative expression of a group of children living at a social care home, away from their families. After a detailed description of the three action research cycles they conducted from October 2010 to May 2011, the authors focus on the resulting findings. They emphasise the transformation of the students’ perceptions of the ‘different’ children who participated in the programme. It seems that the students’ initial pity gradually developed into recognising the children’s abilities. The article concludes with a documented reference to the personal and professional empowerment of the students who participated in the action research programme.

The issue closes with four book reports. Three reports refer to Greek books, addressing important factors that influence and illuminate the educational process. The fourth report is on a recent book in English, which uses specific examples to present current trends of educational action research by utilising various contemporary tools in a reflective perspective.