



AECED

aesthetic and embodied
learning for democracy

**REPORTS OF CASE
RESEARCH
COMPLETION**

Deliverable 4.3

DECEMBER 2024



Funded by
the European Union



UK Research
and Innovation

This project has received funding from the European's Union HORIZON Research and Innovation Actions under Grant Agreement no. 101094052 and the UK Research and Innovation

Project Title	Transforming Education for Democracy through Aesthetic and Embodied Learning, Responsive Pedagogies and Democracy-as-becoming
Project Acronym	AECED
Grant agreement	101094052
Project start date	1 April 2023
Project end date	31 March 2026
Call	HORIZON-CL2-2022-DEMOCRACY-01
Participants	University of Zagreb (UNIZG) University of Lapland (ULA) Philipps University Marburg (UMR) Riga Technical University (RTU) Universidade Aberta (UAb) University of Hertfordshire (UH) – Associated partner
Coordinator	University of Lapland
PI	Professor Susan Meriläinen
Deliverable	4.3 Reports of case research completion Report, by each partner, of completion of their case(s) research, including participant recruitment, conduct and data collection, and creation of data sets
Work Package	4
Lead Beneficiary	Philipps-University Marburg
Work package leader	Kardelen Dilara Cazgir Prof. Dr. Susanne Maria Weber
Version	4
Due Date	31.12.2024
Submission Date	20.12.2024
Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Authors	Monika Pažur (UNIZG) Pauliina Jääskeläinen, Joonas Vola (ULA) Kardelen Dilara Cazgir, Susanne Maria Weber, Lea Spahn (UMR) Karine Oganisjana, Rolands Ozols, Konstantins Kozlovskis, Natalja Lace (RTU) Cláudia Neves, Juliana Oliveira, Marta Abelha, Ana Patrícia Almeida and Pedro Abrantes (UAB) Philip Woods, Karen Mpamhanga, Suzanne Culshaw Philippa Mulberry, Helen Payne, Marie Toseland, Claire Dickerson, Jo Barber (UH)
Partner Contributors	All consortium Partners
Document Manager	Kardelen Dilara Cazgir
Internal review	Pilvikki Lantela, Marie Toseland and Simo Kyllönen

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Version	Date	Main modifications	Modified by
1.0	29.11.2024	Reports from partners are compiled as the First draft of Deliverable 4.3 with introduction	Kardelen Dilara Cazgir
2.0	29.12.2024- 05.12.2024	All partners edited their reports according to the feedback from WP4 leaders, gender dimension section was added to the national reports.	Monika Pažur (UNIZG); Pauliina Jääskeläinen, Joonas Vola (ULA); Kardelen Dilara Cazgir, Susanne Maria Weber, Lea Spahn (UMR); Karine Oganisjana (RTU); Cláudia Neves, Juliana Oliveira (UAB); Jo Barber, Suzanne Culshaw, Claire Dickerson, Karen Mpamhanga, Philippa Mulberry, Helen Payne, Marie Toseland, Philip Woods (UH)
2.0	05.12.2024- 09.12.2024	Internal review	Pilvikki Lantela Marie Toseland
2.0	09.12.2024	Comments from the Ethics Advisor	Simo Kyllönen
3.0	10.12.2024- 16.12.2024	Each partner edited their national reports according to the internal review and ethics comments.	Monika Pažur (UNIZG); Pauliina Jääskeläinen, Joonas Vola (ULA); Kardelen Dilara Cazgir, Susanne Maria Weber, Lea Spahn (UMR); Karine Oganisjana (RTU); Cláudia Neves, Juliana Oliveira (UAB); Jo Barber, Suzanne Culshaw, Claire Dickerson, Karen Mpamhanga, Philippa Mulberry, Helen Payne, Marie Toseland, Philip Woods (UH)
4.0	11.12.2024- 17.12.2024	Finalizing the Deliverable 4.3 in accordance with the internal review and the ethical advisor's comments, with revisions made to the gender dimension in the AECED Project and the ethical aspects of the research.	Kardelen Dilara Cazgir, Susanne Maria Weber

ABREVIATIONS

ABE	Arts-Based and Embodied (methods)
ABER	Arts-based and embodied research
AECED	Project Acronym for Transforming Education for Democracy through aesthetic and Embodied Learning, Responsive Pedagogies and Democracy-as-becoming
AELD	Arts-based and Embodied Learning
EU	European Union
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
PAR	Participatory Action Research
PLC	Pattern Language of Commoning
PLCs	Pattern Language of Commoning Cards
RTU	Riga Technical University
UAB	Universidade Aberta
UH	The University of Hertfordshire
ULA	University of Lapland
UMR	Philipps-Universität Marburg
UNIZG	University of Zagreb

DISCLAIMER

Funded by the European Union and UK Research and Innovation. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

REPORT CASE(S) DESIGN

Report, by each partner, of their case(s) design (including ethics permission) and how it contributes to the total project

CONTENT

1. Introduction	6
1.1 WP4 meetings	6
1.2 Cooperation with other work package leaders	6
1.3 Cross-case analysis group	7
2. Case trialling - PAR phase	8
3. Ethical aspects in the aeced project	11
4. Gender dimension in research	12
5. Next steps in workpackage 4: advancing case analysis and cross-case analysis	14
6. Appendix	15
6.1 Croatia case report	15
6.2 Finland case report	20
6.3 Germany case report	26
6.4 Latvia case report	31
6.5 Portugal case report	37
6.6 UK case report	41
References	47

1. Introduction

During the previous deliverable period (WP4 D4.2), national partners designed their case research, obtained ethical approval, and documented their case designs. Following this, each national partner initiated its own case trial process. This report provides a summary of the completion of case research within the AECED Project.

This introduction outlines how the WP4 leader facilitated and coordinated the process through WP4 meetings, collaborated with other work packages, and established the Cross-Case Analysis groups.

A brief overview of case completion is provided next, with detailed explanations presented in the Appendix by each partner.

Finally, the report includes an ethical evaluation of the AECED project, considers the gender dimension in the research process, and outlines the steps for the next reporting period.

1.1 WP4 Meetings

As the leader of WP4, UMR has taken the initiative to coordinate WP4 meetings. These meetings facilitate the case trialling process, and provide opportunity to monitor the progress of national partners, discuss initial findings, and address challenges within the Consortium. Additionally, during June and July 2024, three AECED Consortium Meetings were organised by the WP1 Leader, during which all national partners presented updates on their case trialling process and engaged in collaborative reflection for the ongoing case trialling process.

During the trialling process, the WP4 leader prepared drafts of the national case reports, which were presented for feedback from national partners during one of the WP4 meetings. After that meeting, the leader worked on refining the templates, and incorporated written feedback, received via email from the national partners, into the final version. Overall, the WP4 leaders facilitated engaging discussions and critical consideration of the case reports during the meetings, encouraging input from each national partner. The WP4 meetings will continue until the end of May 2025, aiming to create a collaborative platform for data analysis and cross-case evaluation within the Consortium.

1.2 Cooperation with other Work Package Leaders

The WP4 leaders have also been working closely with the WP2 leader (UH) and the WP5 leader (UAB) to ensure alignment and synergy across the work packages. In this context, discussions on the cross-case analysis publication during WP4 meeting sessions have provided an open space for national partners to discuss not only their reporting, but also potential publication opportunities. Regarding scientific publications and the upcoming WP4 4.5 cross-case analysis report, some WP4 meetings have included sessions where the WP4 leader facilitated discussions on theoretical aspects and approaches for the case research analysis. Specific discussions on cross-case publications are planned for WP4 meetings in the upcoming period.

The WP4 leader also organised an online workshop aimed at developing symposium submissions for the European Conference on Educational Research 2024 at the University of Cyprus, Nicosia. The aim was to ensure that communication activities supported the case research process and fostered increased cooperation between the partner countries. Overall, UMR Team organised two main

symposia: one on case research presentations and another on methodology. AECED members were invited to participate and present at these symposia. In total, 7 papers were presented.

Additionally, during the trialling process there were opportunities to collaborate with WP5 leadership in WP4 meetings, particularly on data collection for creating launch-ready versions of the Framework and Guides, as well as on updating the initial findings to revise the pedagogical Framework and Guides. This collaboration facilitated an ongoing exchange of insights, ensuring consistency and progress across work packages.

1.3 Cross-Case Analysis Group

As outlined in the project proposal, a Cross-Case Analysis Group has been established to work on the cross-case analysis report (D.4.5). The formation of this group was announced through the Project Management Group (PMG), and the dates and agendas for future meetings have been set by UMR. As of the end of November 2024, this working group has commenced and will continue until the end of May 2025.

2. Case Trialling - PAR Phase

Each partner successfully completed the PAR phases by the end of December 2024. The Appendix provides a detailed report on the data collection processes conducted by each partner. An overview is presented in Table1, highlighting changes in the educational setting and learning opportunities through virtual, in-person, and hybrid modalities.

Case No.	Country	Educational setting	In-Person/ Virtual/ Hybrid	Time period
Case 1	Croatia	Early childhood and primary education	In-person	January–July 2024
Case 2	Croatia	Early childhood and primary education	In-person	February–July 2024
Case 3	Croatia	Higher education	In-person	February–July 2024
Case 4	Croatia	Higher education	In-person	February–July 2024
Case 5	Finland	Higher education	Hybrid	November–December 2024
Case 6	Finland	Adult, prof. and org. learning	In-person	Winter Semester 2023–December 2024
Case 7	Germany	Higher education	In-person	Winter Semester 2023–December 2024

Case 8	Germany	Adult, prof. and org. learning	Hybrid	Winter Semester 2023–2024
Case 9	Germany	Adult, prof. and org. learning	Hybrid	March– December 2024
Case 10	Germany	Adult, prof. and org. learning and higher education	Hybrid	April 2024–July 2024
Case 11	Latvia	Secondary education	Hybrid	January 2024– December 2024
Case 12	Latvia	Adult/ professional learning phase	Hybrid	January 2024– December 2024
Case 13	Latvia	Inter-generational	Hybrid	January 2024– December 2024
Case 14	Portugal	Early years and primary Education	Hybrid	April-June 2024
Case 15	Portugal	Early years and primary Education	Hybrid	April-June 2024
Case 16	Portugal	Adult, prof. and org. learning	Hybrid	April-June 2024
Case 17	Portugal	Adult, prof. and org. learning	Hybrid	April-June 2024

Case 18	UK	Adult, prof. and org. learning	Hybrid	May–December 2024
Case 19	UK	Secondary education	Hybrid	October–December 2024

Table1: Overview of the AECED Case Research

3. Ethical Aspects in the AECED Project

In the Ethics Summary Report, the involvement of vulnerable groups, such as minors or students, and processing personal data in a sensitive education context, were identified as the project's ethical challenges. Thus, an ethics advisor, Dr. Simo Kyllönen, was appointed to the project. The ethics advisor worked with the AECED Ethics Group, as well as representatives from each partner country, to explore best practices for field work, data collection, and data protection.

Each partner obtained ethics approval from their respective university institutions for the involvement of human participants prior to commencing case research. The WP4 Leader collected the ethical approval documents and included them in WP4 D4.2. The dates of receipt are as follows:

- UMR: 2 August 2023
- ULA: 24 October 2023
- UNIZG: 16 January 2024
- RTU: 29 January 2024
- UAB: 5 February 2024
- UH: 20 March 2024

Since the submission of Deliverable 4.2 under WP4, all national partners have contributed to the Ethics Check Report through separate submissions. In these reports, each partner provided clear descriptions of how they ensure the protection of data subjects, particularly vulnerable groups such as students, safeguarding their fundamental rights and freedoms. Given the complexity of the AECED project (with 6 partners and their 19-case research which spans different educational settings), each partner has carefully specified the steps they have taken and outlined their plans to address ethical considerations. Through the Ethics Check report, every partner reflected on participant recruitment, including the criteria and methods for selecting participants, with particular attention to the inclusion of minors. They addressed participant protection by considering potential power imbalances and safeguarding personal information. Additionally, they examined researcher positionality, focusing on how power dynamics influence the research process and shape its outcomes, including plans for benefit-sharing with participants.

We have had two AECED Ethics Group meetings since submitting WP4 D4.2. During these meetings, the AECED Project Ethics Advisor, Dr. Simo Kyllönen, provided a briefing on the templates and the PAR process-related documents. Protecting vulnerable research subjects has been the main concern for the AECED Consortium since the start of the project, and this issue was also highlighted in the Ethics Check report. The Ethics Advisor supported each partner in understanding how participants needed to be protected during the PAR process, the involvement of minors, and the potential power imbalance between researchers and participants.

As the AECED Project adapts the PAR approach, the risk of power imbalance is minimal. As McDonald (2021)¹ stated, PAR is characterized by collaboration and shared decision-making, which addresses power imbalances and empowers participants from very start of the design process to dissemination. Effective collaboration involves identifying and resolving power struggles, aligning with professional norms and desired outcomes, and strengthening relationships. Reflexivity and thoughtful compromise are crucial for addressing challenges and ensuring the integrity of the research process.

In general, the 19 case studies were based on healthy power dynamics, with minimal power imbalance. The research environment was characterised by democracy, fairness, respect, equality among

participants, and full transparency. Across all of the cases, participation was entirely voluntary with participants having the right to withdraw at any time if they felt uncomfortable or no longer wished to be involved. To ensure transparency and voluntary nature of participation, participants' informed consent was obtained. As the Latvian team recruited participants younger than 18 years old, they also asked for written consent from the child's parent or guardian. All personal data gathered by partners are handled with due care and according to the GDPR (or the British equivalent). This includes also the personal information collected through audio recordings, photos and videos by some national teams.

In terms of data management, all teams save their data in their university-supported online cloud folders:

- Croatia entered the questionnaires into SPSS25 (Computer program for data analysis). Documents for each case include one hard copy with codenames and the real names of participants, and that copy is kept in a separate folder accessible to the project leader. All data is available only on one external disk of the project.
- Finland has some physical documents which are saved in a locked filing cabinet in the locked office rooms. All digitised data is kept in a protected internal data folder in the Ulapland online cloud.
- Germany has some physical documents, which are stored in a locked filing cabinet in locked office rooms. All digitised data is stored in a protected internal data folder in the UMR.
- Latvia has no physical documents. All data is digitally stored on the RTU OneDrive. For additional security, files are encrypted with a password known only to team members.
- Portugal has no physical documents. All data is digitally stored on the Universidade Aberta's OneDrive.
- The UK has no physical documents. All data is digitally stored on the UH OneDrive.

WP4-related documents, such as previous deliverables, meeting calendars, minutes, and other materials, have been securely shared through the consortium-wide Teams channel, Lucit.

4. Gender Dimension in Research

In the AECED project, gender is not viewed as a separate variable but as an integral part of identity, intertwined with historically rooted socio-cultural stereotypes, expectations, and practices. The AECED Project embraces a non-binary understanding of gender, recognising it as a spectrum rather than a binary construct. When the gender dimension intersects with other identities—such as disability, age, educational background, ethnicity, and religion—it shapes each person's experience. In the AECED project, all project teams acknowledge this dimension throughout the research process. At this point, researchers' positionality becomes important for understanding potential power dynamics and the balance of power. In the AECED project, the majority are female researchers. Furthermore, a mixed team of academic researchers at various levels—including research interns, master's student assistants, PhD candidates, postdoctoral researchers, and professors—can contribute to mitigating potential power imbalances in the research process. The presence of a mixed group in the national teams can be an effective strategy for ensuring participation in the research process—from design to data analysis—and for breaking tensions and rigid hierarchies between academia and non-academia, such as those between students and professors, teachers and professors, or professionals and professors in the research process.

In this project, where aesthetic and embodied learning methods are employed, gender and its intersections become even more significant. Arts-based aesthetic and embodied pedagogical practices have a great potential to provide inclusive teaching and learning pathways. With an implementing critical framework, AELD can provide more equity-based pedagogies that can support of “the success of all students regardless of gender, race, sexuality, religion, linguistic diversity, ability level, socioeconomic status, and other identity categories”ⁱⁱ.

In arts-based and aesthetic learning literature, gender differences are often discussed in relation to various art-based learning settings, with particular emphasis on embodied practices such as dance. While dance, as Desmond (2006: 37)ⁱⁱⁱ describes it, functions as a “discourse of the body” and engages with the “politics of aesthetics,” it is important to contextualize these reflections within the broader focus of embodied and aesthetic learning processes. Desmond critiques interpretations that essentialize identities based on ‘biological difference,’ instead framing identities through an intersectional lens that considers race, gender, trans-gender identities, and other structural categories. Moreover, emerging literature^{iv v vi} reflects on how gendered norms shape experiences of embodiment, body movement, and aesthetic standards, often perpetuating hierarchical and normative views.

The AECED project builds on such critical reflections, not by focusing specifically on dance but by addressing the broader dynamics of aesthetic and embodied representation and the risks of essentialist or hierarchical perspectives. Especially in aesthetic and embodied transformation, bodies might become not only visible, but hypervisible depending on the ‘gaze’ applied in such situations. Are students mutually observing each other while experimenting with embodied work? Will bodies be evaluated in the taxonomies of beauty, health, fitness and shape? Such questions go beyond traditional critiques of representation and visibility – they reflect on power-dynamics taking place while setting up AELD practices. Especially in institutionalized settings, bodies become vulnerable, as students are asked to step out their institutionalized bodies. How to relate to each other within frames of body-normativity and a strong social desirability? These and similar questions reflect the power dynamics becoming relevant in AELD settings, AELD Interventions are to be reflected as conditioned in specific socio-cultural and economical settings of (non)acceptabilities. Gender dimensions are relevant in many aspects, including agency, sense of self, and the gendered body.”

The project seeks to engage with such questions by considering the socio-cultural and economic contexts that condition (non-)acceptability in embodied and aesthetic learning. Institutionalized settings, in particular, can amplify these dynamics, as students are often encouraged to step outside their habitual or socially constructed bodily identities. AELD practices must therefore critically reflect on how bodies relate to one another within frameworks of body normativity, social desirability, and institutional expectations.

As feminist scholarship discusses the complex ways in which the body is politicized by patriarchy, capitalism, and colonialism, bodies and embodiments may be discussed as intimate vehicles of protest against power, challenging cultural, economic, and social practices^{vii}. From this perspective, the AECED project recognizes that bodies exist within power struggles. The body is understood within discourses, which permeate the inside of the body, too. Bodies as a living entity that learns and challenges, are explored from performativity perspectives. The AECED project is interested in individual and collective learning as well as organizational learning and epistemic transformation. It is interested in the question, how the body can serve as a learning, practicing, and living “entity” for democracy-as-becoming through aesthetic methods.

As mentioned above, gendered norms and gender discourses will be taken into account in partner’s research and analytical perspectives during the data analysis phase. They will be analysed and reflected

regarding the mobility of the gendered body. In educational settings where case trials take place, especially in bureaucratic institutions such as schools and universities, project partners may ask, how much space is available for non-binary experiences. These considerations are reflected in the research methodology, based on contributions shared by each partner within the consortium during the case tracking process and WP4 meetings.

Meanwhile, the research group of the AECED project is predominantly female and primarily composed of individuals with European identities. Most educational settings represented in this project, such as educational science departments, are female dominated. For instance, women account for 79% of all education degree students on average in the EU^{viii}. The project partners reflect in their cases on gendered acceptance of aesthetic and embodied approaches.

5. Next Steps in Workpackage 4: Advancing Case Analysis and Cross-Case Analysis

The case trialling process has been successfully completed by each partner. Moving forward, the WP4 Leader will oversee the case analysis phase for the AECED Consortium and guide the reporting of WP4 D4.4. Meanwhile, the Cross-Case Analysis Group will advance the development of the WP4 D4.5 Cross-Case Analysis report. Partners will continue their case analysis and initiate cross-case analysis based on preliminary findings.

Based on the case trialling process experience, plans are underway to schedule a WP4 meeting focused on developing a vision for refining the Framework and Guides. Following an intended exchange and co-creation session with WP4 and WP5 Leaders, an agenda will be developed to guide the visioning process, with an invitation extended to all AECED Consortium members. This effort during the WP4 research phase, prior to the start of the WP5 process, will offer valuable insights for the subsequent work package.

In the AECED Project, memoing is used by researchers to take descriptive, reflexive, conceptual, or theoretical notes before, during, and after each of the PAR phases. In the AECED Project, research memoing highlights the unique aspects of each case, contrasting the iterations within each case, conduct cross-case comparisons within national research and between the research partners and the cross-case analysis prepared. Currently, most national teams are focused on data collection and case completion. In the next phase, they will fully engage with the Metadata Matrix, provided for cross-case comparison. All the national teams will transfer their memos to the Metadata-Matrix. They will develop them further during the data analysis phase and finish submitting to the Metadata-Matrix until mid of February.

In coordination with WP2, the progress of publications at each educational setting will be monitored to support publications. Members of the AECED Consortium will participate in the 2025 European Educational Research Conference in Belgrade, contributing to research workshops and symposia, presenting cross-case analysis findings, engaging with the broader scientific community.

6. Appendix

6.1 CROATIA Case Report

Case Number and Educational Setting:

Case 1: Teachers group, Early Childhood and Primary Education phase

Case 2: One-school group, Early Childhood and Primary Education phase

Case 3: Teaching staff, Higher Education phase

Case 4: Students, Higher Education phase

1.	Timeline and steps
	<p>Please provide an overview of the phases of your research process until completion. Give an account of the PAR activities taken throughout the process. Please refer to changes and adaptations made during the research process.</p>
	<p>Case 1 Early childhood and primary education, 11 preschool and primary school teachers from different educational institutions; from January 2024 to July 2024.</p> <p>Case 2 Early childhood and primary education, 14 primary school teachers and experts (pedagogue, psychologist, educational rehabilitator) from the same school; February 2024 to July 2024.</p> <p>Case 3 Higher education case, 14 postdoctoral students and teaching staff; February 2024 to July 2024</p> <p>Case 4 Higher education case, 14 students from the Faculty for Teacher Education, February 2024 to July 2024.</p> <p>In all four cases there has been 6-months of participatory action research conducted where 6 phases of PAR have been implemented. Phases were not implemented in a linear order, but some phases were completed more than once to follow PAR cycles.</p> <p>Phase 1 - Introduction (January 2024)</p> <p>This phase was same in all four cases. The aim of this phase was to introduce the theme of Education for Democracy - as transformation through aesthetic and embodied learning. The presentation about the project was prepared. First participants were introduced to the project's goals, partners and team members. Then, through activity, participants were introduced to the projects' 3 main concepts and their interconnection. After the introduction, participants filled out the "informed consent" sheets.</p> <p>Phase 2 – Familiarisation (more iterations during February, March and April 2024)</p> <p>This phase occurred more frequently within the cases. Each time, researchers conducted educational activities based on the Guides and Framework with participants, so they were able to better understand how to use them in their practice. In Case 1 and Case 2 there were two iterations of this phase, lasting 1-2 days (in February 2024; and May 2024). Within Case 3 and Case 4 there were 3 meetings, where educational activities were conducted lasting half a day (during March and April 2024).</p> <p>Phase 3 – Collaborative reflection (during all six months in all four cases)</p> <p>Reflection was happening on two levels: (1) reflection during the process; and (2) reflection after the process. All learning activities where participants participated included reflection time. Participants shared their work and were invited to reflect on what is happening and why it is important regarding the project's research questions. Often, these evaluations were connected to the position of the person in the room, or with showing their feeling with a body motion or just one word. Each meeting finished in circle where everybody was invited to share their thoughts. During these cases, there were reflection groups where participants discussed the activities they had implemented in their practice. They shared what they did but also commented on the Guides and how the children of different ages had reacted to the implemented activities.</p> <p>Phase 4 – Planning (April 2024)</p> <p>During the planning phase meetings were conducted where we presented steps on how participants could plan their learning activities. Participants were given time to plan their activities, which were then shared in a meeting in which they</p>

could exchange ideas and receive feedback and guidance from researchers. Participants were given an online platform where they could share their plans, as well as a Google form that helped them to evaluate and reflect on their activity after implementation.

Phase 5 – Action (during April and May 2024)

The Action phase took place on two levels: (1) When researchers implemented activities based on the Framework and Guides and practitioners were participants. Researchers were observing participants' nonverbal actions and their verbal reflections and recorded these in their notes.; (2) Actions implemented by participants in their practice. Participants planned their learning activities and implemented them in their everyday practice. After this, reflection groups took place for participants to reflect on what had happened.

Phase 6 – Final reflection (June and July 2024)

After completing the first 5 stages of PAR, participants were invited to comment on the Framework and Guides to assess their usefulness and how applicable they were for their everyday practice.

2. Participant recruitment

Please describe your way of participant recruitment and in which way participants were involved during the research process.

Case 1 Early childhood and primary education. In December 2023 there was an open call with a detailed explanation of the project and expectations of participants in that process. The open call was published at the university website and also was sent to selected groups of preschool teachers and teachers. 11 people applied and they were all accepted. The case was done with 11 preschool and primary school teachers coming from different educational institutions.

Case 2 Early childhood and primary education. In January 202 there was an open call with a detailed explanation of the project and expectations of participants in that process. The open call was published on our website and also sent to selected principals of primary schools. One school applied with 15 people interested to be part of the project. In the end 14 primary school teachers and experts coming from the same school were involved.

Case 3 Higher education case. In January 2024 there was an open call with a detailed explanation of the project and expectations of participants in that process. The open call was published on the University of Zagreb's website and also sent to e-mail lists of postdoctoral students and teaching staff from the Faculty for Teacher Education, University of Zagreb. 14 postdoctoral students and teaching staff applied, and they were all accepted.

Case 4 Higher education case. In January 2024 there was an open call with a detailed explanation of the project and expectations of participants. The open call was published on the university website and also sent to the e-mail lists of students of different academic years from the Faculty for Teacher Education, University of Zagreb. 14 students applied, and they were all accepted.

After participants expressed their interest, they were further contacted by the project leader, who was available to answer their potential questions. On the first encounter, all participants were introduced to the project (goals, concepts, what is expected from them, timetable of the project...) and were given an informed consent form. They all had time to read through the information, ask questions and choose from the different methods that were going to be used in the participatory action research, as well as which methods of data collection they consented to.

There was a continuous interaction and involvement of participants during the project throughout all phases in different interactive forms, both in person and online, to ensure that their voices and opinions were included in re-planning the different cycles of the PAR process. It was important that the reflections of participants were honest and that they felt safe to share their opinions, so therefore continuous contact throughout the whole process was important.

3. Ethical issues in data collection

What were the key ethical steps taken? Please describe your ethical considerations related to communication, information, voluntary participation, transparency, power dynamics, etc., within your process.

At the beginning of the project all participants picked from an envelope one code that would be their codename for the whole project (example of code: butterfly, round, triangle, etc.). Each participant wrote their name on the paper and painted a code next to it. There was one hard copy of this codebook, which was stored in a specific folder by the project leader. After data were entered, the codebooks were eliminated. After this, participants were referred to by their codenames. For example, during any activity where data about participants' reactions or thoughts were collected, researchers used the

given codenames of participants. Before each activity participants were asked if they consented to being recorded or photographed. Photos were taken for two purposes: as research data where frozen pictures were methods of data collection; for following the process and personal reactions of participants to some learning activities. The first session focused on identity, and all participants shared their gender and preferred pronoun. During the activities, differences were taken into consideration, and participants had an opportunity to opt out of activities, however nobody did so.

During the cases, all learning activities began with a slow introduction where the activity was explained, followed by the activity and then reflection at the end. During all phases, each participant had an opportunity to opt out of or withdraw from an activity if they felt they did not want to participate. The researcher created a safe environment in which people learnt through experimentation, exploration, giving and taking. There was no one person, a leader, who is an “expert”, giving knowledge to others. Everyone, including the researcher, grew through the sharing of experience. In many activities, the researcher handed over the responsibility for their learning to the participants and allowed them to analyse the situation or problem in hand, to think for themselves and to come to their own conclusions. In this way, a learning process was shared between the researcher and participants, so they had an opportunity to change and adjust it to their needs.

4. Gender-Dimension

Explain in which ways gender became relevant in your PAR process.

There are three processes of integrating gender-dimensions in the project:

- (1) Before the PAR, all invites for the project were gender-sensitive and inclusive for all genders to apply.
- (2) At the level of PAR, since all participants (except two) categorised themselves as female, everything was discussed in female gender when talking about a group as a whole. We ensured that all the materials were gender-sensitive, that gender stereotypes in examples and case studies were avoided, and an inclusive language was used.
- (3) In the familiarisation process, identity was discussed with participants. As part of this learning activity, researchers discussed with participants different gender identities.

5. Data collection process

Explain how the data was collected. Specifically, who collected the data, what methods were employed, through what means, and in what environment?

An identical process of data collection was used in all four cases. The Croatian national team developed a research design with additional needed protocols and instruments for data collection, and all researchers within different cases used and implemented this design.

All data was gathered during in person encounters with participants. One interview for final measuring from Case 3 was done via Zoom platform because the participants were unwell.

In all 4 cases, all data collected together by Monika Pažur, Katarina Aladrović Slovaček, Vlatka Domović, Maša Rimac Jurinović, Maja Drvodelić.

Collection of data was done by several methods and on two levels:

Level 1: Transformation of participants

Data collected on transformation of research participants focused on their thoughts and on the principles of “democracy as becoming” was done by researchers through initial and final measuring using following research methods:

- Group reflection using drama methods – group improvisation on the main thematic elements important for “democracy-as-becoming” and the AECED project – photos of frozen pictures created by the group in the initial measuring and again in the final measuring (after the whole PAR process). Photos were taken for researchers to see which bodied reactions participants have on some concept (like democracy; participation; dialogue).
- Individual reflection using narrative method Concepts in advance – An instrument with then basic concepts (10) that participant defined in their own words; in the initial measuring and again in final measuring (after the whole PAR process).
- Fulfilling an instrument for measuring elements of a culture with a focus on the level of democratisation of an educational institution/class where someone is working. The instrument contained 20 statements about

	<p>educational institutions and each participant stated on the Likert scale from 1-5 the level of agreement with each statement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interviews – 8 group interviews, 2 within each case, one at the beginning of the PAR, and other at the end. <p><i>Level 2: Process Reflection/Experience:</i></p> <p>Different techniques and methods were used to facilitate reflection and re-planning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drama methods: individual reflection (e.g. stepping out of roles and talking about what happened in an imaginary world) and group reflection (joint improvisation, searching for solutions, etc.) Narrative methods: storytelling (e.g. letter to a character or letter to the author; guided fantasy), techniques to gather what participants have learned (e.g. INSERT - I know, it's new to me, I'm conflicted about it, it confuses me; double diary - I also learned commentary; table I know, I want to know, I learnt), techniques that gather opinions and values of participants (hot chair, associative cards and connection with content, frozen image) Research methods: individual interviews, participant observations (done by researchers and gathered in their research diaries), reflective groups, photos.
<p>6.</p>	<p>Creation of the data sets</p> <p>Briefly describe what kinds of data you collected for the national analysis? List all data obtained during the research process.</p>
	<p>In all four cases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview recordings (8 group interviews and 3 individual interviews) – all were transcribed by a researcher Quantitative data regarding democratic school culture (approx. 100 questionnaires) Qualitative data regarding main project concepts (approx. 100 questionnaires) Field notes (researchers notes from educational activities and reflexive groups – altogether 37 notes) Photos from the process of PAR (100 photos) – will be explained by each researcher with focus on explaining participants reactions on some learning activities, and with no codes or personal data in the explanation; later these photos will be deleted.
<p>7.</p>	<p>Data management and storage</p> <p>Where is the data stored, how was it transferred, and through whom? Please elaborate in particular on anonymization, storage of transcripts and/or records, etc.</p> <p>Questionnaires are entered into SPSS25 (computer program for data analysis); Recorded interviews are transcribed. All data are entered under the codenames that participants chose at the beginning of the project. Codename sheets were eliminated after data entrance.</p> <p>Photos will be explained by each researcher with focus on explaining participants reactions on some learning activities, and with no codes or personal data in the explanation; after this process, photos will be deleted.</p> <p>All data is available only on one external disk of the project that is available only to the closer research team.</p>
<p>8.</p>	<p>Reflections on the process of data collection</p> <p>Include an account of where data collection deviated from the case design and how any such deviation affects the robustness of the data. Specifically discuss any lessons learned, challenges, highlighting both successes and areas for improvement and relations to the research questions.</p> <p>There were not many deviations from the initial planning of the process and data collection. However, there are some elements that were interesting and different from what was expected.</p> <p>Reflection on the role of a researcher – a problem solver or a researcher?:</p> <p>A big challenge was a case where all participants came from the same primary school. Group conversations easily became conversations about everything that is wrong in the school, which directed the focus away from the research questions.</p> <p>Changing what researchers looked for while observing</p> <p>From the very beginning participants reacted in a very similar way to each other when in touch with aesthetic and embodied methods, so there was not as much following the process as researchers originally planned.</p>

Usefulness of Framework and Guides

In the process of planning, participants had some problems with finding ways to implement something very theoretical and conceptual in their everyday practice. Because of that, to support to participants, we created some steps for planning that led them step by step from principles of AECED to what they could do in their group of children. We created instructions how to apply the AECED principles with their educational group. With these instructions the participants felt that the Framework and Guides were useful, however they were not sure if they would know how to use them without this kind of support.

9. Preparations for Cross-case Analysis: Memoing

How did you engage in memoing on the Metadata Matrix during or after the research process? How did the memoing influence the case trialling and the PAR process?

Everything was entered into Metadata Matrix after all cases have finished. One researcher, who was part of a case, entered data for that case into the Metadata Matrix - all together 3 researchers entered data. Researchers met to discuss some categories (mostly theoretical and conceptual cells). Many elements that were asked in Metadata Matrix had already been discussed among researchers in the process of PAR and collected via researchers' diaries.

Memoing led to some insights, mainly regarding how the Framework and Guides could be improved, including how to adapt the Framework and Guides for different types of participants.

6.2 FINLAND Case Report

Case Number and Educational Setting:

Case 5: Higher Education

Case 6: Adult, Professional and Organisational Learning

1.	Timeline and steps Please provide an overview of the phases of your research process until completion. Give an account of the PAR activities taken throughout the process. Please refer to changes and adaptations made during the research process.
<p>Action (time period): explanation</p> <p>CASE 5 & 6.</p> <p>Recruitment stage: May 2023 – April 2024</p> <p>Recognising and contacting interested teachers. Collecting early feedback for the Framework and Guides. Informing the complete ULapland staff about the project and the possibility of listing as a participant.</p> <p>CASE 5</p> <p>Personal teaching trials with students of higher education by AECED personnel: November 2023, March 2024, October 2024.</p> <p>Direct involvement with students. Using the reflections and feedback for the second round of personal teaching trials.</p> <p>CASE 5</p> <p>Trial participant interviews / June 2024 – December 2024</p> <p>Semi-structured and recorded interviews and discussions with the teachers after or during their teaching trials to gather direct experiences of using and applying the methods, Framework and Guides.</p> <p>CASE 6</p> <p>Workshops for trial participants: Autumn 2023 / Three sessions</p> <p>Workshop on AELD methods for teachers. The first round: introducing the methods, Framework, Guides, and thematic democratic values.</p> <p>Workshops for trial participants, second round: Spring 2024 / Three sessions</p> <p>Second round enabling planning and reflecting with starting or ongoing teaching trials. Based on the needs and wishes of the participants. The opportunity was given to try out different methods within the workshop.</p> <p>CASE 6</p> <p>Mentoring & planning sessions for teaching trials / Spring 2024 – December 2024)</p> <p>A process where the consented trial participant requests mentoring in planning the teaching trials.</p> <p>CASE 6.</p> <p>Workshop for dance and movement therapists/ Autumn 2024 (21st September, Helsinki)</p> <p>Finnish Association of Dance Therapy (linked with European Association Dance Movement Therapy) gathering. Workshop for the professionals of embodied methods. Collecting feedback on the Framework and Guides for professional learners and users of AELD methods with the emphasis on embodied methods.</p>	
2.	Participant recruitment Please describe your way of participant recruitment and in which way participants were involved during the research process.
<p>CASE 5 & 6</p>	

May 2023 Early peer feedback for PAR: Inviting 15 teachers from the University of Lapland to comment on the first draft of the Prototype Pedagogical Framework, based on connections and personal contact within the organisation. Comments received in person, online, and via email. The early feedback PAR functioned as a recruitment to reach out for possible interested teaching personnel to become trial participants for cases 5 and case 6.

CASE 5

13th of September: presenting the AECED project to the teachers at the Faculty of Education at the University of Lapland. In-person and online (hybrid). The faculty has a staff of 76 people as potential attendees of the faculty meeting. At least 20 teachers were present in person and online in the recruitment event.

CASE 5

On the 20th of September, there was a general AECED information meeting including possibility for recruitment. Invitations were sent to all the faculties at the University of Lapland via email and advertised on the University of Lapland's webpage. Personal invitations were sent to other university staff members based on personal networks at Aalto University, the University of Turku, Uniarts Helsinki, and Uppsala University.

CASE 5

Presenting the AECED project online to the teaching development committee of the University of Lapland. Approx. 15 persons were present in the recruitment event.

In all information meetings the possibility to sign up as an interested trial participant teacher was announced. All interested parties were informed and invited to the following information events.

CASE 5

Students on those University courses that our researchers' team held were invited to participate in research. The possibility to give consent and recruit was presented in the beginning of each course.

Course 1:

1st iteration / Autumn 2023 / From the total number of the student in this course 9 gave the consent and participated in the research.

2nd iterations / Autumn 2024 / From the total number of the student in this course 12 gave the consent and participated in the research.

Course 2:

1 iteration / Spring 2023 / From the total number of the student in this course 12 gave the consent and participated in the research.

CASE 6

The workshops functioned as both recruiting events and research events depending if the teacher gave their consent. Teachers could freely try out different methods, and then decide whether they wanted to participate in the research through the workshop participation as adult, professional and organisational learners (CASE 6), and if they wanted to try out the methods in their own research and become trial participants (CASE 5).

Workshops invited interested teachers to try out the project's methodology and to hear from the prototype Framework and Guides. Teachers could take part in the workshop without participating in the actual research requiring a written consent. Teachers could take part every which workshop they wanted. Consent was asked from each teacher when they first time took part to the workshop event.

Workshops

1st Iteration: Series of 3 workshops with a total of 19 participants including facilitators and visiting researchers where the number alters between individual workshops

2nd Iteration: Series of 3 workshops with a total of 19 participants including facilitators and visiting researchers where the number varies between individual workshops

CASE 6

Education event on embodied methods with preliminary registration circled on the email list of the Finnish Association of Dance Therapy. Participation of the event could then give their consent for participating also in the research CASE 6 on professional learning.

3. Ethical issues in data collection

What were the key ethical steps taken? Please describe your ethical considerations related to communication, information, voluntary participation, transparency, power dynamics, etc., within your process.

Ethics permission was granted by the University of Lapland, where the case studies took place. In higher education & professional learning, all the teachers and students were legally adults.

Informing about the project and involving teachers was done openly within the university to guarantee accessibility and transparency to PAR. Still, we recognise the efficiency of personal networks, which may be dominant within the actual number of people committed to the PAR process.

Volunteer participation required written consent including the data protection procedure, and a possibility to withdraw from the research.

AECED researchers who also were trial participant teachers recognised potential power imbalance. It was emphasised that if one wishes not to participate in the research, it will not have any negative effects on how the student performance is evaluated. In courses where it was not possible to separate participation and non-participation (collective work), the non-participants were given alternative tasks, which had the same extent/level of difficulty. Participants were respected as co-learners and co-knowledge producers.

Emerging vulnerabilities were treated with sensitivity, for equity and risk mitigation. Any discomfort due to emotionally affective methods was taken into consideration: explaining the possible impacts and granting permission to abort the exercise.

Shared responsibility among all the participants was strongly emphasised and advised, to keep the learning situation as safe as possible.

4. Gender-Dimension

Explain in which ways gender became relevant in your PAR process.

PAR for case 5 and case 6 were planned to be open, inviting and relevant to all genders.

All the materials and processes were planned to be gender sensitive

Gender stereotypes in examples and case studies used in PAR, if emergent, were critically addressed, discussed, studied and problematised respecting the safe learning space of each group or individual. Gender is part of the PAR learning for democracy process.

Inclusive language was used. The researchers were not all representing same gender. For gender pronunciation, the Finnish language only has a gender-neutral/non-binary third-person expression traditionally (hän). In expressions such as different professions, where gendered language has a history, gender-neutral versions were used.

We ensured that the course contents, materials, tools and the online platform were accessible and relevant to all genders.

We actively encouraged and supported the participation of all genders in course, learning and workshop activities.

5. Data collection process

Explain how the data was collected. Specifically, who collected the data, what methods were employed, through what means, and in what environment?

Data was collected by the project researchers Pauliina Jääskeläinen and Joonas Vola, and the project's PI Susan Meriläinen. Additional data was received from: Quest researcher Olga Válková Tarasová who observed and gave notes on CASE 6 professional learning session on the 8th of November 2023 and for CASE 6 professional learning Professor Mar Perézts co-guided and gathered material on the session on the 4th of December 2023. Data was collected in person.

Data collection was conducted both in person and online, using the following methods:

a) In person: lectures, teacher workshops, teacher mentoring sessions, interviews, and a dance therapy workshop.

b) Online: course assignments, mentoring sessions, workshop planning, and debriefing activities.

Methods for data collection were

CASE 5

Writing an autoethnographic research journal based on the lectures/teaching/courses given by the researchers

Semi-structured audio recorded and transcribed (AI transcription) teacher interviews.

Analysing student learning diaries and feedback. All data was organised and analysed by applying the frame of content analysis.

CASE 6

Audio recorded researcher's notes after workshops

Writing an autoethnographic research journal based on

workshops either as a participant or facilitator (in person)

mentoring sessions with the teachers (in person)

Collecting and producing artefacts (drawings, templates) from teacher workshops.

Audio recorded discussions and researcher's notes from the workshop for the dance and movement therapists.

During the iterative process, we made the following decisions:

- a) To arrange a second round of workshops for teachers during Spring 2024 with a focus on planning the use of AELD methods (Autumn 2023 workshops concentrated on familiarising with the Framework, Guides and methods and the core values of democracy-as-becoming).
- b) For applying AELD methods to specific lectures, using music/sound and film, the ways of reflecting with the students were given more structure to open up the process better for the teachers for evaluation.
- c) To arrange mentoring sessions for teachers besides the workshops to aid their involvement in the trialling period and discussing and developing further the possibilities and problems in the AELD Framework. We recognise these meetings as significant for the co-planning of the implementation and development of AELD.
- d) 4) Extension of the trial period for the PAR teachers.

6. Creation of the data sets

Briefly describe what kinds of data you collected for the national analysis? List all data obtained during the research process.

- Researcher's fieldnotes and reflection research journals in written and audio recorded /transcribed format (AI transcription) (based on the teachers' workshops, teacher tutoring meetings and lectures of higher education).
- Learning diaries from the students of higher education in written format.
(9+12+12) =33 learning diaries from three trials
- Filled in commoning card templates
- CASE 5: 7 templates from exercise within a lecture with students of higher education
- CASE 6: 3 templates from teachers of higher education from the workshops.
- Photographs
- CASE 6: 60 photos from teacher workshops (of drawings, sculptures, art cards, collages, without pictures of participants). Any of the photos in the data sets do not include the participants, and they are not identifiable from the photos.
- CASE 5: 6 photos of student group work posters from the lectures. These do not include any identifiable personal information.
- Drawings
- CASE 6: 4 drawings from teacher workshops.
- Trial-participant teacher interviews recorded in audio format and transcribed (AI transcription) into textual format. The transcriptions are checked to ensure it does not include any identifiable personal information.
- 10 interviews.

7.	Data management and storage
<p>Where is the data stored, how was it transferred, and through whom? Please elaborate in particular on anonymization, storage of transcripts and/or records, etc.</p>	
<p>All digitised data has been stored in the protected internal data folder “HALLA / AECED_2023-2026” accessible only for the named personnel of the Ulapland, AECED project.</p> <p>Physical documents such as templates and drawings, are held in a locked filing cabinet in locked office rooms, as well as immediate data-saving devices (audio recorder).</p> <p>The metadata of the project is described in the University of Lapland Research Portal LaCRIS, before the end of the project. Anonymised metadata is also transferred to the Metadata Matrix for cross-case analysis in the form of memoing templates within the matrix. The Metadata Matrix is stored in the project's closed Teams channel.</p> <p>Transcriptions have been produced by using the AI program “Cockatoo”.</p>	
8.	Reflections on the process of data collection
<p>Include an account of where data collection deviated from the case design and how any such deviation affects the robustness of the data. Specifically discuss any lessons learned, challenges, highlighting both successes and areas for improvement and relations to the research questions.</p>	
<p>MITIGATING DIFFERENCES ON AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC DATA PRODUCTION</p> <p>The researcher’s systematic use of the autoethnographic approach in recording and writing reflective research journals differs. The potential weaknesses produced by these differences in the level of specificity in the notes are mitigated by using peer interviews along with the project researchers’, especially when recording the experiences from the personal teaching trials, and by applying memorising techniques concerning the workshops, where more than one researcher was present, for collective knowledge production.</p> <p>IMPROVING VISIBILITY OF LEARNING PROCESS AND RESULTS FOR AELD EVALUATION</p> <p>The structuring of reflections with the student participants was added due to the fact that some of the teaching trials and their reception did not open up enough from the learning diaries, and their affective and effective trialling and evaluation required more open dialogue within the frame of the lecture. Also, more emphasis on explaining the connection between the applied teaching method, material, democracy and the theme of the course was added, to aid the students in reflecting on their learning diaries.</p> <p>SCULPTING THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE FRAMEWORK AND GUIDES WITH PARTICIPANTS Responding to the needs of participating teachers, implementing the Framework and Guides became a co-learning and co-developing process together with the researcher-facilitators, where the possibilities and hindrances of their use were discussed thoroughly with the participants. We see these discussions as building layers, where each discussion feeds the next one and the collective understanding of how AELD ideas and methods could be used, increased. These discussions became themselves transforming dialogues towards democracy-as-becoming in our University. There are different levels of engagement with the prototype Framework and Guides between the participants, from careful readership in planning the personal teaching trials to those who did not read the Guides but relied on the information given about the prototypes through the workshops and mentoring.</p>	
9.	Preparations for Cross-case Analysis: Memoing
<p>How did you engage in memoing on the Metadata Matrix during or after the research process? How did the memoing influence the case trialling and the PAR process?</p>	
<p>The research process ended in December 2024 due to the extended time period given for the teachers to do their teaching trials.</p> <p>The memoing in the Metadata Matrix influenced the ways in which the data was organised and analysed. We used it directly as a means of organising and transforming the data from raw to modified and pseudonymised. How to use the memoing for Metadata Matrix was discussed to bring clarity to the difference between case studies 5 and 6, and experiences were shared, yet besides these discussions, a single strategy was not established.</p>	

The categories which the Metadata Matrix provides sometimes challenge the phenomenological interconnectedness of the different phases and aspects. Yet, it also brought in a content analysis-based approach to how to modify the data, how to perceive it, and how to prepare it for cross-case analysis.

In the role of the researcher-participant, the project researchers also work as trialling teachers applying the Framework and Guides, and besides facilitators also as peer participants in workshops, the memoing combined personal trials and trials of the interviewed teachers. This makes the knowledge production very much collective, among the project researchers and their peer trial participant teachers. This is an attempt to close any knowledge gaps in PAR, by combining inside-outside points of view rather than aiming to dictate or manipulate any result of PAR by being closely involved in the process.

6.3 GERMANY Case Report

Case Number and Educational Setting:

Case 7: BA & MA Students, Higher Education

Case 8: COMMONING, Adult/Professional/Organisational Learning

Case 10: Cultural Education (KUBI), Higher Education & Adult/Professional/Organisational Learning

1. Timeline and steps

Please provide an overview of the phases of your research process until completion. Give an account of the PAR activities taken throughout the process. Please refer to changes and adaptations made during the research process.

Cases 7-10: November 2023-December 2024

Earlier start than the official start of case trialling due to the integration into the German higher education system.

Timeline

- Introduction (Case 7, Case 8) – November 2023
- Data gathering (Case 8) – December 2023, February 2024
- Data gathering (Case 7) – January and February 2024
- Data gathering (Case 7) – July 2024
- Data gathering (Case 9) – March, April 2024
- Online Workshop and data gathering (Case 10) - April 2024
- Workshop and data gathering (Case 10) – May 2024
- Online workshop (Case 9) – June, July, August 2024
- Data gathering (Case 10) – July 2024
- Co-present workshop and data gathering (Case 9) – October 2024

Case 7 took place in a higher education setting, recruiting BA and Master's students at Philipps University of Marburg. It included three iterations:

- First iteration: Conducted with MA7 seminar students (18) completed in the Winter Term 2023-2024.
- Second iteration: Conducted with BA11 seminar students (8), completed in the Summer Term 2024.
- Third iteration: Conducted with MA7 students (20), completed in December 2024.

Case 8 took place in an adult/professional/organisational setting at the Higher education university of St. Pölten, Austria. The participants were professionals enrolled in a further education program, all working in organisational contexts such as social work, NGOs, kindergartens, and similar fields. This case included one iteration:

- First iteration: Conducted with participants from the Bertha von Suttner University St. Pölten Further Education Program Module Seminar, completed in the Winter Term 2023-2024. We conducted 4 peer interviews with seminar participants and 5 additional interviews which participants completed in two selected partner organisations. Two pattern labs were realized with two organisations involved.

Case 9 took place in an adult/professional/organisational setting, together with our cooperating Partners of the Commons Institute Germany, we involved Pattern Language of Commoning (PLC) Practitioners from social movements and activists throughout the main steps of PAR.

It included four iterations; we are currently at the 4th iteration.

- First iteration: We reached out to PLC users through an online survey and collected initial data from March to April 2024, receiving responses from 67 participants.
- Second iteration: An online workshop series ran during June, July, and August 2024. In these workshops, PLC users exchanged ideas and tested their methods.
- Third iteration: In October 2024, a co-present workshop and data-gathering session took place in Marburg, where researchers conducted 9 interviews.
- Fourth iteration: Online workshops and additional 11 interviews finished by December 2024.

In Case 10, we worked with HE students, beginning with an explorative workshop applying methods from the Guides for practice for HE and Professional/Organisational education. The material generated in the workshop was valuable feedback and critically highlighted the necessity to connect aesthetic approaches and learning for democracy. In the following online workshop for a diverse group of arts educators (professionals), we provided the Framework and Guide Part I for practice and reflected on aesthetic transformation and learning for democracy in peer-interviews. This workshop was documented through participant observation. Due to the impossibility to continue the online series from the side of the collaboration partner, we integrated a third iteration with students in HE who collectively developed a performance on democracy through aesthetic and embodied methods. In this phase, we had interviews on the experience of aesthetic, embodied and participatory learning environments.

2. Participant recruitment

Please describe your way of participant recruitment and in which way participants were involved during the research process.

Case 7: Participants were recruited from UMR for the MA7 Winter 23/24 (18 participants), BA11 Summer 24 (8 participants), and MA7 Winter 24/25 terms (20 participants). All seminars in this case were elective, meaning that students could freely choose to participate and withdraw at any time. There was no institutional requirement for students to take these seminars, and no grading system was in place. Attendance alone was sufficient for students to pass, and non-attendance had no impact on their curriculum.

Case 8: Participants (8 participants) were professionals who had graduated from university and were employed in organisations. The aim of their participation was to apply their academic knowledge and transform their institutions through a fee-based further education program. This case was part of a seminar within the program module.

Case 9: Participants (58 for online survey, 15 for workshop, 20 for interviews) were recruited from among Commoning activists and experts in the field of social movements.

Case 10: Participants signed up for the online workshop through an open call to all members of the KulturForscher! Network. The HE participants were recruited directly in the times of the HE courses (interviews conducted face-to-face and online)

3. Ethical issues in data collection

What were the key ethical steps taken? Please describe your ethical considerations related to communication, information, voluntary participation, transparency, power dynamics, etc., within your process.

We assured participants about data security throughout the data collection process, aiming to build trust and minimise concerns. In all cases, participants received a written document titled "Informed Consent" at the beginning of the research. This document outlined the use of their personal information and covered all data produced, developed, or received during the data-gathering process. For interviews, an additional informed consent document was provided, which participants read and signed. Participants provided their informed consent both verbally, recorded on audio, and in writing by signing a consent form. To mitigate potential power imbalances, the collection of informed consent was carried out by researchers, not the project leader. As the research was planned to be conducted as ethnographic research, researchers kept observation notes in some sessions of the seminars and workshops. Participants were informed of this in advance, and they were assured of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without consequence.

4. Gender-Dimension

Explain in which ways gender became relevant in your PAR process.

As most of our cases take place in educational settings (case 7, 8 and 10), women are strongly represented with approximately a 80% rate. Men generally are rather less represented in the educational setting. In the commoning case 9, women and men were rather equally represented.

Gender did become relevant for the data-collection process, too, where we make sure, that everybody's needs are met.

Gender is relevant not only regarding participants, but as well as an analytical dimension for intersectional analysis. An intersectional research approach will always be taken into account.

5. Data collection process

Explain how the data was collected. Specifically, who collected the data, what methods were employed, through what means, and in what environment?

Data was collected in each phase of the course by the UMR research team and also through peer-interviews done by participants. The following methods were used to collect data:

Case 7: Data collection strategy involves a multi-method approach.

- Visual Data: Photographs captured during the case trialing process, including the visible and recognizable faces of the participants (written content was obtained from each participant).

Qualitative Data: PLCs and image-based semi-structured in-depth peer interviews, seminar journaling, group reflections, evaluation form for the Framework and Guide Part I, group reflections, participant-developed methods, ethnographic research.

Quantitative Data: Evaluation form for the Framework and Guide Part I using a structured 1-5 rating scale.

Data collection by: Susanne Maria Weber, Kardelen Cazgir, peer-interviews by participants.

Case 8: Data collection strategy involves a multi-method approach.

- Visual Data: Photos captured during the case trialing process, during the seminar and Innovation-Lab, without the recognizable faces of the participants.
- Qualitative Data: PLCs based semi-structured in-depth peer interviews, seminar journaling from participants, group reflections.

Data collection by: Susanne Maria Weber, interviews by participants.

Case 9: Data collection strategy involves a multi-method approach.

- Visual Data: Photos captured, and videos recorded during the workshop including the visible and recognizable faces of the participants (written content was obtained from each participant).
- Qualitative Data: Researcher-led interviews, ethnographic research, Evaluation form for the Framework and Guides, group reflections, participant-developed methods.
- Quantitative Data: Evaluation form for the Framework and Guides using a structured 1-5 rating scale.

Data collection by: Susanne Maria Weber; Dirk Netter; Vero Pinzger; Kerstin Bischoff; Jörg Schwarz; Canan Yalvac, Sarah Wieners; Kardelen Cazgir.

Case 10: Data collection strategy involves a multi-method approach.

Data collection methods:

- Visual Data: participant observation, mind-maps, video recording with a visible and recognizable faces of participants (written content was obtained from each participant).
- Qualitative Data: Recorded oral sharing rounds, qualitative interviews, short personal writings.

Data collection by: Lea Spahn, Helena Wolter

6. Creation of the data sets

Briefly describe what kinds of data you collected for the national analysis? List all data obtained during the research process.

Case 7

- Photos from the seminar in digital format; verbal collective reflections transferred into brown papers in written format; researchers' field notes in written format; PLCs and image-based peer interviews in transcribed audio format; researcher reflection on interview recordings in written format; students-developed methods (suggested to be integrated to our practical Guide) in written format; seminar-journaling (feedback template) in written format; evaluations (quantitative and qualitative data) for Pedagogical Framework and Practical Guide in written format; participant observations in written format.

Case 8

- Photos from the seminar and Innovation-Lab activities in digital format; seminar-journaling (feedback template) in written format; PLCs based peer-interview recordings in transcribed audio format.

Case 9

- Photos and videos from the on-side workshop; qualitative and quantitative data via online survey; researcher-led interviews in transcribed audio format; collective reflections of sessions in transcribed audio format; evaluations (quantitative and qualitative data) for Pedagogical Framework and Practical Guide in written format; participant observations in written format; participants-developed methods (suggested to be integrated to our practical Guide) in written format; participant observations in written format.

Case 10

- Digitized mind-maps, text documents of the personal writing exercise, video recording of the official presentation and dance event, transcribed interviews, Participant observation of the practical application with peer researchers

7. Data management and storage

Where is the data stored, how was it transferred, and through whom? Please elaborate in particular on anonymization, storage of transcripts and/or records, etc.

The data generated during the studies was processed in accordance with the applicable regulations of the UMR and EU GDPR. A dedicated cloud file, accessible solely by the project team, was created to ensure that data is used exclusively by authorised researchers. During data transfers, researchers ensure data security, while UMR guarantees the protection of the transferred data. Data management prioritises both the security and the easy availability and accessibility of the data. Digital data was directly transferred to the cloud, paper documents were scanned, and photos, videos, and audio recordings were uploaded.

Case 7: Susanne Maria Weber transferred all data.

Case 8: Kardelen Cazgir transferred all data.

Case 9: Dirk Netter transferred the data related to the online survey and recorded audio interviews. Vero Pinzger transferred the remaining data.

Case 10: Lea Spahn transferred all data.

The project team will have exclusive use of the data - within the funded period of the project. The project website as well as the website of the Commons Institute Germany will be used to publish results, processes and methods, guaranteeing the anonymisation or pseudonymization of the research participants. At the conclusion of the project, we will collaborate with participants from Case 7 and Case 9 to publish a PLC Handbook. Should they request, their names will be acknowledged in the publication where the methods they have developed are featured.

8. Reflections on the process of data collection

Include an account of where data collection deviated from the case design and how any such deviation affects the robustness of the data. Specifically discuss any lessons learned, challenges, highlighting both successes and areas for improvement and relations to the research questions.

Throughout the PAR process, the UMR team faced unforeseen challenges and issues, along with strengthening situations, differing from what was initially planned in the design phase of the research. We reflect the conditions that have faced according to the following categories:

Presentation and Usability of the Guides and Frameworks: We observed that the Framework and Guides are not yet user-friendly in all cases. To improve clarity, the Consortium could develop a standard introduction and familiarisation phase. Instead, as in other countries, we gradually expanded our methods.

Unexpected technical challenges: Case 10 was initially planned to begin with an online workshop, which took place as scheduled. However, the planned intervention did not proceed as expected due to technical issues during the workshop, requiring a re-planning of the Case 10.

Unforeseen time issue: In all cases, we have seen that all participants, whether in HE or Adult/Professional/Organisational Education settings, were engaged in other works, private life outside the project, outside their profession - volunteer activism, or student status. The time that individuals can volunteer to participate in the project is very limited, and we had difficulties involving the participants due to different schedules and conflicting calendars on a tight deadline. This process taught us that time issues are crucial for projects and must be considered.

Strengthened collaborations over time: We planned to collaborate with the Commons Institute during the Case 9 design and leverage their network to support participant recruitment. However, as the process unfolded, they became interested in our PAR approach, leading to co-organising online workshops. Experts from the Commons Institute also contributed their experience and expertise to planning and moderating the face-to-face workshop. Following the case trial, we plan to continue working together during the trailblazer and exploitation phase.

Extension of the PAR process: The duration of Case 7, Case 9, and Case 10 was extended during the PAR process, diverging from the original plan. By involving more participants over a longer period in the trialling phase, the UMR Team believes that implementing the Framework and Guides with more participants in later stages will be more meaningful for this research.

The diversification of the interventions followed in the PAR process: Case 10 required interventions with several different groups of participants involved throughout the process due to a lack of continuation with the external partner. The material is focused more on the Pedagogical Framework than the Guides but created great connections to future trailblazer participants.

9. Preparations for Cross-case Analysis: Memoing

How did you engage in memoing on the Metadata Matrix during or after the research process? How did the memoing influence the case trialling and the PAR process?

UMR researchers have developed a strategy to store data securely in a university-supported cloud folder. Additionally, they will design a national strategy utilising the Metadata Matrix to transfer the memos, including descriptions made before and during the PAR process and reflections gathered during and after the PAR process. The Metadata Matrix created a space for researcher reflection: Due to the direct and continuous involvement of the researchers, the memoing enabled space to reflect issues of positionality and intersectionality, and enabled the documentation of minute learnings specific to participatory research designs. It is also a shared tool for all participating researchers to create transparency about their activities and learnings regarding the RQs and surprising fields of attention like spatial arrangements and moments of body shame.

6.4 LATVIA Case Report

Case Number and Educational Setting:

Case 11: Daugavpils State Gymnasium, secondary education phase

Case 12: Jūrmala State Gymnasium, Adult/ professional learning phase

Case 13: Riga Secondary School No. 22, inter-generational learning

<p>1. Timeline and steps</p> <p>Please provide an overview of the phases of your research process until completion. Give an account of the PAR activities taken throughout the process. Please refer to changes and adaptations made during the research process.</p>	<p>The research was conducted in two iterations, each following the phases of Participatory Action Research (PAR). In each iteration, the project team collaborated with teachers and school principals (educators) and observed their work with secondary school students.</p> <p><i>Iteration 1 (31 January – 15 November 2024)</i></p> <p>Introduction (15.-16.02.2024). The project was introduced to educators, who learned key concepts such as AELD, responsive pedagogies, democracy-as-becoming, Prototype Framework and Guides during the AECED Intensive Training Program organized by RTU.</p> <p>Familiarisation (19.02.-19.03.2024). Educators read and analysed the Prototype Framework and Guides documents both individually and in groups.</p> <p>Collaborative Reflection (20.03.-22.03.2024). Educators shared feedback and suggestions for improving the PPF and PPG in Zoom meetings with the RTU team.</p> <p>Planning (25.03.-05.04.2024). Educators participated in group and individual consultations to plan their work with students for the AELD trials.</p> <p>Action (10.04.-23.04.2024). Educators embedded AELD (drama and collage creation) into students' learning, testing three models from the Prototype Guides to address democracy-related issues across subjects, integrating cognitive, affective, and embodied learning.</p> <p>Reflection (Analysis and Synthesis; 29.04.-15.11.2024). The analysis of reflections from educators and students, along with post-trial discussions, helped to evaluate the outcomes of the AELD trials.</p> <p>In the second iteration, the focus of the research shifted from embedding AELD into subject-specific learning to emphasising embodiment practices and addressing problem situations related to democracy and civic participation. Additionally, the participant structure was adjusted to meet the specific needs of each case, and some PAR phases merged due to participants' prior experience from iteration 1. In Case 12 (adult/professional learning phase), participants only included teachers and the principal of Jūrmala State Gymnasium.</p> <p><i>Iteration 2 (23 August – 30 December 2024)</i></p> <p>Introduction and Familiarisation (23.08.2024). Educators from project schools participated in embodiment activities organised by the RTU team and led by psychologist Anna Steina, an LV stakeholder, analysing the role of embodiment in fostering democratic ethos and relationships.</p> <p>Collaborative Reflection and Planning (02.09.-06.09.2024). Zoom discussions gathered Educators' feedback on their experiences and facilitated planning for the second round of trials in schools.</p> <p>Action (19.09.-25.10.2024):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case 11 – Secondary education phase (19-20.09.2024) • Case 12 – Adult/professional learning phase (25.10.2024) • Case 13 – Intergenerational learning (02.10.2024)
--	---

Participants engaged in embodiment activities and democracy-related problem-solving using drama sketches and collage creation as AELD.

Reflection (Analysis and Synthesis; 30.10.-30.12.2024). Analysis of participants' written reflections, group discussions, and interviews.

2. Participant recruitment

Please describe your way of participant recruitment and in which way participants were involved during the research process.

The invitation for secondary education institutions to participate in the project was shared using the Homepage of the Institute of Lifelong Learning and Culture "Vitae" which has access to all the schools in Latvia. Four schools submitted applications and motivation letters to participate in the project, with the aim of transforming their school culture for democracy, acquiring and mastering AELD, and engaging in the AECED research. However, after individual discussions with each school's principal and lead pedagogues, during which the expectations for co-researching and co-learning were clarified, only three schools remained. The fourth school decided it would not co-conduct the research. These three schools now represent the three Latvian cases. Since most of the 10th-grade students were under 18, their participation in the project was only possible with written informed consent from their parents or guardians, which was provided to the researchers by the school principals or teachers. Additionally, the RTU research team's contact information was shared with parents and/or students in case they required further clarification about any aspect of the research. It was emphasised that students could leave the project at any time without any negative impact on their assessments or attitudes toward them.

Number of participants in the first iteration:

- Case 11 – 17 students out of 22 in the class, the school principal, and three teachers.
- Case 12 – 13 students out of 15 in the class, the school principal, and four teachers.
- Case 13 – 14 students out of 53 in the 10th grade, the school principal, and four teachers.

Students who chose not to participate continued their regular studies during this period. Of the 44 students who participated in the research, 40 were minors (under 18), and 4 were adults. Both students' parents and teachers, including principals, signed informed consent forms before the project began in schools. Parents signed them after discussing the project with their children and the pedagogues, while the teachers and principals made their final decision to participate on 15 February 2024. This decision was made immediately following the introduction to the key ideas of the project and the research, which took place at the start of the AECED Intensive Training Program organized by the RTU team in Riga on 15-16 February. While the first iteration followed the same strategy of collaborative learning between students, teachers, and the principal across all three schools, the structure of the cases in the second iteration was adjusted to align with the educational phase:

- Case 11 – Secondary education phase: Daugavpils State Gymnasium participated in AELD embodiment activities with 16 students, the school principal, and three teachers.
- Case 12 – Adult/professional learning phase: 14 teachers and the principal of Jūrmala State Gymnasium.
- Case 13 – Intergenerational learning: 10 students, 10 teachers, and the principal of Riga Secondary School No. 22.

In the first iteration, the RTU researchers acted as neutral observers of the AELD process, without intervening. In the second iteration, participants requested the research team to organise an embodiment activity focused on analysing how the method promotes democratic relationships. This activity was met with genuine interest and enthusiasm by the participants.

3. Ethical issues in data collection

What were the key ethical steps taken? Please describe your ethical considerations related to communication, information, voluntary participation, transparency, power dynamics, etc., within your process.

The data collection adhered to EU research ethics regulations, with confirmation and permission granted by the RTU Ethics Committee after reviewing six documents submitted by the RTU research team and obtaining informed consent forms from parents and Educators. Both Educators and students were provided with all the necessary information about the project, its realisation stages and specific elements, including issues related to confidentiality and protection of personal data. They could share opinions openly, as the reflection was voluntary and anonymous. Participants were also allowed to opt out of activities if they felt any discomfort or stress. The reflection questionnaire began with a voluntary question about participants' gender, allowing researchers to explore how responses varied based on this demographic information. The

research was grounded in healthy power dynamics, marked by fairness, respect, equality among participants, and full transparency. The first iteration-related research outcomes were presented to participants before the second iteration. The research findings are presented and discussed at scientific conferences and will be published in papers completely anonymously and only in a summarized format.

No video recordings or photographs of participating students were taken during the AELD activities. Audio recordings of post-AELD trial discussions with teachers, as well as semi-structured interviews with both teachers and students, were used solely for transcribing into Word files. After transcription, the recordings were deleted, and participants were anonymized in the transcripts using codes such as Researcher 1, 2, Student 1, 2, 3, etc., and Pedagogue 1, 2, 3, etc., to ensure full confidentiality of the data.

4. Gender-Dimension

Explain in which ways gender became relevant in your PAR process.

The AELD trials, conducted across two iterations in three secondary schools in Latvia, provided an open and safe space for gender expression, free from discrimination or bullying.

- The learning activities and classroom settings fostered a gender-neutral environment, which positively influenced gender socialisation, inclusivity, and active participation.
- In some cases, the creation and performance of drama sketches encouraged gender fluidity, allowing students to move between different gender expressions and identities. For instance, a male student confidently took on the role of an elderly woman, demonstrating empathy and flexibility in gender expression, unconstrained by societal expectations of masculinity. His ability to explore and embody a different identity, coupled with the supportive reactions from peers and teachers, reflected the democratic ethos established within the classroom.
- All 10th-grade students were invited to participate in the project without restrictions, ensuring that all genders had equal access to information, materials, and learning opportunities.

5. Data collection process

Explain how the data was collected. Specifically, who collected the data, what methods were employed, through what means, and in what environment?

Throughout the two iterations, all data were collected by Professor Karine Oganisjana and Scientific Assistant Rolands Ozols from the RTU project team using both online and in-person methods across the various phases of the PAR process. In the first iteration, the data collection strategy was consistent across all three schools.

Iteration 1 (15 February – 1 July 2024)

Introduction (15-16.02.2024): Written reflections from educators were collected via Google Forms on their AELD experiences during the AECED Intensive Training Program organised by RTU. Additionally, audio recordings of selected fragments and photographs of educators' creations (collages) were taken by the RTU researcher Konstantins Kozlovskis.

Familiarisation (19.02.-19.03.2024): No data were collected during the individual and group readings of the Prototype Framework and Guides by educators.

Collaborative Reflection (20.03.-22.03.2024): Audio recordings of educators' reflections and suggestions for improving the Prototype Framework and Guides were collected during three Zoom meetings organised by the RTU team.

Planning (25.03.-05.04.2024): No data were collected during group and individual consultations with educators or during the joint planning of the first AELD trials with students.

Action (10.04.-23.04.2024): Data collected during this phase included post-trial-1 written reflections from both students and educators via Google Forms; audio recordings of post-trial discussions with educators; field notes from RTU researchers' observations; presentations of AELD activities, and photographs of collages created by students.

Reflection (Analysis and Synthesis; 29.04.-01.07.2024): No new data were collected during this phase.

In the second iteration, case-specific differences led to variations in both the data collected and the methods used for data collection.

Iteration 2 (23 August – 30.12.2024)

Introduction and Familiarisation (23.08.2024). Audio recordings were made of psychologist Anna Steina's explanations regarding the impact of embodied activities on democratic ethos and relationships.

Collaborative Reflection and Planning (02.09.-06.09.2024). No audio recordings were made during this phase.

Action (19.09.-25.10.2024):

- Case 11 – Secondary education phase (19-20.09.2024). Data collected included post-trial 2 written reflections from both students and educators via Google Forms; field notes from RTU researchers' observations; presentations of AELD activities; students' short thought pieces on what democracy means to them; and audio recordings of the interviews with both students and Educators.
- Case 12 – Adult/professional learning phase (25.10.2024). Data collected comprised post-trial 2 written reflections from educators via Google Forms; audio recordings of selected learning sessions; field notes from RTU researchers' observations.
- Case 13 – Intergenerational learning (02.10.2024). Data collected were post-trial 2 written reflections from both students and educators via Google Forms; field notes from RTU researchers' observations and an audio recording of the finalising game, which enabled the educators and students to exchange ideas about how they learned and felt while learning from each other.

6. Creation of the data sets

Briefly describe what kinds of data you collected for the national analysis? List all data obtained during the research process.

The list of data collected for the national case analysis can be systemised into four groups:

- *audio recordings* of the Zoom meetings, trial episodes, onsite post-trial discussions, and final interviews with teachers, principals, and students. These recordings were transcribed into *Word files* for analysis using Unstuck AI. In some cases, the audio recordings were analysed directly to extract the key ideas, which were then summarized in English to address the research questions.
- *observation notes* of the trials, focusing on how drama sketches and collage creation were integrated into AELD learning and reflective activities.
- *post-trial written reflections* from educators and students collected via Google Forms. The reflection questions for the first and second iterations differed, as the trial content and activities were distinct and complementary. This approach ensured the collection of relevant data to answer all research questions through qualitative content analysis (QCA) of the reflection texts in Google Spreadsheets.
- *PowerPoint presentations* created and used by the teachers during AELD activities, *students' written thought-pieces* on democratic values and their role in life and *photographs of students' artistic creations – collages* produced while solving democracy-related problem situations.
- While the data collected are primarily qualitative, their analysis also yields quantitative information, such as category frequencies identified through QCA.

7. Data management and storage

Where is the data stored, how was it transferred, and through whom? Please elaborate in particular on anonymization, storage of transcripts and/or records, etc.

RTU has a Microsoft 365 license that provides each staff member with secure OneDrive storage of one terabyte. A dedicated folder for the LV AECED project has been created, allowing RTU project team members to directly edit (extract and insert data) without using email. Additionally, for extra security, files are encrypted with a password known only to team members.

All data were collected directly by the RTU researchers, who observed the AELD activities in schools. A preliminary Excel file, intended to register the characteristic elements of the democracy-as-becoming principles and responsive pedagogy systematized from the PPG, proved impractical for use. As a result, the observation strategy was revised. Rolands Ozols took handwritten notes, documenting participants' emotions, embodied responses, and reflections, while Karine Oganisjana observed the AELD as a holistic process of experiencing democracy within a responsive pedagogical environment. The notes were scanned and stored in the LV AECED folder as anonymous materials for subsequent analysis.

They organised anonymous reflections from students and educators after each trial, gathering their responses in Google Spreadsheets. They also audio-recorded Zoom meetings, selected episodes of activities and discussions with educators and students; collected presentations of AELD activities and students' thought pieces on democracy; photographed

creative works; and interviewed educators and students who wished to share their personal experiences. After extracting key ideas from the audio recordings, the recordings are deleted to ensure they remain unavailable. To ensure full anonymity and confidentiality, participants were invited to create personal codes known only to them, without using their names. They were also offered to photograph their codes and keep them for use in reflections during the second iteration. The intention was to track changes in participants across iterations while maintaining the confidentiality of their reflections.

The only physical documents are the informed consent forms signed by parents/guardians and students as well as by teachers. These forms are kept in the locked drawer in the office of the Latvian team's leader.

8. Reflections on the process of data collection

Include an account of where data collection deviated from the case design and how any such deviation affects the robustness of the data. Specifically discuss any lessons learned, challenges, highlighting both successes and areas for improvement and relations to the research questions.

The key challenge faced by the Latvian research team in data collection was the age of the 10th-grade students, the majority of whom were minors (under 18). Out of 44 students, only four were adults. As a result, in addition to completing the necessary formalities and obtaining signed consent forms to meet research ethics requirements, we were unable to make video recordings of the AELD activities. While video recordings would have been highly valuable for analysing emotions and embodiment during the drama sketches and collage creation, this method was not feasible.

To address this challenge, we decided from the outset to make audio recordings of the activities, ensuring that students would not be visible. These recordings were intended to complement other research data—such as observations, reflections, and discussions—helping to compensate for the absence of video materials.

However, significant technical difficulties arose during the activities held in school halls. The layout, background noise, student movement, and quiet voices—all of which were difficult to capture from a distance—adversely impacted the audio quality, rendering the recordings unusable. As observers, the researchers were unable to follow the speakers or actors with a recorder or mobile phone, as this would have disrupted the learning activities. Instead, they had to remain at opposite ends of the hall to avoid disturbing the participants. As a result, capturing high-quality audio of the drama sketches and collage interpretation process proved impossible.

Consequently, the drama sketch and collage creation methods, which had been part of the original design for data collection (along with observation, reflection, and interviews), were excluded from the scope of the research. However, audio recordings were successfully made during in-person discussions or Zoom meetings, where high-quality data could be ensured.

To ensure a comprehensive analysis, we employed triangulation using a range of methods, allowing us to address all research questions from multiple perspectives. In addition, we conducted a qualitative content analysis of the reflection materials using Excel, rather than MAXQDA. This approach allowed us to achieve a 'panoramic view' of the data, drawing on multiple categories from the responses to various reflection questions to answer each research question.

9. Preparations for Cross-case Analysis: Memoing

How did you engage in memoing on the Metadata Matrix during or after the research process? How did the memoing influence the case trialling and the PAR process?

The final version of the Metadata Matrix, which includes templates for the descriptive, reflective, conceptual, and theoretical dimensions of memoing related to the six PAR phases (Introduction, Familiariation, Collaborative Reflection, Planning, Action, and Analysis and Synthesis), was completed and uploaded to the LUCIT platform, along with the relevant materials, after the first iteration of the Latvian part of the research (April 24 to May 8, 2024).

Consequently, memoing for this iteration involved recalling the contexts and specific aspects related to each PAR phase, including the emotions experienced, cognitive insights gained, challenges encountered, and contradictions that emerged while answering the template questions and identifying key themes. This process required synthesising insights gained from observing AELD activities in schools with the findings from qualitative content analysis of teachers' and students' reflections, as well as post-AELD discussions with teachers and school principals.

The integration of these insights informed the planning for the second iteration, during which the focus shifted from integrating AELD into the teaching and learning of academic subjects to using embodiment activities to promote democracy and address democracy-related problem situations. In the second iteration, memoing became even more relevant, as all three Latvian cases focused on different educational phases: secondary education, adult/professional learning, and

intergenerational dialogue. Memoing highlights the unique aspects of each case, contrasting with the first iteration, where all three schools shared a common focus and aim. The memoing process is still ongoing.

6.5 PORTUGAL Case Report

Case Number and Educational Setting:

Case 14: Educators and teachers Online 1, Early years and primary Education

Case 15: Educators and teachers Online 2, Early years and primary Education

Case 16: Educators and teachers Online 3, Adult and professional learning

Case 17: Educators and teachers Online 4, Adult and professional learning

1.	Timeline and steps Please provide an overview of the phases of your research process until completion. Give an account of the PAR activities taken throughout the process. Please refer to changes and adaptations made during the research process.
<p>Case 14-17: April and June 2024 (completed)</p> <p>The Portuguese team's case studies were based on an 8-week online course and took place between April and June 2024, for teachers and educators to provide the knowledge and skills necessary to carry out independent research and integrate them in the project as co-researchers. This course was specifically designed and built to develop Portuguese case studies. Although this resource was not foreseen, it could contribute to the sustainability of the project, allowing us to explore aesthetic and embodied learning in an online environment.</p> <p>The course was structured into 6 themes (introduction, familiarisation, collaborative reflection, planning, action and final reflection) according to PAR:</p> <p>Phase 1 - Introduction</p> <p>The aim of this phase was to introduce the theme of Education for Democracy - as transformation through aesthetic and embodied learning.</p> <p>Phase 2 - Familiarisation</p> <p>The aim of this phase was to gather feedback from the trainees on the pedagogical frame of reference and the Guides.</p> <p>Phase 3 – Collaborative reflection</p> <p>The aim of this phase was to develop a collaborative reflection among the trainees on the most interesting and least interesting aspects of the Pedagogical Framework and the Guides.</p> <p>Phase 4 – Planning</p> <p>The aim of this phase was for the trainees to plan an intervention in which they develop aesthetic and embodied activities in their educational context.</p> <p>The trainees could base their planning in the examples in the Guide or create new ones.</p> <p>Phase 5 – Action</p> <p>The aim of this phase was to implement the activities designed in the previous phase in an educational context. Over a few weeks teachers and educators had to develop one or more aesthetic and embodied activities with the students in mind.</p> <p>Phase 6 – Final reflection</p> <p>The aim of this phase was for each trainee to develop a narrative reflection on how the activities throughout the course went and their outcome.</p>	
2.	Participant recruitment Please describe your way of participant recruitment and in which way participants were involved during the research process.
<p>Given the Portuguese team's experience with teaching and learning environments in eLearning, the case studies were all developed based on this course.</p>	

To recruit those interested in taking part in the course, information about the project was publicised through stakeholders, local, regional and national partners. Using institutional contacts, emails were sent to several formal and non-formal education institutions asking for the course to be publicised among potentially interested parties.

The project received a total of 101 interested teachers and educators, 40 of whom were selected on the basis of the following criteria: Degree and academic background; Level of education (20 from pre-school and primary education and 20 from professional education); The project started with 34 who responded regarding participation; Dispersal at national level (so that we could be representative at national level).

This operationalisation was not linear; on the contrary, it frequently involved interactions and continuous involvement between the researchers and the participants throughout the research process. The participants directly involved were the educators and teachers who attended this course. The children and young people who were students in their activity sessions were indirect participants, so we had no restrictions and/or ethical issues.

3. Ethical issues in data collection

What were the key ethical steps taken? Please describe your ethical considerations related to communication, information, voluntary participation, transparency, power dynamics, etc., within your process.

The participants were fully informed about the project and decided to take part voluntarily.

They all signed a declaration of informed consent.

Each participant was given a code that guaranteed their anonymity and confidentiality.

The information was stored in the Universidade Aberta folder, shared exclusively between the project's researchers.

The direct participants are teachers who work directly in both levels or modalities of education (early years, primary and vocational). Thus, the participants are all adults who have been recruited through an open call to take part in an online training programme, ensuring great diversity. Distance learning is also recognised as a tool for promoting this diversity. The relationship between researchers and participants was intended to be one of co-operation and mutual benefit.

The interaction environment created during the online programme was intended to be a practical immersion in the type of interaction environment that our project aims.

Asynchronous online courses can play a significant role in promoting gender equality in education.

4. Gender-Dimension

Explain in which ways gender became relevant in your PAR process.

The flexibility and accessibility of these courses can help address several challenges that some genders and other underrepresented groups often face.

- We ensured that all the materials were gender-sensitive;
- Gender stereotypes in examples and case studies were avoided;
- Inclusive language was used;
- We ensured that the tools and the online platform were accessible and relevant to all genders;
- We actively encouraged and supported the participation of all genders in course activities.
- The gender dimension is not regarded as an isolated issue, but as an intersectional question, in which the cultural and social contextual factors of participants are taken into account in analyzing the results.

5. Data collection process

Explain how the data was collected. Specifically, who collected the data, what methods were employed, through what means, and in what environment?

Data was collected in each phase of the course by Cláudia Neves and Juliana Oliveira. The following methods were used to collect data:

- Surveys and Questionnaires (post online course) using google forms

- Interviews by email after the course (to allow flexibility - Participants could respond at their convenience, allowing them to take time to answer without the pressure of a real-time conversation and more considered answers. Respondents had the opportunity to reflect on their responses and provide more thoughtful, detailed, and well-considered answers, improving data quality).
- Discussion Forums to analyse ideas about the themes, participation levels, and the quality of peer-to-peer interaction.
- Assignment Submissions – to evaluate the depth and breadth of student submissions for assignments, such as proposals for AELD activities and individual written reflections.

Data analysis:

The data were analysed using the content analysis methodology. The content analysis categories provide structuring frameworks for analysing the responses to the questions posed at each stage of the course, allowing researchers to identify recurring themes, patterns and insights about the role of education in democracy and the potential of aesthetic and embodied learning to support democratic understanding and engagement.

6. Creation of the data sets

Briefly describe what kinds of data you collected for the national analysis? List all data obtained during the research process.

Participant Demographics: Age, Gender, Education Level; Characterisation of the Educational Institution, Geographical Location; Educational phase of the participants.

Engagement Data: Module Completion Rates and Interactive Engagement

Feedback on Course Design and Content: Qualitative Feedback on Framework and Guides; Perceptions of Democratic, Education Aesthetic Concepts; Impact of resources and activities carried out; Potential of aesthetic and embodied activities in Education and Democracy; Individual and collective transformation accompanying the activities carried out; The importance of aesthetic and embodied activities to experience democracy in education.

Learning Outcomes: Post-Course Assessments/surveys and reflective Journals or Essays.

Interaction and Collaboration Data: Forum Participation.

Emotional and Sensory Engagement: surveys and interviews.

Creative Submissions: aesthetic and embodied intervention projects and activities.

Technology and Platform Usability: Technical Difficulties and Accessibility.

The data collected were written interviews (5), online surveys (23), online discussions in forums (more than 6 forums where the 23 participants expressed themselves, generating more than 50 discussion topics on the course themes); individual reflections (23); intervention project proposals (23); Photographic records (+100) and videos about the activities carried out (3).

This mix of quantitative and qualitative data provided a comprehensive understanding of how learners engaged with the aesthetic and embodied elements of the course while exploring education for democracy-as-becoming concepts

7. Data management and storage

Where is the data stored, how was it transferred, and through whom? Please elaborate in particular on anonymization, storage of transcripts and/or records, etc.

The data generated during the studies was processed in accordance with the applicable regulations of the Universidade Aberta.

Qualitative data: participants' notes; observation field notes; participants' written reflections (diaries); audiovisual recordings; images, including photos. Among these, datasets that can potentially be published include anonymized observation field notes, participants' written reflections, and metadata associated with audiovisual recordings and images. Sensitive data, such as raw audiovisual recordings and participants' notes containing identifiable information, will remain restricted to ensure compliance with ethical and legal standards. Images and videos that include children will only be published after being properly anonymized and blurred to ensure privacy and adherence to ethical guidelines.

The process of encouraging the availability of research data under Horizon 2020 is being carried out through B2Share, which follows the FAIR principles that data should be searchable (findable), accessible, interoperable and reusable.

The project team will have exclusive use of the data - within the funded period of the project - as the project website becomes available.

The website will be used to publish results, processes and methods, guaranteeing the principle of anonymity of the research subjects.

There are no physical documents, all digital documents are stored in the Universidade Aberta's onedrive.

8. Reflections on the process of data collection

Include an account of where data collection deviated from the case design and how any such deviation affects the robustness of the data. Specifically discuss any lessons learned, challenges, highlighting both successes and areas for improvement and relations to the research questions.

Deviations in Participant Engagement: The original case design expected full engagement from participants throughout the course, including active participation in embodied learning activities and completion of creative assignments. Eleven (11) participants dropped out during the course due to lack of time. Despite these dropouts, the data from more traditional learning components (e.g., discussion forums, surveys and assignments) remained strong. The course design could include more robust measures to maintain engagement, such as periodic check-ins or incentives for completing all activities.

Technical Limitations Impacting Data Collection - The course was designed to include video and multimedia submissions (e.g., learners recording themselves performing or reflecting on embodied tasks). The Moodle platform has storage limitations for uploads. Some learners faced technical difficulties or privacy concerns that prevented them from submitting videos or photos involving children (those who had children or personal data were not submitted). The absence of multimedia submissions was replaced by alternative methods of engagement (e.g., written reflections in place of videos. These videos refer to material shows the result of activities, not any participant image/inclusion)

Unexpected Themes in Qualitative Feedback: The case design focused on measuring how the course's aesthetic and embodied learning activities influenced learners' understanding of democracy-as-becoming. During qualitative interviews and surveys, participants unexpectedly emphasised that the course didn't bring anything new, it just consolidated previous conceptions. This unanticipated data could be used to adjust future research designs to account for emotional and aesthetic aspects of embodied learning, in addition to its civic and democratic dimensions.

In each of these cases, while deviations from the initial design posed challenges, they also revealed areas for improvement and provided unexpected insights, enriching the study and informing future research designs.

Presentation and usability of Framework and Guides:

In Portuguese studies, it was clear that the Guide for early years and primary education was much better accepted and used than the Guide for adult education and professional learning. As for the Framework, all the data points to an interest in the document but difficulty with its density and therefore with reading and understanding it.

9. Preparations for Cross-case Analysis: Memoing

How did you engage in memoing on the Metadata Matrix during or after the research process? How did the memoing influence the case trialling and the PAR process?

After carrying out the studies, the Portuguese team created memos according to the categories of the meta matrix in order to facilitate cross-case analysis.

6.6 UK Case Report

Case Number and Educational Setting:

Case 18: Supporting the Development of Democratic Doctoral Supervision Practices, Adult, Professional and Organisational Learning

Case 19: Supporting Aesthetic and Embodied Learning for Democracy in Secondary Education, Secondary / School teachers

1.	Timeline and steps
Please provide an overview of the phases of your research process until completion. Give an account of the PAR activities taken throughout the process. Please refer to changes and adaptations made during the research process.	
<p>Case 18 – May 2024 to December 2024</p> <p>Data collected by Karen Mpamhanga, Joanne Barber, Suzanne Culshaw, Philip Woods</p> <p>4 cycles which enabled the trialling of the prototype Framework, Guides and aesthetic and embodied learning for democracy in differing institutions and through differing approaches to facilitating engagement with the Framework and Guides.</p> <p>Cycle 1. Doctoral supervisors at institution A.</p> <p>Cycle 2. Doctoral supervisors at institution B.</p> <p>Cycle 3. Doctoral supervisors at a range of institutions, working collectively.</p> <p>Cycle 4. Doctoral supervisors at a range of institutions, working individually.</p> <p>PAR activities: In Cycles 1-3, participants engaged in five PAR phases, facilitated by the researchers. In Cycles 1 & 3, introduction was self-led via video; familiarisation was online; planning and trialling were combined and online for Cycle 3, hybrid for Cycle 1; evaluation was online. Cycle 2 was more condensed, with introduction, familiarisation, planning and trialling happening on one day, in a hybrid format, and evaluation offered online on a different date. Cycle 4 was in a self-directed mode, working through a Companion Guide guiding participants through the Framework, Guides and supporting resources.</p> <p>Changes & adaptation during research process: combining of planning and trialling phases for time efficiency; change of order of cycles, with cycle 2 following cycle 3 due to the challenges of scheduling cycle 2, and then the combining of 4-phases to enable single visit; fewer participants in cycle 4 than anticipated, due to the time requirements for participant engagement.</p> <p>Case 19 – October 2024 to December 2024</p> <p>Data collected by Suzanne Culshaw, Joanne Barber, Philip Woods</p> <p>Case studies. Each case study involved an individual secondary teacher and enabled intensive qualitative data generation/analysis that illuminates the context, complexity and interweaving factors shaping the teacher's interpretation and trialling of the Framework, Guide and aesthetic and embodied learning for democracy (AELD).</p> <p>2 case studies currently in progress:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher 1. A self-directed pedagogical approach where the teacher (following introduction/familiarisation) guided themselves through reflection, planning and actioning a trial of AELD practice - followed by researcher-facilitated reflection and evaluation. • Teacher 2. An immersive pedagogical approach where the teacher undertook introduction, familiarisation, reflection/planning, actioning a trial of AELD and reflection/evaluation collaboratively in a process of co-creation with the researcher. <p>PAR activities: Multiple discussions and rapport established with participants so the process is flexible, responsive and makes clear that the trialled AELD is determined by the teacher in light of their professional setting and interpretation of the Framework/Guide.</p>	

Changes & adaptation during research process: Plans to involve whole or part of an institution (eg, a school) were changed as it became clear that availability to participate was restricted by lack of time. Intensive case studies with teachers able to participate in the required timeframe was adopted as the approach.

2. Participant recruitment

Please describe your way of participant recruitment and in which way participants were involved during the research process.

Case 18

Participants were recruited via an open call from key institutional gatekeepers (Cycles 1 & 2); via personal networks (Cycles 1, 2, 3 & 4), who also shared recruitment information through their own networks; and through a recruitment video posted to LinkedIn and X (formerly Twitter), and an invitation email sent to the Staff and Educational Development Association email list (Cycle 4). These recruitment activities resulted in expressions of interest, and engagement of n=8 participants in Cycle 1, n=8 participants in Cycle 2, n=7 participants in Cycle 3, and n=6 participants in Cycle 4.

In Cycles 1-3, participants watched a video in their own time which introduced the project; they were introduced to the Framework, Guide and supporting resources, and were invited to engage in AELD activities to develop understandings of project underpinnings; they then engaged in collective planning and trialling, working through activities to support planning and enacting an ABE activity to foster professional learning; they then engaged in a group interview which used collage and gesture-response as a means to foster reflection. These activities were carried out in the presence of the research team, and participants were invited to post reflections to a shared online space between phases.

In Cycle 4, participants worked through a Companion Guide, which introduced activities, documents and resources introduced in Cycles 1-3. The researchers were not present. Participants were encouraged to share reflections in a reflective space.

Evaluation of engagement in PAR was carried out through invitations to complete a qualitative questionnaire and engage in group/or individual interviews.

Case 19

Researchers contacted schools, educational associations and individuals that were potential participants and shared invitations to participate via social media platforms such as: LinkedIn and X.

In the research process, methods of data collection were agreed in discussion with participants, who also determined the AELD they trialled.

3. Ethical issues in data collection

What were the key ethical steps taken? Please describe your ethical considerations related to communication, information, voluntary participation, transparency, power dynamics, etc., within your process.

Cases 18 and 19

- approval by University of Hertfordshire ethics committee of ethics applications (one for each case) that specified: the applicants; details of how participants would be involved, where the study would be located, and any necessary permissions; assessment of harms, hazards, risks; information about participants, confidentiality, consent (including reference to personal data), use/storage of data and any rewards
- each participant was given an information sheet which includes information on: study title; purpose; the right to withdraw at any point; the approach to gaining informed consent; any restrictions on participation; how long they will be engaged in the project and what they will do; possible disadvantages and benefits of taking part; confidentiality; audio-visual material; what will happen to the data collected; who reviewed the study; what happens if factors that put others at risk are identified by the study; contact details of those who can answer questions about the study (i.e., the researchers) and who to contact within University of Hertfordshire if there are complaints/concerns about the study. Opportunities given for participants to ask questions or seek clarifications about the project.
- each participant invited to sign consent form or complete an email consent statement
- to be participatory, researchers built collaborative relationships with participants, carrying out the research so it is flexible and responsive to participants (e.g., scheduling sessions to suit participants, being recognisant of the time commitments) and aimed to be transformative for participants.

- researchers are reflexive about: power differences (eg, that researchers may be seen as occupying a privileged position in relation to research methods and innovative design of aesthetic and embodied pedagogies); how their actions (in oral, written and embodied communications with participants) can best foster genuinely participatory research with diverse participants; engaging with participants recruited from a range of contexts, some of whom are known previously by the researchers

4. Gender-Dimension

Explain in which ways gender became relevant in your PAR process.

Invitations to participate in the UK cases were designed to be as clear and concise as possible. The purpose was to enable those who might be interested to identify what the research was essentially about and whether it engaged with their professional priorities as educators and hence attracted their interest. This approach was intended to be accessible and engaging whatever the gender of potential participants. Once recruited, researchers were responsive to participants (for example, in arranging sessions at convenient times, offering repeat sessions when necessary and in responding to participants' questions and preferences) so that they felt comfortable and accommodated. In this way, differences amongst participants in relation to their preferences and needs in relation to the research (whether as a result of gender or other variables) were accommodated. Throughout the research, gender stereotypes were avoided, inclusive language was used and it was clear that participation was not dependent on gender.

5. Data collection process

Explain how the data was collected. Specifically, who collected the data, what methods were employed, through what means, and in what environment?

Case 18

Data collected by Karen Mpamhanga, Joanne Barber, Suzanne Culshaw, Philip Woods

Data were collected from participants by researchers, who are all members of the UK team and named in the ethics applications and subsequent approvals, through the following means:

- Video recording (and transcripts), screenshots and photographs of reflective activities that participants were engaged in, both online and face-to-face.
- Recordings of face-to-face and online sessions (and transcripts), carried out by the researchers.
- Outputs from the activities in the face-to-face sessions, generated by researchers and participants), which were photographed and transcribed (where appropriate), or screenshot or photographed in the online environment.
- Audio/video recordings of online group interviews, including arts-based and embodied methods (collage and gesture response), and the transcripts, facilitated by researchers.
- Audio/video recordings of individual online interviews, facilitated by the researchers
- Qualitative self-completion questionnaires, administered through Microsoft Forms

Researchers generated data from their own observations and reflections through:

- Researcher fieldnotes and reflections which include researchers' creative expressions

Case 19

Data collected by: Suzanne Culshaw, Joanne Barber, Marie Toseland, Philip Woods

Data are collected from participants by researchers, who are all members of the UK team and named in the ethics applications and subsequent approvals, through the following means:

- Reflective activities
- Recordings of face-to-face and online researcher-participant meetings
- Outputs from the activities in the researcher-participant meetings, including arts-based & embodied methods of data generation
- Individual interviews

Researchers generated data from their own observations and reflections through:

- Researcher fieldnotes and reflections which include researchers' creative expressions and autoethnography

Challenges included plans to involve whole or part of an institution (eg, a school) being changed as it became clear that availability to participate was restricted by lack of time. Intensive case studies with teachers able to participate in the required timeframe was adopted as the approach.

6. Creation of the data sets

Briefly describe what kinds of data you collected for the national analysis? List all data obtained during the research process.

Case 18

Data generated as follows, all digitally stored:

- Textual data scanned/photographed (e.g. results of reflective activities, notes of interviews, researcher fieldnotes, transcripts)
- Audio-visual recordings (e.g. of face-to-face and online sessions, individual and group interviews, arts-based and embodied methods of data generation, researchers' creative expressions)
- Qualitative self-completion questionnaires
- Photographs of outputs from the activities in the sessions and researchers' creative expressions

A total of 29 participants have engaged with Case 18. With n=23 in Cycles 1-3 and n=6 in Cycle 4.

This has resulted in audio-visual recordings from 17 sessions, with associated transcripts and researcher notes; images of activities in sessions in the 4 in-person parts of the hybrid sessions, and images shared from the participants in the online sessions. This includes 5 online collage-informed data generation sessions, with resulting audio-visual recordings, transcripts, notes, and images of collages.

At the time of writing (20.12.2024) there have been 11 questionnaire responses across all cycles; 3 short written participant reflections; and 3 completed interviews, and there is potential to receive a small number of reflections or qualitative questionnaire data before the end of the data collection window (31.12.2024). There are 8 researcher creative expressions (images of an iterative collage, haikus, and end-of-case researcher reflective collages) and researcher notes .

Case 19

Data generated as follows, all digitally stored:

- Textual data scanned/photographed (e.g. results of reflective activities, notes of interviews, researcher fieldnotes and autoethnography notes)
- Audio-visual recordings (e.g. of face-to-face and online researcher-participant meetings, individual interviews, arts-based and embodied methods of data generation, researchers' creative expressions in fieldnotes and autoethnography notes)
- Photographs of outputs from the activities in the sessions and researchers' creative expressions in fieldnotes and autoethnography notes)

At the time of writing (20.12.2024), a total of 5 participants have engaged with Case 19. With n=4 self-directed cases and n=1 immersive case.

Self-directed cases: There is potential to receive 4 reflections or completed qualitative questionnaires before the end of the data collection window (31.12.2024)

Immersive case: This has resulted in 12 audio-visual recordings from 4 in-person sessions, with associated researcher notes and creative reflections (images of 'doodles' and drawings, haikus), as well as transcripts. Outside of these sessions, there are additional researcher written and creative reflections (drawings), including 2 end-of-case researcher reflective collages. There are also written participant reflections, copies of lesson plan(s)/planned activity/ies and anonymised samples of student-generated (AI) images.

7. Data management and storage

Where is the data stored, how was it transferred, and through whom? Please elaborate in particular on anonymization, storage of transcripts and/or records, etc.

Data are stored in the University of Hertfordshire OneDrive, which provides secure, multi-factor-identification storage. Digitally photographed or scanned physical data are stored in this way, and the original physical data dismantled (such as collages) or destroyed (hand-written notes). Only named members of the UK research team are given access to the OneDrive files. Participants are made aware of the data storage arrangements, and who has access to these data, through

Participant Information Sheets. Modified data, that is research data which have been anonymised, may be shared with the wider AECED project consortium. If it is shared, it is shared securely, through the Consortium-wide Teams Channel, Lucit, where only named project partners have access; via a secure file exchange, such as Exchange File, or via zipped, password protected files.

The process of pseudonymisation concerning audio-visual (video) recordings of participants stored on the UH OneDrive is underway. This will involve the removal of participants' names, and thumbnails from the automatically generated Zoom and Teams transcripts and the removal of the names of other people referred to in the discussions. Due to the nature of the audio-visual recordings, which capture participants' visual identities and surroundings, some identifiable data will remain in these recordings. Participants were made aware of this through Participant Information Sheets and gave informed consent for the retention of this personal data. Pseudonymisation will also involve the redacting of names on any participant-produced materials. Photographs of participants' ABE outputs are anonymised and exclude visual identities.

All data and recordings stored as data on the UH OneDrive will be deleted from the OneDrive 60 months after the completion of the project.

8. Reflections on the process of data collection

Include an account of where data collection deviated from the case design and how any such deviation affects the robustness of the data. Specifically discuss any lessons learned, challenges, highlighting both successes and areas for improvement and relations to the research questions.

Case 18

Case 18 has resulted in rich, deep and authentic data. The case has used a range of qualitative data collection activities, including ABER approaches which reflect the spirit of the wider AECED project. Data collection promoted dialogue, participant agency, voice and reflection. The case worked with diverse participants from different higher education institutions and discipline areas, drawing on democratic approaches to foster engagement. The 'hook' of democratic doctoral supervisory practice was effective, and participants demonstrated a genuine interest in the project, and resonated with its aims.

The main challenge during the data collection period has been time. Processes have taken time, e.g., gaining ethical approval, securing permission to access participants, scheduling sessions to meet participant needs. Concurrently, the time-commitment required to engage with the project meant that some interested parties decided not to participate. We were aware of the time constraints of participants and looked to adapt activities, sessions and timeframes to accommodate. Opportunities to further engage with participants over a longer period of time would have been welcomed – but would have required further time-commitment from participants, which might have been difficult to achieve. Recruitment to the self-led cycle was lower than hoped, perhaps reflecting again the challenges of finding time to engage in professional learning opportunities independently.

Case 19

Plans to involve the whole or part of an institution (eg, a school and/or a charitable organisation supporting secondary education) were changed as it became clear that availability to participate was restricted by lack of time on the part of the institutions and relevant staff. The focus of the case then became single-teacher case studies with teachers able to participate in the required timeframe. A lesson learnt was the pressures and limitations that restrict professional development time in the secondary education sector.

There are advantages to the single-teacher case studies. The immersive case enables intensive, responsive and emergent qualitative data generation: this helps address the AECED research questions by illuminating the context, complexity and interweaving factors shaping the educator's interpretation, translation and experience of the Framework, Guides and AELD. The self-directed case studies create trials that more closely resemble the situation with the launched AECED resources where educators download and work through these themselves.

9. Preparations for Cross-case Analysis: Memoing

How did you engage in memoing on the Metadata Matrix during or after the research process? How did the memoing influence the case trialling and the PAR process?

Cases 18 and 19

We have yet to begin memoing via the Metadata Matrix. We are aware that we will be doing this and have discussed this; that awareness contributes to framing our thinking about our reflections, plans for (cross-case) analysis and writing up insights into the redesign of the Framework and Guides.

References

- ⁱ McDonald, B. (2021). Professional Power Struggles in Participatory Research. *Journal of Participatory Research Methods*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.35844/001c.18692>
- ⁱⁱ Rhoades, M. (2021, February 23). Arts-Based Pedagogy and Gender Equity. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education. Retrieved 13 Dec. 2024, from <https://oxfordre.com/education/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264093-e-1348>
- ⁱⁱⁱ Desmond, J. C. (1993). Embodying Difference: Issues in Dance and Cultural Studies. *Cultural Critique*, 26, 33–63. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1354455>
- ^{iv} Andreoli, G.S. (2019). Dance and Gender Relations: A Reflection on the Interaction between Male and Female Students in Dance Classes. *Journal of Education & Social Policy*.
- ^v Marta Miranda da Costa Pinto. (2021, June 18). Embodying race – cultural reproduction of ideals of aesthetics, gender and ethnicity in contemporary dance auditions. *Master Arts, Culture & Society*. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/2105/60960>
- ^{vi} Oliver, W., & Risner, D. (Eds.). (2017). *Dance and Gender: An Evidence-Based Approach*. University Press of Florida. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvx1ht59>
- ^{vii} Harcourt, W. (2022). Body Politics. In L. Shepherd, & C. Hamilton (Eds.), *Gender Matters in Global Body Politics: A Feminist Introduction to International Relations* Taylor & Francis Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003036432>
- ^{viii} Eurostat. (2022). Students enrolled in tertiary education by education level, programme orientation, sex and field of education. https://doi.org/10.2908/EDUC_UOE_ENRT03