
Defining Educational Research: A Perspective of/on Presidential Addresses and the Australian Association for Research in Education¹

Bob Lingard

The University of Queensland

Trevor Gale

University of South Australia

Abstract

This paper is concerned with the definition of the field of educational research and the changing and developing role of the Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE) in representing and constituting this field. The evidence for the argument is derived from AARE Presidential Addresses across its 40-year history. The paper documents the enhanced complexity and diversity of the field over these 40 years, including the emergence of a global educational policy field, theoretical and methodological developments in the social sciences and new research accountabilities such as the Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) measure. Specifically, the paper suggests that the evidence-based movement in public management and education policy, and the introduction of the ERA, potentially limit and redefine the field of educational research, reducing the usefulness and relevance of educational research to policy makers and practitioners. This arises from a failure to recognise that Education is both a field of research and a field of policy and practice. Located against both developments, the paper argues for a principled eclecticism framed by a reassessment of quality, which can be applied to the huge variety of methodologies, theories, epistemologies and topics legitimately utilised and addressed within the field of educational research. At the same time, the paper argues the need to globalise the educational research imagination and deparochialise educational research. This call is located within a broader argument suggesting the need for a new social imaginary (in a post-neoliberal context of the global financial crisis) to frame educational policy and practice and the contribution that educational theory and research might make to its constitution. In relation to this, the paper considers the difficulties that political representations of such a new imaginary

might entail for the President and the Association, given the variety of its membership and huge diversity of its research interests.

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to plot, evaluate and contribute to definitions of education research and its functions and purposes in a changing world, and to consider its impact, broadly defined, in actual and desirable or normative terms. We seek to do this from the perspective of the Australian Association for Education Research (AARE), the premier and omnibus association of education researchers in Australia. In particular, our analysis draws on the Presidential Addresses delivered at the Association's Annual Conference since its inception in 1970, specifically those from 1974,² when the practice of publishing these Addresses in the Association's journal, the "Australian Educational Researcher" (AER), first began.

We use our research on the Addresses to capture issues in education research, which have been traversed in differing ways, sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly, by these Addresses. These include defining education research as a field, including AARE's location within that field and the positionings of the Presidents and their respective Addresses therein. They also include the questions of the purposes of education research, which implies as well the issue of the readership or audiences for such research. The latter then touches on matters of dissemination and publication and diffusion and impact more broadly. This raises matters of publication and the various and competing outlets for publication of education research, nationally and increasingly on an international scale. Issues of quality, including associated politics, also come into play; quality, however, is a complex concept when applied to the diversity of education research (Moss et al., 2009). The Howard Government's Research Quality Framework (RQF) and the Rudd Government's Excellence in Research Assessment (ERA) are specific Australian policy manifestations of this focus on research quality and research accountability. The research assessment exercise in the UK (the RAE) is perhaps the best known and longest running of these research accountability exercises and has influenced the development of similar exercises throughout the world (Coryn, 2008). Questions of the relationships of education research to education policy and practice are also important in its very definition and have become more significant in state policies framed by new public management that call for evidence-based policy (Watson, 2008; Gale & Wright, 2008; Lingard, 2008; Wiseman, 2010). Another way of thinking of this relationship is as impact.

We traverse this range of matters later in this paper. Before doing so we reflect upon how we might define education research. One way of considering this is to distinguish between intellectual resources and topic. We might say that the intellectual resources of

education research are those of contemporary social science, in both theoretical and methodological senses. This would include the plethora of theoretical developments, as well as methodological ones cutting across the (perhaps) obsolete binary of qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Both theory and methodologies in the social sciences have also been challenged by the postnational or transnational realities of a globalised world, a matter to which we return later in this paper. The distinctive feature of education research among the social sciences then might be seen to be its focus: that is, education research involves the use of the intellectual resources of the social sciences and applies them to the institutions and practices of education. However, the changes associated with what Bernstein (2001) has called the “totally pedagogised society” and what Thomson (2006) has called the “pedagogisation of everyday life”, mean that we need to extend the institutional and practice focus of education research. These processes have seen pedagogies more evident across the social system and thus the widening of the potential institutional focus of education research. We might see this as demanding the deparochialisation of the institutional and practice foci of education research. Michael Young (1996) has spoken of the de-differentiation of educational institutions as we move towards what some describe as a knowledge society with an emphasis on learning across all professions and in all workplaces. The institutional and practice foci of education research then has broadened considerably with these developments, namely, institutional de-differentiation and the inflation of the pedagogisation of everyday life associated with the knowledge economy and learning as a central trope.

In our view education research also encompasses practitioner research, which involves methodologies and theories from the social sciences and their application to issues of practice in education and its improvement. However, we do not mean or want to limit practitioner research to action research alone (see Campbell & Groundwater-Smith, 2009). Nor do we seek to denigrate action research, but to suggest that practitioners (teachers and policy makers in all education sectors) can and ought to participate in other types of education research. Indeed, our position would be that education practitioners should have what we might call a “researchly disposition”. This means all education practitioners, policy makers and teachers, should be interested in research and knowledge production and see themselves as participants in the field of educational research broadly defined. Educational professionals should be research-informed, but also research-informing. The other side of this is that education researchers located in universities and research institutes should also have an educative or “pedagogical disposition” (Lingard & Renshaw, 2009), that is, they should have commitment to improving both policy and practice and disseminating their research findings. Certainly at least one past President, Leo Bartlett, held such a position:

If we accept that research is educational to the extent that it engages the practice of education educatively, then the focus of debate among our

membership must surely be the state of education in Australia. (Bartlett, 1989, p. 28)

Bartlett made this observation in an attempt to challenge what he refers to as a “third person science”, a conception of knowledge producers separated from and located in a hierarchical relationship with educational practitioners. Implicit here is a translation model of educational research and a depiction of active researchers and passive practitioners. This is a model, which valorises third person science and regards teachers as the mere objects of educational research, that was reinstated in US developments in educational research during the GW Bush Presidency. We eschew such a hierarchical binary, while also demanding the creation of a concept of quality that can be applied to all types of educational research (Furlong & Oancea, 2006, Moss et al., 2009), while at the same time recognising that research of all types needs to be disseminated in different ways to different readerships for different purposes. Impact refers then to the effects of educational research on professional practices, but effects also work through academic publications and the contribution to knowledge (Lingard, 2001). We need to recognise then that education is both a field of research and a field of policy and pedagogical practices.³

We acknowledge that in writing about such matters we speak from positions of power in these relationships, indeed within the field of educational research, at least within its Australian sub-field. Our challenging of traditional accounts of what constitutes educational research and education researchers is possible in part because of where we are located in the field. The positionality of practitioners means that they are not always able to speak to this. But for us, we are both past presidents of the Association, both sociologists of education, both male and so on, which necessarily means that we **see** particular things rather than others. Our positionality has effects and demands “reflexivity”. This selectivity, of course, includes the choice of Addresses included in our core data set, the criteria for which we return to later, that is, those Addresses which form the empirical basis of our argument here about the changing nature of educational research. Selectivity is also involved in the exclusion of some Presidential Addresses from this data set, but we note that in deciding on this we read all of them and all have informed this paper.

It is important for us to recognise these matters and not just leave them to our readers to discern, for as critical sociologists they require us to reflect on our own subjectivities and positions in the field, to objectify them as Bourdieu would say. It is because of this reflexivity that we believe we are better able to recognise the value of the positions of others, as well as the flaws in our own. Indeed, this reflexivity and recognition of our positionality (ie. the rejection of epistemological innocence in Bourdieu’s terms), we hope, has enabled a generosity in our readings of the Presidential Addresses and

in relation to the varieties of educational research.⁴ This does not mean that there cannot be or should not be disagreements, of multiple kinds, among and between educational researchers, but to acknowledge that such productive disagreements contribute to the development of education research, to the conversations of education practitioners and indeed to the broader conversations of humanity.

We add one final caveat in this introduction. In our view, globalization has thrown out some serious challenges to research methodologies and epistemologies. However, we need to be careful not to reify globalization as the conceptual “explain all” of new phenomena in education (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). At the same time, we also need to be wary of the constraints of methodological and theoretical nationalism and the assumption in our educational research that society is homologous with nation. In Appadurai’s (2001) terms, we need to “globalise the research imagination” and work with a strong version of the internationalization of higher education, which moves beyond the apparent reality of theory being produced within the academies of the nations of the global north and researchers in the nations of the global south simply taking their nationally-bound research sites as places for the empirical application of these theories developed elsewhere. Connell (2007) in “Southern Theory” similarly comments on the dangers of implicitly assuming that northern theory is synonymous with the universal. Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) makes the complementary point about the association between research and colonialism for many postcolonial peoples. Appadurai, Connell and Tuhiwai Smith are suggesting the need to “deparochialise” educational research.

In another more recent essay in which he reflects again on the need today to globalise the research imagination, Appadurai (2006) has argued (almost *a la* Stenhouse) for an ecumenical and broad definition of research as simply the capacity to do systematic inquiry and to make that inquiry public. Indeed, Appadurai sustains an argument that a researchly disposition should be conceptualised as a basic human right and that this is central to active citizenship in an age of globalization, when citizenship needs to be imagined beyond the nation. We agree with Appadurai and concur with his position that a researchly disposition ought to be central to practitioner habitus in education.

We turn next to an articulation of the criteria for selecting Presidential Addresses as central data for our analysis. This is followed by an outline of the themes that we see as cohering the field of educational research in Australia as manifested in our reading of AARE’s published Presidential Addresses since 1974. In the conclusion, we move to a consideration of the significance of the emergence of the postnational (Appadurai, 1996) or transnational (Vertovec, 2009) for social theory, epistemologies and methodologies and their implications for educational research. We locate these considerations against the potentially narrowing and disciplining effects of emergent

research accountabilities (Blackmore, 2008; Lingard, 2008). We conclude with a succinct reading of developments and possibilities in educational research as mediated by AARE and rapidly changing social, political, temporal and spatial contexts.

The Selection of Presidential Addresses as Data Base

Eleven AARE Presidential Addresses formed the core data set that informed our analysis – largely from an Australian and AARE perspective – of the definitions of educational research over time and its functions and purposes in a changing world. This includes Addresses by: Bill Radford (1974), Barry McGaw (1976), Millicent Poole (1979), Leo Bartlett (1988), Helen Hocking (now Helen Dunn) (1989), Richard Smith (1992), Fazal Rizvi (1996), Judyth Sachs (1997), Lyn Yates (1998), Peter Renshaw (2001), and Jan Wright (2007). They were chosen according to the extent to which they could be seen to be:

- Indicative of particular issues within AARE and within educational research, the relations between these, and also indicative of social, political and economic issues more broadly;
- Significant in their own right, as firsts: first published, first by a woman, first to be overtly political, first delivered offshore in Asia and concerned with Asia-Australia relations in educational research, and first focused on theory;
- Representative of the four decades of the Association's existence; and
- Scholarly works in their own right and indicative of the genre of Presidential Addresses.

We articulate our selection criteria here so as to show that we are not innocent in the history we have constructed, and that we also desire our account to be open to critical analysis by others. For the purposes of our analysis, Addresses needed to meet at least three of these criteria and preferably all four. Informing our thinking first and foremost were matters to do with the historical and emerging character of the Association and related changes in the definitions of educational research and researchers.

In terms of historical representations and the complex melange of residual, dominant, emergent and contested themes in educational research, we can see in the three papers from the 1970s (Radford, McGaw and Poole) the first small steps away from the dominance of educational psychology, as clearly indicated by Poole in her expressed concern that the hegemony of educational psychology might be replaced by an hegemony of the sociology of education. This concern should be seen in the context of Radford's role and the significance of ACER in the formation of the Association, specifically its educational psychological orientation. McGaw also suggested that, given

the complexity of educational research and practices, educational psychology was necessary, but not sufficient for defining the field of educational research.

The two papers from the late 1980s (Bartlett, Hocking) are significant for a number of reasons. First, Bartlett calls for the politicisation of the Association and a broader political impact for educational research, along with a rejection of the putative neutrality of educational research. He called for a rejection of what he referred to as third person science. Hocking's Address is significant in that she contextualises her argument against the AERA and BERA presidential addresses of the previous year. Her Address also provides an empirically based and theorised account of the actual and desired relationships between educational research and policy production, that is, she gives an account of one aspect of research impact. It is also significant to note that Hocking is the last non-academic president of the Association and one of only three in the Association's forty-year history. For example, Radford was director of ACER, Barry McGaw when president was a university professor, but was the director of a state department of education research branch when he initially took on the role, while Helen Hocking was also employed in a state department of education research branch.

Richard Smith's Address of 1992 is political in Bartlett's sense, in that Smith's major concerns were the move from elite to mass higher education spawned by the Dawkins reforms and their potential impact on educational research and the work of AARE. This issue of the role and place of research in schools of education in the Dawkins universities, where most teachers are educated, remains a pressing concern for educational research in Australia and for the Association. Similar matters abound in the UK, where large numbers of teachers are educated in schools of education which receive no government research funding.

The Addresses by Rizvi (1996), Sachs (1997) and Yates (1998) from the late 1990s are also all overtly political in various ways. Implicitly postcolonial in orientation, Rizvi's Address challenges the silent ethnocentrism and nationally-bound character of Australian educational research. This stretches the concept of the political in educational research from national concerns first emerging in Bartlett's Address to more postcolonial and global concerns. Yates (1998), as with Hocking (1989), situates her Address against contemporaneous critiques of educational research at that time by Hargreaves and Tooley in the United Kingdom. Judyth Sachs' 1997 Address is in one sense a theorised rearticulation of some of the concerns expressed in earlier presidentials by Radford and McGaw. Sachs distinguishes between research **on** and **for** education and theorises practitioner research, while rejecting a conception of research/practitioner relationships as outlined by Radford, as simply one-way and instrumental in character. Indeed, Sachs wants to see researchers and practitioners as collaborative partners, rejecting the conception of practitioners as merely the objects of research.

Finally, we included two papers from the first decade of the twenty-first century, selected on the basis of the significance of the issues they raise: the first by Peter Renshaw (2001), the second by Jan Wright (2007). Renshaw follows in the long tradition of educational psychology and its significance within the field of educational research and within the work of the Association. However, his Address is framed by what we might see as the new educational psychology, which is grounded in socio-cultural and constructivist theory, and which has since formed the basis for an influential special interest group within the Association⁵. In his Address, Renshaw wants to scaffold the Association as a community of learners, while being aware of the potentially excluding character of community and indeed of the first person plural (we) to refer to the Association. Wright's Address recognises the significance of theory to adequate social explanation in empirically based research in education and indeed in the broader social sciences. To some it might appear as a paradox that a researcher in the field of health and physical education (Wright) argued such a case for theory in a presidential address. However, given the status and international standing of Australian theory and research in this field, and Wright's place within it, her focus is hardly surprising.

Among Presidential firsts, we selected William Radford's Address because it was the first to be published in the AER; a precedent followed through to the present time. In a sense, it is also the first Radford Lecture: the series of Lectures delivered each year at the Association's annual conference and named after Radford in his honour⁶. Millicent Poole's Address was the first by a woman president, reflecting the impact of second wave feminism in Australia from the early 1970s onwards and especially in the field of education. We have included her Address on these grounds and because she canvassed the emerging tensions between educational psychologists and sociologists within the educational research community. We have also included Leo Bartlett's address, written at the time of the Hawke Labor Government, because it appears to demonstrate another turning point in the perceived role of the Association, namely the politicisation of educational research and the politicisation of AARE. Bartlett sees very broad political purposes for educational research, extending to researchers' roles as public intellectuals helping to define civil society and inform broader public and democratic debates about education and its purposes. Bartlett saw a public pedagogy role for educational researchers, which could be seen as reflecting an understanding that both cultural production and reproduction are pedagogical in character. Bartlett was also the first president to politicise the presidency to the extent that he prepared a campaign ticket for the election, which among other things argued for a broadening of the membership and implicitly at least demanded a broadened definition of the category "educational researchers".

Fazal Rizvi's 1996 Address is included because it was the first to be delivered offshore in Asia (outside Australia and New Zealand) and the first to canvass the ethnocentrism

of Australian educational research. He saw this as related to the failure to locate Australia within the Asia-Pacific; rather, educational research was most often positioned as an outpost of North American and European intellectual traditions and framed by “Northern Theory”. The holding of the conference in Singapore and the focus of Rizvi’s Address can be contextualised against the Keating’s Government’s desire for greater Asia literacy in Australian politics and education. JanWright’s 2007 Address was the first to explicitly address the necessity of theory in good educational research. Wright has a reputation as an important theorist in physical and health education, a discipline with a history as one of the strongest special interest groups in the Association. Her Address should also be contextualised against what she perceived as the potential narrowing of the field related to the establishment of new research accountabilities in Australia.

This broadening definition can be contrasted with the membership addressed in Radford’s 1974 presidential address, which primarily comprised “professional educational researchers” located in educational research institutes, state department research branches or university schools of education. We note, however, that Don Anderson, the eminent Australian National University sociologist, was also President of the Association in 1985. His involvement indicates some of the debates about the definition of educational research, that is, is it defined simply by its topic or by an idiosyncratic theory and methodology; as does Helen Hocking’s Presidential in that it was concerned with the important relationship between educational research and policy making and in fact drew on her then recently completed PhD thesis at the University of Tasmania. This concern about the relationship of educational research to not only educational policy production, but also to leadership and teacher practices in schools, has been ongoing for the Association since its inception. As we have already noted, Bartlett picks up on this in his descriptor “educational” rather than “education” research (also see Griffiths, 1998). We also note that Bartlett’s address was one of the first to be framed by broader social theory, rather than derived from psychology. Bartlett drew heavily on the modernist Frankfurt School of Critical Theorist Jurgen Habermas; a theoretical focus also underpinning the work at the time of Richard Smith.

The Presidential Addresses could be seen as a particular genre, but one that has developed over time. Its purpose would appear to both reflect and direct the field of education research and the work of the Association, or at least some part of these. Often this reflection / direction is contextualised in relation to developments in the field and to broader political developments. In the early years of the Association these reflections were bounded by national considerations, later challenged by global developments, both within and outside the field and the Association. As with all genre, Presidential Addresses have certain organisational and lexical features. They are in some ways similar to academic papers, but framed by a more authoritative authorial voice; indeed, the Addresses could be seen to be positioned within a magisterial discourse (Bourdieu &

Passeron, 1977). Some addresses as well reflect and direct the field through meta-accounts of the President's own research and positioning within the field. The position of President also appears to provide a justification for the authoritative voice of addresses, while they always attempt to speak to the "we" of the Association and of educational researchers, thus discursively constituting a community in this articulation and speaking constructively across difference.

This magisterial discourse also works to mask the subjective interests of presidents, their individual research interests and their institutional locations. To paraphrase Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992, p. 194), identifying them as AARE Presidents speaking to the Association is not devoid of implications, but forces us to consider the relations between the two that are speaking through the President's mouth. Presidents both come to the position with authority in the field and gain authority (academic distinction) in the field from being President. The Presidency provides opportunity, for example, to conduct symposia at AERA and BERA, to publish an Address in the Association's journal, to be involved in the formation of postnational associations of educational research, and to have input into government policy formation in respect of research and research accountabilities. The Presidential Address is always delivered by individuals who may or may not embody the broad collective interests of the Association, or be representative of its membership, as a whole or in part. Hocking refers to AARE as a "hidden college of educational researchers". We would see Presidential Addresses assuming this hidden college as their implicit listeners and readers, while at the same also helping to constitute the boundaries of this college and its defining logics of practice. We would also note how influential some Presidents became in subsequent career moves.

Finally, without being critical of presidents, we note the deafening silence about concerns about Indigenous education across the forty years of the Association's existence. Working against the silence has been the inauguration by the Association of the Betty Watts award for Indigenous research and researchers and consideration of researching Indigenous education in respect of ethical issues and political power relations in conducting research.

Issues in Education Research Defined by Presidents' Addresses

There is a number of issues that appear to have been the foci of Presidential Addresses from 1970 at the Association's foundation, to the present. While recognising that these are issues constructed by the professional association of education researchers and its presidents, we also believe that they are issues central to the definition and politics of education research more broadly. We see the issues as being constructed around two broad domains. The first is consumed with considerations of definition, for example, "how **do** we" and "how **ought** we" define education research. The second set of issues congeals around considerations of the role of AARE as the professional association

representing the interests of educational researchers. The construction of the role of AARE also reaches out to matters of membership. We deal with these two broad domains in turn.

We have already noted the significance of the different nomenclature of **education** and **educational** research. The former appears to simply define the topic of research described as education research, while the latter suggests a more educative and pedagogical function of research on the topic of education, although education research can have an educative effect for those who read and take account of its findings. Educational research suggests that research so defined has a function in relation to the improvement of education policy and practices. This is reflected in what we see as a necessary pedagogical disposition for educational research and researchers, that is, a commitment to broader dissemination of research findings beyond publication in high status, international, refereed journals. We note as well, however, how contemporary policy around research accountabilities and internal university policies regarding appointment, tenure and promotion now valorise these kind of publications, rather than those written explicitly for practitioners and policy makers. We would also suggest that “the other” to this pedagogical disposition ought to be a researcherly disposition in those working as policy makers in education, educational leaders and practitioners. What we mean by this descriptor is an openness of all of these practitioners to findings, understanding and enlightenment to be derived from a critical reading of educational research. These matters go to the heart of research on/for education. Normatively, we believe educational research should work across and eschew this binary.

In the first Presidential Address published in the AER, Bill Radford defined educational research as an activity carried out by researchers located either in universities, research institutes or the research branches of large state education bureaucracies. This definition denied a conception of practitioners or policy makers as either potential or actual education researchers. Radford constructed the relation between education researchers/education research and practitioners/policy makers as unidirectional, requiring translation of research findings for both of these groups and their fields. This definition, of course, reflected the membership – approximately 150 foundation members – who were either professional researchers in research institutes, state departments or located in universities. We note that more than 90% of the foundation membership was male. There has been considerable feminisation of the membership since that time. Implicit in Radford’s definitional work was the acceptance that educational research was synonymous with educational psychology and educational psychology defined in a particular way.

All of these matters raised in the Radford presidential have been challenged by subsequent presidents. Interestingly, we would see this professional and narrow definition of educational research as standing in contrast with the ambience of rapid social change and progressive policy making associated with the Whitlam Government (1972-1975) and related progressive changes in North America and Europe – perhaps more evidence that the “sixties” did not reach Australia until the mid-seventies; almost at the dawn of the dismantling of progressive Keynesianism and the emergent hegemony of neo-liberalism ushered in by Thatcher (1979), Reagan (1981) and Deng Xiao Peng (1979).

Another issue across the Presidential Addresses are the questions “who are educational researchers?” and “who should they be?”. This definition is extended over the history of the Association to include an increasingly wider variety of researchers, practitioner-researchers and policy-making researchers.

Across the Presidential Addresses there is a construction of educational research as contributing to understanding and enlightenment, as well as the contribution to improvement in practices. Trowler (2003) makes an important distinction here between enlightenment and engineering relationships between research and practice. There are tensions between these two purposes in the Presidents’ broadening definition of education research and researchers. Barry McGaw, for example, suggests that educational research must be distinguished from educational psychology research and that educational phenomena are too complex to be understood through the lens of educational psychological research alone.

To this point we have noted the multiple audiences for educational research as including the field of educational researchers, educational practitioners and policy makers in education. Bartlett in his 1988 Presidential Address, challenges this perspective, which he saw to be limited in its political reach. Drawing on the work of German critical theorist Jurgen Habermas, Bartlett argued that educational research and educational researchers should also contribute to the democratic conversations of the broader polity, civil society and humanity. His view was that educational research and researchers could make a positive contribution to these conversations and to progressive education policy making. Ten years later, Yates in her 1998 Presidential Address endorsed this broader function for educational research.⁷ As we have noted several times, Bartlett prefers the descriptor educational rather than education research because of his stance that educational research should engage the practices and policies of education “educatively”. In some ways, this is a re-articulation of the improvement agenda associated with some earlier definitions of education research. In his argument about the contribution that education researchers ought to make to the democratic polity, Bartlett suggests that educational researchers should take on a public pedagogue role. Thus Bartlett’s definition of educational research and its political involvements demand that educational researchers

have what we might call a pedagogical disposition. This disposition demands that there be multiple modes of dissemination of educational research relevant to its various potential audiences. Such dissemination stretches from high status, internationally recognised, peer reviewed journals through to magazines of teacher associations and op-ed opinion pieces in newspapers. Bartlett's presidential also implied the need for a more overtly political role for AARE in public and policy debates and a more outward looking disposition, including a call for an expanded AARE membership and alliances with other cognate academic and research-orientated groups. This approach can be seen in relation to the neo-corporatist policy processes which were utilised by the Hawke / Keating Government in the 1980s, which managed policy processes through dealing with peak representative bodies. This approach articulated by Bartlett can be contrasted with Radford's more professional definition of educational research and more inward looking functions for AARE and narrower conception of its membership.

Bartlett called for more politically committed education research and within that commitment recognised the need for theory within it. It is interesting, however, that the explicit place of theory in education research was not a major theme of a presidential address until that of Jan Wright in 2007, even though several Addresses, Jill Blackmore's for example, were deeply theoretical in orientation and theoretically informed.

On the point of theory and politically committed research, we also note the significance of Australian feminist research in education and its global recognition and impact (Yates, 2008), the framework that imbued both Lyn Yates and Jill Blackmore's (2003) Presidential Addresses. Wright's call for more theory and indeed the need for theory in education research was set in the context of governments increasingly attempting to set research agendas and research priorities with implications for valorised methodologies and theories, either implicit or explicit within these political agendas. For example, as Jean Anyon (2009) has recently pointed out, the Bush government in the USA attempted to construct "empirically randomised control trials" as the "gold standard" for assessing educational research and for evaluating all research applications and failed to recognise the significance of theory to social explanation in educational research. The situation in the UK has been similar (see Ozga, Seddon, & Popkewitz, 2006). As Anyon argues, this has witnessed the devaluing of qualitative studies and the use of systematic theory in the field of educational research. Wright and Anyon both argue, and we strongly agree with their stance here, that theory is necessary to understanding and explanation within educational research. This is a usage of theory that goes well beyond theory as "a mantric reaffirmation of belief" (Ball, 2006, p. 64). Bourdieu's (1994) expression of theory as "thinking tools" and the practices of research as "field work in philosophy" beautifully encapsulate the intimacies and imbrications of theory and data, the epistemological and the empirical, as does Jean Anyon's (2009) insightful introduction to her book, "Theory and Educational Research: Toward Critical Social Explanation".

Thus, Wright's Presidential stresses the contribution of education research to understanding and enlightenment, rather than its instrumental relation to practitioner and policy-maker practices and their improvement. And, as we know from Carol Weiss's (1979) classic study of the impact of social sciences research on policy, the most pervasive effect works through enlightenment or percolation, which has an extended time frame and, given this, policy practitioners often do not recognise the taken-for-granted research base of their assumptive worlds. Impact is a slippery concept to measure and is situated within varying temporalities.

Regarding AARE and its functions, and as indicated already, the membership of AARE has broadened across the time since its inception. As also demonstrated, the definition of educational research has similarly broadened to include practitioner research, research by policy makers and research from differing theoretical, disciplinary and methodological perspectives. Poole as President spoke about the transition from the hegemony of educational psychology to the potential emergence of a sociology of education hegemony. We note that educational research in today's AARE is represented by a broad field indeed and one of us (Lingard, 2001) as President argued that the Association needed to define and defend this broad definition of educational research, with the most significant factor being the varying definitions of quality associated with different research approaches, rather than commitment to specific theoretical or methodological orientations (Lingard, 2001). This remains an important objective in the context of ERA. BERA Presidents Geoff Whitty (2006) and Pamela Munn (2008) in 2006 and 2007 respectively argued a similar case for educational research as a broad field where quality ought to be the most salient factor (also see Furlong & Oancea, 2006; Moss et al., 2009). Lyn Yates (2004) has provided an intelligent and instructive account of measures of quality in education research, traversing a number of possible criteria including contribution to learning, usefulness to teachers and adherence to scientific rigour, while pointing out the shortcomings of each. The field today is eclectic in theoretical orientation, disciplinary bases, methodologies, epistemologies, ontologies and foci, both institutional and practice wise. Indeed, educational research today has been characterised as evidencing a "multitude of tongues" (Moss et al., 2009, 501). Perhaps such eclecticism reflects "the effervescence of the social world" today (Bourdieu 2008) and educational research as a kind of cultural physics. Such eclecticism has to be protected in the new ERA, thus demanding a complex calculus of quality and an openness of spirit of all educational researchers, whatever their theoretical and methodological proclivities.

Since its inception, AARE's work has involved defining, disseminating and defending educational research. This representational role has evolved in the context of a broadening definition, broadening membership and changing contextual circumstances. It was Bartlett as President who brought to the presidential election a specific manifesto,

which argued the necessity for a broader political role for the Association. Other Presidential Addresses (such as Richard Smith, 1992) also considered the role of AARE and its political involvements in the context of the time, such as the Dawkins reforms of higher education and post-Dawkins developments. This broader political representational role of AARE has endured since the time of these Addresses and subsequent government policy developments in respect of research generally, research quality specifically and the role and purposes of educational research as well. One of us (Gale, 2006), as President, sought to theorise AARE's potential engagement in contexts of policy influence, at a time when education researchers and their research were not just marginalised in policy making processes, but also maligned under parliamentary privilege and in the popular press. Wright's call for the centrality of theory in good educational research was also situated in the context of potential governmental reduction of the scope, theories and methodologies of educational research and the potential impact of quality assessment exercise in the definition of educational research.⁸

AARE's role has also changed reasonably dramatically in relation to what today the social sciences would call globalisation and its associated flows, networks and diasporas of global ideas and people (Appadurai, 1996). Helen Hocking spoke in her presidential to both AERA and BERA Presidential Addresses. While Bartlett called for a more outward political role for AARE, he situated this role in relation to Australia as the site of political activism. Hocking's address was the first inkling of a more global reach, although we note the close relationships between AARE and NZARE from the outset and that an Australian perspective on educational research was heavily influenced by traditions and developments in the United Kingdom and North America. Fazal Rizvi's presidential address was delivered in Singapore at the 1996 annual conference, which was held in conjunction with the Educational Research Association of Singapore (ERAS). Rizvi's address was located against and within the attempts by the Keating Labor Federal Government for Australia to become more Asia literate and to re-orient towards Asia both economically and culturally in the context of globalisation. As an aside, current Prime Minister Rudd, the senior public servant involved in the conceptualisation and delivery of the Keating Government's National Asian Languages and Culture Strategy, has also reiterated the need for Australia in both cultural and economic terms to be the most Asia-literate society on the globe. This carries significance for contemporary educational research.

Rizvi's Address exemplified the observation (*a la* Foucault) by postcolonial critic Edward Said (1993, 2003/1978), that even the most arcane knowledges and theories are imbricated in relations of power and that processes of orientalism are decidedly political. Orientalism recognised the deep significance of the positioning of the eye of the creator of theory. In rejecting Orientalism and reading educational research contrapuntally, Rizvi voiced the silent parochial ethnocentrism of much Australian educational research.

Bartlett also recognised the implicit politics of all educational research, while at the same time calling for a more overtly exogenous political role for AARE, but one limited by national boundaries, as opposed to Rizvi's more global reach in the context of an emergent globalised economy, following the collapse of the Communist bloc in the post Cold War world.

This enhanced global reach of AARE was also manifested in closer relationships between AARE and the American Educational Research Association (AERA) with a formal AARE symposium allocated at AERA annual conferences from the mid 1990s. From around that time, similar relationships were developed with the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE), and with BERA and ECER (the latter two formalised in 2005). In 2001, AARE also held a joint conference in Freemantle along with the Education Association of South Africa, although formal relations have not continued and need revitalising. Early in the twenty-first century, AARE was also involved in the creation of the Asia-Pacific Educational Research Association (APERA), a manifestation of the new regionalisms associated with globalisation, and became a formal executive member of APERA from 2005. This more global outlook was also evident in Lyn Yates' 1998 presidential, when she located educational research in Australia in the context of a number of stinging critiques of the quality of educational research then being published in the UK and which were later used to "discipline" educational researchers in that location. Indeed, Ozga et al. (2006) have shown how educational research in the UK has become the focus of government policy as new capitalism began to utilise such knowledge about itself as a resource for governing and managing organisations and risk (Thrift, 2005). More recently, AARE along with AERA, BERA and a large number of other national and regional research associations have participated in the establishment of a world educational research association as an omnibus or loose federation of such associations globally. The emergence of this World Education Research Association [WERA] is a recognition today of the intimate global interconnectedness of research problems and research issues in education. We also argue that it is a recognition of the need to deparochialise (Appadurai, 2001; Lingard, 2006) education research and to globalise the research imagination (Appadurai, 2001), so as to move beyond an implicit "methodological nationalism" (Beck, 2000) and the "colonial present" where global north/global south relations are constituted in academic and research terms as relations of theory generation and empirical application (Appadurai, 2001). Sensitivities regarding a potential reading of this new WERA as neo-colonial in orientation or enhancing the reach of northern theory were to the fore in discussions about its formation. This emergence is also reflective in a Bourdieuan sense of the construction of a global educational policy field and a global field of educational research (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010; Lingard, Rawolle, & Taylor, 2005).

We have to this point elaborated issues raised in the Presidential Addresses concerning the definitions of educational research and the role and functions of AARE. These two themes and changes to their articulation have of course been located in changing historical contexts, which have become a melange of the national, regional and global, as globalisation has reconstituted the work of the nation and of the nation state and witnessed the emergence of some postnational tendencies (Appadurai, 1996, 2006) or what others have called “transnationalism” (Vertovec, 2009). Words and concepts circulate without their fields of production and context and thus for understanding in their fields of reception need “worlding”, as argued by Edward Said (1983). One can read the world through the word and the word through the world. The written word, argues Said, unlike the spoken word, does not carry its context with it. Another way of expressing this need for contextualisation is put by Jean Anyon (2009, p. 2) when, following Saskia Sassen, she argues the need for an “analytics of exogeny” within educational research, because to understand x we cannot merely describe x. We also need to look exogenously at non-x. This analytic, she would argue, is also necessary to adequate social explanation derived from empirical research. We fully concur with her observation.

The worlds of AARE have changed over time, as each successive “world” has recognised the failure of previous worlds to recognise its broader contextual location and interconnectivity. As we have noted, AARE began as and from within the world of educational psychology researchers located within the academy and specialist research institutions. It expanded to include practitioners and policy makers as researchers and multiple and variegated theories and methodological approaches. Successive presidents reframed AARE’s world, initially limited to Australia, then extended to include the UK and USA, Europe, Asia and then the World. This worldliness has both reflected and expressed globalization and its flows and enhanced interconnectivity, as we have become increasingly aware that it is “a small world after all”, as ICTs have seen the contraction of time and place. Transnational theorists such as Vertovec (2009) argue that many relationships have been “planetised”. As the educated and privileged of the globe have become phenomenologically aware of the globe as one space, a more cosmopolitan postnational disposition has emerged. This has been expressed through the emergence of AARE’s connections with a range of other research associations and more lately in the creation of a global education research association and we would note that AARE’s President is the first Vice-President of this global association. Also reflecting this new global world has been the increased participation of international visitors in AARE’s annual conference. For example, almost 20% of participants at the Melbourne 2004 conference were from overseas, particularly from China; yet another reflection of the changing geopolitics associated with globalisation.

What seems evident is that every time Presidents re-imagine what educational research is, it reflects a changed membership and broadening theoretical and methodological frameworks among educational researchers. The increasingly diverse membership of AARE and its enhanced political role together have created some representational difficulties for AARE. That is, as AARE becomes broader, more inclusive and more complex, it becomes more difficult (for Presidents and AARE's Executive) to represent the Association and its members' interests. It is difficult to speak in the first person plural – to use “we” – given the diversification and incommensurate epistemologies of the groupings of educational researchers. But, in our view, this is the most significant challenge today for the AARE and one which needs to be carefully negotiated.

In Conclusion: The Changing Place and Character of Educational Research

Table 1 represents the narrative constructed in this paper about developments in educational research in Australia and related developments in the Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE), as read through our analysis of AARE's Presidential Addresses. We stress here our support for a principled eclecticism in respect of educational research and argue that there is a need for a construction of quality that can be applied across the multiple theoretical and methodological approaches and topics within contemporary educational research, set against principled considerations of matters of paradigm commensurability and incommensurability. We agree with Pamela Moss and her colleagues here (2009, p. 514) that this demands at a meta-epistemological level “proposing principles, practices, social structures, and incentives that ensure a vigorous educative dialogue” across the many and varied forms of educational research. We (all educational researchers of whatever orientation) need to recognise and value the diversity of approaches to how the objects of educational research are constituted, and how research is conducted methodologically and theorised.

Such complexity and the diversification of the field of educational research in Australia today are represented in Table 1 and imply the difficulties this creates for the representational and political work of the Association in relation to governments, policy makers, the Australian Research Council (ARC), federated peak research bodies (e.g., the Council of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences), and so on. This representational role for AARE is obligatory today, rather than optional as it might have been in the Association's earlier days. This is not to deny the influential role of early Presidents in terms of government policy and educational research in Australia and the positions from which some spoke (e.g., Radford as director of ACER, McGaw as director of the Research Branch of the Queensland Department of Education). The contemporary representational obligation of AARE relates to research becoming the focus of

government policy, specifically new research accountabilities such as ERA, and to the rise of so called evidence-based policy in the public sector, framed by efficiency and effectiveness concerns of public sector management (Head, 2008; Wiseman, 2010). Following Head, we see research as only ever one factor, which contributes to the creation of educational policy and thus prefer the descriptor “evidence-informed” policy and indeed use the descriptor evidence-informed practice in relation to teachers, while seeing teachers themselves as potential educational researchers. Values, professional knowledge, along with research findings, understandings and insights inform policy and teacher practice.

The Table also shows the diversification of both AARE membership and the field of educational research, which it constitutes and at the same time represents. This diversification of research and researchers also has theoretical, disciplinary, methodological and epistemological aspects, stretching for example from a particular definition of educational psychology sitting within a positivist applied science model through to more arcane poststructuralist and postcolonial educational research, which challenges the epistemological assumptions of traditional educational psychology and is itself at epistemological odds with it. Yet, as we have noted, there are ways in which some policy developments today, including research accountabilities, might work to delimit these broader definitions of educational research and usher in a new empiricism, as governments seek to construct a gold standard of quasi-positivist experimental design within social science research. In this context, there is a way in which governments can be seen to govern through data with policy being increasingly constructed as numbers, and with governments desiring to frame educational research in particular ways in respect of methodologies and topics (Ozga, 2009; Ozga & Lingard, 2007)⁹.

An additional significant potential impact in educational research as documented in Table 1 relates to the contemporary creation of the contours of a global educational research field. This emergent field is one on which tensions are played out between epistemological challenges to northern theory read as the universal and the global application and reach of such theory. Following Appaduari (2001), we see the pressing need to globalise the research imagination in education and thus to deparochialise educational research. There are serious epistemological, theoretical and methodological challenges in relation to such matters.

We argue that we need to deparochialise educational research in another way. Earlier we mentioned Bernstein’s reference to an inchoate totally pedagogised society and Thomson’s allusion to the emerging pedagogisation of everyday and everynight life (that is, in all its facets). We see workplaces, cultural centres such as museums and art galleries and multifarious aspects of public policy (e.g. training requirements attached to certain welfare benefits) becoming educational and pedagogical in focus. Related,

	Definitions of educational researchers	Disciplinary / theoretical location	Methodological	Relationship between research, policy and practice	Research and politics	The Association and politics	Spatial / locational focus
Beginning elements Singular consensus	Exclusive definition: Professional Education Researchers (ACER, State Department research branches, university academics); not inclusive of policy makers and practitioners	Education research defined largely as psychological research Singular	Positivist quantitative evidence conceived as quantifiable; correlations; cause and effect relations	Engineering relationships; research to inform and solve policy and practice problems; unidirectional, from research to policy and practice; (see Trowler 2003: 170)	Research as neutral	Endogenous politics. Creating the Association. In the service of the State / greater good	Creation of an Australian field of education research framed by northern theory, epistemologies and methodologies; 'parochial' national focus
Current elements Plural dissensus	Inclusive definition: includes policy makers, practitioners, academic and student researchers, and research institutes, departments of education	Theoretical and disciplinary eclecticism Plural	Methodological eclecticism across quantitative / qualitative divides within a post-positivist frame; evidence is more broadly defined; multiple representations of data; recognition of the need for theory in social explanation of research data	Enlightenment (indirect relationship to policy and practice; reconstituting the problems of policy and practice) and engineering; relationship is bi-directional, research informing policy and practice, policy and practice informing research; (see Trowler 2003: 177)	Increasing recognition of research as political	Exogenous politics; representing the Association in other peak associations national, regional and global debates and fields	Emergence of global education research field and some recognition of the need to move beyond the dominance of northern theory, epistemologies and methodologies; need to 'deparochialise' educational research

Table 1: AARE: Beginning (historical) and current (emergent) elements in Australian educational research

learning appears to have replaced education as the central trope of policy. Hence, there is also a need, we aver, to deparochialise the institutional and practice foci of educational research. Again, there are significant challenges and opportunities here.

We see processes and practices of cultural production and reproduction as pedagogical in character. In relation to this, we are aware of how some contemporary social theory has taken a pedagogical turn. For example, postcolonial critics such as Gayatri Spivak (1993), see a postcolonial politics as being pedagogical in approach. We have also spoken about educational researchers as taking on a public pedagogue role in relation to the broader dissemination of research. In relation to these matters, in the past educational research has been a subset of social sciences research, drawing on theories and methodologies from parent disciplines. It would seem to be the case today, in the totally pedagogised society, that educational theory and research are well placed to play a role at the forefront of contemporary social science theorising (Lingard, Nixon, & Ranson, 2008).

Set against this observation and our argument concerning the two ways in which educational research needs to be deparochialised, are policy developments in relation to new forms of research accountabilities, which sit in contradistinction to these challenges and the broadening purview of educational research. We have also alluded to the impact of the evidence-based policy movement in contemporary public management and its potentially disciplining effect on educational research as part of an emergent policy as numbers (Ozga & Lingard, 2007; Wiseman, 2010). As Luke and Hogan (2006) argue, calls for evidence-based policy in education are in effect attempts instigated through a policy lens to redefine what counts as educational research. Both new research accountabilities and evidence-based policy seem to be about disciplining and containing: a politics of sameness rather than difference in respect of educational research. Further, this new empiricism might also be seen as linked to what Žižek (2008, p. 1) refers to as the “weak thought” of the postmodern era, which is opposed to the somewhat grand explanations associated with enlightenment modernism. These tensions have been encapsulated by Blackmore (2003, p.1) when she asks the question, “what is the role of the educational researcher today?”: “policy service, policy critique, technical expert or public intellectual?”. All of these things would be our considered answer.

The new research accountability framework in Australia (i.e., ERA) being developed by the ARC for the Rudd government, will also have potential impact on educational research, some of it positive and some of it negative. ERA appears to valorise single-authored journal articles in high status peer reviewed journals, which have been classified on a grid of journal rankings. This valorisation and framing of high status research dissemination has also encouraged a plethora of bibliometric developments

and usage to do with citations, journal impact scores and so on. We see these as global developments and as intimately linked to the emerging commensurate global field of educational research. ERA's stance here might be a good thing; what ERA does is provide measures of research status, standing and quality. There is an obvious attraction here to policy makers interested in research accountability, as the development of such bibliometrics appears to offer an easy approach to the measurement of research quality and impact. However, in a field such as education (similar in this way to the fields of law, architecture, nursing, social work and medicine), which is a field of research (whose parameters are being challenged as noted above) and a field of policy and practice, additional measures of impact are required. Failure to evoke these measures will reduce the real policy and practice relevance of educational research. Furthermore, the classical academic measures of impact such as citations and journal impact scores appear to grant high status within the field to non-Australian journals with potential impact on knowledge production in Australian educational research. We note that AARE's journal has a B ranking in the ARC's journal rankings grid!

In education, impact as measured in academic terms through citation indices and journal impact scores is a very different measure from impact related to effects of educational research on policy and practice. It seems to us, then, that impact is a complex concept and that we – that is, educational researchers and AARE – need to do some serious thinking about it, contributing towards the development of a workable and defensible definition of educational research. We also suggest that impact in educational research in relation to policy and practice demands dissemination in places other than high status journals (for example, articles in practitioner journals). We note that the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) in the UK takes account of end-users on peer review panels for research grant applications. Louise Watson (2008) offers a similar argument to this, suggesting that impact must be considered in a policy sense as well as academically, so as to both reflect and protect the actual character of educational research. While Watson focuses on the impact of educational research on policy, the research of Figgis and colleagues (2000), and McMeniman and colleagues (2000) has contributed to enhancing our understanding of the complexity of the impact of educational research on teacher practitioners.

To reiterate, given the character of the field of education, we stress the necessity for both an academic measure of impact, but also a definition linked to impact on policy and practice. Failure to work with both arms of this binary would further widen the gap between educational researchers and educational practitioners and potentially reduce the positive impact of such research and its usefulness. As an aside, we are, however, not suggesting that only educational research of a particular kind has impact on policy and practice. Rather, we suggest that the most arcane educational theory and research might have impact on practice in the long term, without having specifically constructed

impact of this kind as an overt purpose of the research.

Across the time of the Association's existence, educational research has been positioned in differing ways in state departments of education and in the federal bureaucracy. With the rise of new public management framed by a neoliberal social imaginary in the context of globalisation, state departments of education have tended to either abolish their research branches or reduce their scale, as they moved to outsource and commission research from educational researchers in universities and other research institutions. Such commissioned research sets the research problem and often implicitly demands a particular theoretical and methodological approach. Many significant and influential research reports, however, have been produced out of such research, for example, the Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study (Lingard et al., 2001) that produced the influential concept of productive pedagogies. In terms of impact, such reports, while having much impact on policy and practice, do not count in traditional research impact measures. Furthermore, these research monies are usually not granted the same standing as those won from competitive peer-reviewed ARC Discovery grants.

Over the last decade or so, state systems and the federal government have introduced a range of high stakes testing for a range of accountability and auditing purposes in education, so much so that they now appear to be awash with accountability and student performance data. These developments reflect what has been called an "audit culture" in public sector management today (Power, 1997), where counting and calculation become central to governance (Power, 2004). Additionally, international performance data (for example, that provided by the OECD's PISA (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Programme for International Student Assessment)) have also become more influential in policy production and in relation to systemic accountability. This situation has seen more researchers and statisticians employed again in education bureaucracies. These changes and fluctuations in the position of educational research and educational researchers inside and in relation to state and federal bureaucracies carry significance for educational research and measures of research productivity, quality and impact.

The Rudd Government, in its commitment to more transparency and information for parents in relation to schools, has also endorsed enhanced usage of student performance data such as that made available by NAPLAN (National Assessment Program Literacy and Numeracy) and is encouraging "like school" comparisons of school performance. The controversial My School website is part of this transparency and accountability agenda. It is interesting that while the Rudd Government has been exceedingly critical of neoliberal economic policies in the context of the global financial crisis, it still appears to work within a neoliberal social policy framework, including within education and particularly with regard to schooling. It seems to us

that the critique of neoliberal globalisation offered by the Prime Minister (Rudd 2009) in his essay in “The Monthly”, is a most pertinent and telling one and with which we largely agree. Rudd sees the neoliberal experiment of the last 30 years as having failed, and in so doing, he argues, it has revealed itself “as little more than personal greed dressed up as an economic philosophy” (Rudd, 2009, p. 23). Despite Rudd’s stinging critique of neoliberal economic policy and his support for a more socially-democratically framed and interventionist state and the related acceptance that the pursuit of social justice is founded on a belief in the value of equality linked to broader democratic goals, Labor’s education policy appears to be justified more narrowly in human capital and productivity terms. In our view, we need a new social imaginary for education in contemporary Australia, one that goes beyond the taken-for-granted of neoliberalism and one which would accompany this new social democratic vision (see Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, chapter 9). We see here a significant role for educational research and educational theorising to contribute to this new post-neoliberal social imaginary and to critiques of the heavy residues of a neo-liberal sensibility that remain in educational policy.

At issue here, of course, is how such a project relates to the role of AARE President and the Association’s representational and political work on behalf of educational research and researchers, particularly given their multiple and diverse perspectives and approaches to educational research in terms of both topic and intellectual resources. Given the complexity and diversity of educational research today and many of the issues traversed in this conclusion, along with the intensification of academic work, we ask the question: “Is it possible or indeed desirable for the President (supported by the Executive) to pursue such matters on behalf of the Association?” This is the difficult we of AARE.

On the other hand, there are many issues in respect of educational research about which there would be consensus amongst educational researchers. These would include the need to move the amount of funding for such research towards 1% of all educational expenditure in Australia. Currently, it is less than half this. By comparison, funding for medical research represents about 1.5% of total health expenditure. Past AARE Presidents have also argued for the establishment of a nationally competitive grant scheme specifically to support educational research. Similarly, the 1992 ARC Report, “Educational Research in Australia”, argued for the creation of a specifically focused national council for educational research funded by its major stakeholders (Australian Research Council, 1992). It might be a propitious time to re-ventilate that idea. Further, and to reiterate, we argue that the Association needs to work on matters of defending and defining educational research and research impact and to work towards quality measures for a defensible and an eclectic construction – theoretically, methodologically and in terms of topics – of the field of educational research.

Endnotes

- ¹ This paper has developed from our introductory essay in Gale and Lingard (2009). That edited collection provides an archive of an archive of AARE Presidential Addresses and in its construction “manifests a dialectical tension between the poles of order and disorder” as with all archival work, as suggested by Walter Benjamin (Jennings, 1999, p. 487).
- ² We were not able to locate Presidential Addresses from the first three years of the Association’s existence, 1970 to 1973.
- ³ We are using field here in a quasi-Bourdieuian way to refer to an arena that has particular logics of practice with particular hierarchical relations of power, the distribution of different capitals and different agent habitus involved in contestation over the stakes in the field. See Rawolle and Lingard (2008) on Bourdieu and education policy. Lyn Yates’s (2004) “What does Good Education Research Look Like?” also provides a quasi-Bourdieuian account of the field of educational research.
- ⁴ See Moss et al. (2009) for a brilliant attempt to construct a productive dialogue across the different types of educational research around a search for quality.
- ⁵ In some ways this socio-cultural psychological framework can be seen to sit across psychological and sociological concerns, perhaps to some extent overcoming the potential disciplinary conflicts between educational psychology and sociology of education that Millicent Poole spoke about in her Presidential Address.
- ⁶ An overview of Radford Lectures since their inception would be an interesting research task and one which would complement and strengthen the history we have constructed on the basis of Presidential Addresses alone. Bessant and Holbrook’s (1995) history of the Association has also been very useful to our account based on Presidential Addresses.
- ⁷ Another President, Jill Blackmore (2003), in her Presidential Address asked the question whether or not there was a future for “feminist public intellectuals” in globalised, “privatised”, performative universities.
- ⁸ See the special issue of “ACCESS”, volume 27, number 1/2, 2008, which considers research accountabilities globally and their potential effects on the scope and focus of educational research and its dissemination.
- ⁹ See here, for example, “The Economist”, February 27-March 5, 2010, which had a special feature on “The data deluge” and new forms of governance.

References

- Anyon, J., with Dumas, M. J., Linville, D., Nolan, K., Perez, M., Tuck, E., & Weiss, J. (2009). *Theory and educational research: Toward critical social explanation*. New York: Routledge.

- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appadurai, A. (2001). Grassroots globalization and the research imagination. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *Globalization* (pp. 1-21). Durham, USA: Duke University Press.
- Appadurai, A. (2006). *Fear of small numbers: An essay on the geography of anger*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Australian Research Council. (1992). *Educational Research in Australia*. Canberra: AGPS.
- Ball, S. J. (2006). *Education Policy and Social Class*. London: Routledge.
- Bartlett, L. (1989) New and old testaments of alliance in educational research: AARE Presidential Address. In T. Gale and B. Lingard (Eds.) *Educational research by association* (pp. 59-79). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Beck, U. (2000). The cosmopolitan perspective. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(1), 70-105.
- Bernstein, B. (2001). From pedagogies to knowledge. In A. Marais, I. Neves, B. Davies, & H. Daniels (Eds.), *Towards a sociology of pedagogy: The contribution of Basil Bernstein to research* (pp. 363-368). New York: Peter Lang.
- Bessant, B., & Holbrook, A. (1995). *Reflections on Educational Research in Australia*. Melbourne: AARE.
- Blackmore, J. (2003). Tracking the nomadic life of the educational researcher: What future for feminist public intellectuals and the performative university? *Australian Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 1-24.
- Blackmore, J. (2008). Anticipating policy and the logics of practice: Australian institutional and academic responses to the globalising "quality research" agenda. *ACCESS*, 27(1/2), 97-113.
- Bourdieu, P. (1994). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2008). *Political interventions: Social science and political action*. London: Verso.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Sage: London.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Campbell, A., & Groundwater-Smith, S. (Eds.). (2009). *Connecting inquiry and professional learning in education*. London: Routledge.
- Connell, R. (2007). Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge and social science. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Coryn, C. (2008.) The fundamental characteristics of international models and mechanisms for evaluating government-funded research. *ACCESS*, 27(1/2), 9-25.
- Figgis, J., Zubrick, A., Butorac, A., & Alderson, A. (2000). Backtracking practice and policies to research. In Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs (Ed.), *The Impact of Educational Research* (pp. 279-373). Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

- Furlong, J., & Oancea, A. (2006). Assessing quality in applied and practice based educational research: A framework for discussion. In J. Blackmore, J. Wright, & V. Harwood (Eds.), *Counterpoints on the quality and impact of educational research* (pp. 89-104). Coldstream, Vic: AARE.
- Gale, T. (2006). Towards a theory and practice of policy engagement: Higher education research policy in the making. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 33(2), pp. 1-14.
- Gale, T., & Lingard, B. (Eds.). (2009). *Educational research by association: AARE presidential addresses and the field of educational research*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Gale, T., & Wright, J. (2008). Utility as a first principle for educational research: Reworking autonomy in Australian higher education. *ACCESS*, 27(1/2), 115-129.
- Griffiths, M. (1998). *Educational research for social justice: Getting off the fence*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Head, B. (2008). Evidence-based policy: Three lenses. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 67(1), 1-11.
- Jennings, M. W. (Ed.).(1999). *Walter Benjamin: Selected writings 1927-1934* (Vol 2.1 & 2.2). Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard.
- Lingard, B. (2001). Some lessons for educational researchers: Repositioning research in education and education in research. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 28(3), 1-46.
- Lingard, B. (2006). Globalisation, the research imagination and deparochialising the study of education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 4(2), 287-302.
- Lingard, B. (2008). Globalising research accountabilities. *ACCESS*, 27(1/2), 175-188.
- Lingard, B., Ladwig, J., Mills, M., Bahr, M., Chant, D., Warry, M., et al. (2001). *The Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study*. Brisbane: Education Queensland.
- Lingard, B., Nixon, J., & Ranson, S. (2008). Remaking education for a globalized world: Policy and pedagogic possibilities. In Lingard, B., Nixon, J., & Ranson, S. (Eds.), *Transforming Learning in Schools and Communities* (pp. 3-33). London: Continuum.
- Lingard, B., Rawolle, S., & Taylor, S. (2005). Globalizing policy sociology in education: Working with Bourdieu. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(6), 759-777.
- Lingard, B., & Renshaw, P. (2009). Teaching as a researched-informed and a research-informing profession. In A. Campbell & S. Groundwater-Smith (Eds.), *Connecting Inquiry and Professional Learning in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Luke, A., & Hogan, D. (2006). Redesigning what counts as evidence in educational policy: The Singapore model. In J. Ozga, T. Seddon, & T. S. Popkewitz (Eds.), *Education research and policy: Steering the knowledge based economy* (pp. 170-184). New York: Routledge.
- McMeniman, M., Cumming, J., Wilson, J., Stephenson, J., & Sim, C. (2000). Teacher knowledge in action. In Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs (Ed.), *The impact of educational research* (pp. 375-549). Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia.

- Moss, P., Phillips, D., Erickson, D., Floden, R., Lather, P., & Schneider, B. (2009). Learning from our differences: A dialogue across perspectives on quality in education research. *Educational Researcher*, 38(7), 501-517.
- Munn, P. (2008). Building research capacity collaboratively: Can we take ownership of our future? *British Educational Research Journal*, 34(4), 413-430.
- Ozga, J. (2009). Governing education through data in England: From regulation to self-evaluation. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(2), 149-162.
- Ozga, J., & Lingard, B. (2007). Globalisation, education policy and politics. In B. Lingard and J. Ozga (Eds.), *The RoutledgeFalmer reader in education policy and politics* (pp.65-82). London: Routledge.
- Ozga, J., Seddon, T. & Popkewitz, T. S. (Eds.) (2006). *Education research and policy: Steering the knowledge based economy*. New York: Routledge.
- Power, M. (1997). *The audit society: Rituals of verification*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Power, M. (2004). Counting, control and calculation: Reflections on measuring and management. *Human Relations*, 57(6), 765-783.
- Rawolle, S., & Lingard, B. (2008). The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu and researching education policy. *Journal of Education Policy*, 23(6), 729-740.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. London: Routledge
- Rudd, K. (2009). The global financial crisis. *The Monthly*, February, 20-29.
- Said, E. (1983). *The world, the text and the critic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Random House.
- Said, E. (2003/1978). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.
- Spivak, G. (1993). *Outside in the teaching machine*. New York: Routledge.
- Thomson, P. (2006). Policy scholarship against depoliticisation. In J. Ozga, T. Seddon, & T. S. Popkewitz (Eds.), *Education research and policy: Steering the knowledge based economy* (pp. 316-331). New York: Routledge.
- Thrift, N. (2005). *Knowing Capitalism*. London: Sage.
- Trowler, P. (2003). *Education Policy* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies, research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Vertovec, S. (2009). *Transnationalism*. London: Routledge.
- Watson, L. (2008). Developing indicators for a new ERA: Should we measure the policy impact of education research? *Australian Journal of Education*, 52(2), 117-128.
- Weiss, C. (1979). The many meanings of research utilization. *Public Administration Review*, 39(5), 426-431.
- Whitty, G. (2006). Education(al) research and education policy-making: Is conflict inevitable? *British Educational Research Journal*, 32(2), 157-176.

- Wiseman, A. W. (2010). The uses of evidence for educational policymaking: Global contexts and international trends. In A. Luke, J. Green, & G. J. Kelly (Eds.), *What counts as evidence in educational settings? Rethinking equity, diversity, and reform in the 21st Century. Review of Research in Education*, 34.
- Yates, L. (2004). *What does good education research look like?* Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Yates, L. (2008). Revisiting feminism and Australian education: Who speaks? What questions? What contexts? What impact? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 29(4), 471-481.
- Young, M. (1996). *The curriculum of the future*. London: Falmer.
- Zizek, S. (2008). *In defence of lost causes*. New York: Verso.