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Abstract:

This paper reimagines the scholarly book review while responding to *Arts-based Contemplative Practices in Research and Teaching* (edited by Walsh, Bickel, and Leggo, 2014), a rich, sagaciously curated text that will inform the future of the symbiotic field of arts and contemplative practice in curriculum. The authors respond to the anthology through Parallaxic Praxis, a research model that enacts a contemplative artful approach which the team specifically used to address the contemporary challenges of time, attention, and connection. Their review reframes the learning possibilities within the interactive space between self and experience and, in turn, illustrates scholarly engagement through making as a sustainable, deliberate practice of contemplative practice with critical attention.
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Engajamento acadêmico através do fazer: uma resposta ao livro *Pesquisa e Ensino baseados nas artes e nas práticas Contemplativas*.

Resumo:

Este artigo reconstrói a revisão do livro acadêmico ao responder a “Pesquisa e Ensino baseados nas artes e nas Práticas Contemplativas”, editado por Walsh, Bickel e Leggo, em 2014, um texto rico e sagazmente pensado que informará o futuro do campo simbiótico das artes e práticas contemplativas no currículo. Os autores respondem à antologia através da *Praxis Parallaxic*, um modelo de pesquisa que desencadeia abordagens artísticas contemplativas que a equipe usou especificamente para enfrentar os desafios contemporâneos de tempo, atenção e conexão. O livro reestrutura as possibilidades de aprendizagem dentro do espaço interativo entre o sujeito e a experiência e, por sua vez, ilustra o engajamento acadêmico por meio da realização de uma prática sustentável e deliberada de ações contemplativas e críticas.
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Introduction

With growing interest in mindfulness and other contemplative forms of learning and research in education, new ways of knowing and being have emerged from the incorporation of embodied and spiritual ways of engaging in human development. On the frontier of this exciting exploration into mindfulness in education is a symbiosis between contemplative inquiry and arts integrated research. Working in tandem, these two forms of inquiry promise additional interpretive directions that delve into epistemological and collaborative investigations. In this paper, we present an exploration of mindfulness and “making” through a review of the book, *Arts-Based and Contemplative Practices in Research and Teaching: Honouring Presence*, edited by Susan Walsh, Barbara Bickel, and Carl Leggo (2014). The methodology offers an alternative to the traditional book review product, demanding researchers attend to time, attention, and connection in their engagement with a text.

Mindfulness is a practice that allows individuals to increase attentional awareness, focus, and open monitoring of thoughts and emotions without engaging instantaneously and habitually to them. The ability to center awareness to greater levels has the potential to allow humans to access new ways of perceiving the world and the relationships they engage in (Davidson and Kaszniaak, 2015; Ericson, Kjonstad, and Barstad, 2014). The book review response involved “making” through the conceptualization of theory and the construction of knowledge through material design. The making in this instance represents a process-oriented practice that explicates methodological curriculum constructions of understanding. This making process is an example of Aokian aligned curriculum-making, far from notions on management systems, inputs, and outputs (see Aoki, 2005: 271), far from the procedural steps of writing a traditional book review.

The book *Arts-Based and Contemplative Practices in Research and Teaching*, is a welcome addition to the growing field of mindfulness and contemplative practice. Macintyre Latta’s (2015) review succinctly describes the focus of the book as “how arts-based and contemplative practices in research and teaching draw attention to the ability to see, and concomitantly act, on the potentiality of the present” (2015: 1). Binder (2016),
in her review, notes how the 10 authors intimately bring together arts-based research and contemplative practice. She highlights the remarkable “insights rendered by [the] experienced researchers, who explore the liminal spaces of practice where intention, presence and co-creation unfold” (2016: 227). Guiney Yallop (2016), who also praises the book, insightfully points to Walsh and Bai’s (2014) description of the variation possible in creating meditative and contemplative states of consciousness within a multitude of everyday activities.

While this rich, edited book depicts and extends the burgeoning field of contemplative practices in higher education (Barbezat and Bush, 2013; Bush, 2011; Shapiro, Brown and Austin, 2008), the intents and processes for contemplative practices using arts integrated approaches remain less understood and specific explications of how these practices can be practically engaged is helpful. This review and process-explanation of contemplative arts integrated methodology offers one example for imagining possibilities for scholarly review and engagement. This work follows in the tradition of Canadian curriculum scholarship of holding a complex coherence of differing voices (Pinar, 2014) as counterpointed compositions (Ng-A-Fook, 2014).

In overview, we will situate mindfulness and contemplative practice to clarify our concerns around intent, offer possibilities for how metaphors play a central role in this practice, and detail the “making” process. The paper concludes with questions generated with the co-editors of the book, born out of their responses to the products of the making process. The research team is made up of Pauline Sameshima, with a focus on contemplative arts-integrated research; Muga Miyakawa, with a focus on mindfulness; and Michael Lockett, with a focus on metaphor constructions. The team also dialogued with the co-editors of the book to generate new knowledge and additional questions impelled from the artefacts Pauline created as responses to the book.

**Situating Mindfulness**

Mindfulness is growing in popularity. Contemporary mindfulness, or what many in North America consider to be mindfulness, is often mindfulness based stress reduction (MBSR) or some derivative of it. Mindfulness appears in diverse contexts, from clinical psychology, to education, to business, to the military, and so on (Hyland, 2015; Paulson et al., 2013). It has worked its way into the mainstream, spread on magazine covers, purporting to improve life in a trope of calm, peaceful, centeredness, and being *at one with the universe*. As a strategy to increase attentional awareness and focus, mindfulness has the possibility to be a powerful catalyst to improve the human
condition through various psychological and social avenues.

Jon Kabat-Zinn (2003), known for his work at the University of Massachusetts Medical School as the founder of MBSR, claims that mindfulness is a state of being aware and focused on the present moment, with complete acceptance and recognition of the experience without attachment to thoughts or emotions that would otherwise regulate the experience (also see Paulson, Davidson, Jha, and Kabat-Zinn, 2013).

Mindfulness, in its original conceptualization is derived from Buddhist ethics and philosophy (Kabat-Zinn, 2011; Khong, 2009; Marx, 2015; Orr, 2014; Thayer-Bacon, 2003), specifically The Eightfold Path, which is itself a part of Buddhist ontology as described by The Four Noble Truths (DeMoss, 2011; Khong, 2009). Mindfulness in the context of The Eightfold Path is formally referred to as “right mindfulness” in its English translation, where the word “right” refers to a quality of wholesomeness and wisdom, and the word “mindfulness” describes a myriad of qualities, including: reflexivity, thoughtfulness, sensitivity, empathy, and awareness. The Eightfold Path is divided into three categories, of which mindfulness falls into the category of concentration and meditation, denoting its connection to praxis.

Mindfulness provides a means of mediating interaction between the self and experience by disrupting automatic mental processes, and instead inserting a ‘stop’ (Applebaum, 1995; Fels, 2010) wherein the individual may observe and hold the experience in awareness non-judgmentally, thereby using all of the senses and cognitive awareness to experience the present moment as it is. Wiebe (2016) describes this Levisanian aporic moment wherein the researcher is at an irresolvable internal disjunction, face to face with a need to create a re-presentation of the encounter to establish an alternate prepositional position. Mindfulness, as such, has the possibility to be a powerful catalyst to enable researchers to suspend assumptions or to purposefully delay conclusions.

This process of cultivated awareness allows one to inhabit the relationship with self and others in a more open and accepting way (Paulson et al., 2013). To illustrate this acceptance, there is evidence to suggest that mindfulness has positive correlations to empathy, compassion, connectedness, and pro-social behaviour (Mabsout, 2015)—all of which are beneficial for education, teaching, and research. Therefore, it is suggested that mindfulness allows for the space (psychological, temporal, and physical) to allow for multiple ways of knowing and understanding through various modalities of experience (Khong, 2009), illustrated by the process undertaken by this research team.
The Good and the Bad

Kabat-Zinn’s original motivation was to use mindfulness as a method to change patients’ relationship to pain and stress in clinical contexts such as hospitals. Scientific study of the effects of mindfulness has demonstrated a large suite of positive benefits for personal well-being, including: “increased effective functioning including academic performance, concentration, perceptual sensitivity, reaction time, memory, self-control, empathy, and self-esteem” (Oman et al., 2008). Given these benefits, the popularity of mindfulness has increased and a plethora of similar treatments have emerged. Some examples are: mindfulness-based cognitive therapy (MBCT), mindfulness-based relapse prevention (MBRP), mindfulness-based childbirth and parenting (MBCP), mindfulness-based eating awareness training (MB-EAT), and mindfulness-based elder care (MBEC) (Kabat-Zinn, 2011).

Due to the success of MBSR and its analogues, primarily in clinical contexts, there is a scientific leaning to the inquiry of mindfulness. The impetus pushing mindfulness from its original conception as one component in a system rooted in Buddhist ethics towards a prescriptive intervention for personal well-being can be attributed to the study of mindfulness from a North American perspective, demonstrably in neuropsychology and health sciences that have driven the entire field towards quantitative, positivist, and instrumental interpretations of mindfulness. The result is a privileging of quantitative research on mindfulness, perpetuating the primacy of Western positivism, effectively minimizing the holistic and embodied effects of mindfulness.

Applying mindfulness in curricula has demonstrated benefits of increasing academic performance and decreasing anti-social behaviour (Orr, 2014). As institutions and administrators fixate on these positive effects of mindfulness, the reason for implementing it in curricula becomes prescriptive and instrumental. As MBSR and similar programs are secularized, devoid of overt connection to Buddhism, there is no longer any ethical framework to ground mindfulness to remain connected to its foundational principles, namely the Buddhist precepts of non-harm, impermanence, undifferentiated compassion, interconnectedness, and working towards the cessation of suffering for all beings. “Such a colonization of mindfulness . . . has an instrumentalizing effect, reorienting the practice to the needs of the market, rather than to a critical reflection on the causes of our collective suffering” (Purser & Loy, 2013). Thus, we close this section on the Good and the Bad with wonderings about the intent of researchers’ use of these practices.
Making as Scholarly Research

For this book review, three silk and merino wool scarves (Fig. 1) were created by Pauline as a mindful and contemplative research practice into the book themes. The central purpose of this inquiry process is not in the end product but, rather, the act of making which facilitates access to deeper and untapped ways of knowing and the transformation of the self in relation to the other. The making is much like a self-autonomous vehicle that transports the researcher to novel and new associations that arise from the immersion of the sub-consciousness into a process that frees the mind from the usual entrapments of ego and self-identity. The process of making for the other is a process of constructing relation and connection. Each scarf was gifted to a specific co-editor, as a form of reparative pedagogical research.

Reparative pedagogy is guided by perspectives of balance and offering, . . . [resting] on the belief that developing skills and knowledge bases are not enough and that transformational learning requires intentional dynamic development of imagination, creativity, flexibility, holistic thinking, interdisciplinary perspectives, and deep mindfulness. (Sameshima & Slingerland, 2015: 9-10)

Figure 1. Nuno Felted Silk and Merino Wool Scarves. 2016. Artist: P. Sameshima.
When the maker (also named the “creative,” used as a noun) is reparatively positioned, there is an expectation for rupture to occur (Sameshima and Slingerland, 2015). Sedgwick (1997) explains this outlook as, “the position from which it is possible to turn to use one’s own resources to assemble or ‘repair’ . . . the part-objects into something like a whole – though not, and may I emphasize this, not necessarily like any preexisting whole” (8). Reparative research is activism, “a reparation to community” (21). In the making, the creative builds relation with the receiver. Although constructed and uni-directional, it is through gifting and sustained time in making that fabricates a softened and loving relation with the other, changing the possibilities for new communal relationships.

**Constructed Studio Spaces: Metaphoric Landscapes to Traverse**

The conceptual model of *Parallactic Praxis* offers a pragmatic working frame. The research model involves the analysis of data through play, assemblage, rebuilding, translations, and juxtaposition (Sameshima & Vandermause, 2008; see http://www.solspire.com/research-model.html). For example, researchers might translate text data (interview transcripts) into an artful modality (i.e., poetry, visual art, etc.) as a means to interrogate, play with, or dislodge automatic associations. These rendered, functional artefacts materially reveal, question, and convey researcher inquiries and interpretations in aesthetic forms. They are artworks imbued with meaning and created for the sake of provocation, intended to be used to induce dialogue and trouble assumptions. The renderings (created pieces) are then used to press dialogue forward and generate new thinking. The model incorporates a direct team analysis using a Catechization Process (questioning technique) to generate meaning from the renderings. To catechize, etymologically, is *to sound out*, to press knowledge forward through questioning. Catechizations are sets of questions used to determine knowledge, to question searchingly (Merriam-Webster, 2017).

To better understand the liminal studio space (Wiebe and Sameshima, in press), we invite you into the metaphoric maker-space. Re-occurring foci that were threaded through the book were: self, place, relationship, play, falling, time, the ordinary, preparation/practice, humility, and offering. Pauline used these building blocks to construct metaphoric “stories,” constructed landscapes for wandering through—an imagined ground that allowed traversing through the questions raised in her engagement with the book. The metaphoric story enables the investigator to “enter” the rendering as if it were a landscape. A short divergence into the world of metaphors will help understand how metaphors work, as investigative landscapes, and thus how scarves can be used to review a book on contemplative educational research.
Living and Dead Metaphors: A Brief Overview

Metaphors can be sorted, grossly, through a paradigm of live versus dead. Our work engages primarily with live metaphors, an important distinction. A dead metaphor is one with which we no longer linger, no longer pause to consider its metaphoricity. Often these are the figures of speech that have become idiomatic and expected and so we rarely notice their metaphoric origins. For example, *ponytail*—presumably this metaphor was once nascent. At some point in the history of hairstyles, some human might have said to another something like, “the back of your head looks like the backside of a pony.” And thus a neologistic metaphor was born because it was apt and convenient. Certainly more convenient than a literal alternative, than something like, “I like the way you’ve collected all the long strands of hair on your scalp and bound them close to their roots at the longitudinal centre and lower latitudinal hemisphere of your head so they flow outwards in a bundle splaying from its binding.” Because the initial metaphor has been lexicalized we rarely recall the association with a pony’s backside and thus we declare the metaphor dead.

In cases such as the *ponytail*, it could be argued that the *time of death* coincides with lexicalization, when those responsible for our dictionaries acknowledge the term in their collections. In other cases, it might be a matter of personal proximity—a matter of an individual declaring cliché. For instance, imagine a poem depicting a flower sprouting through a crack in a sidewalk, an image symbolizing the tenacity of life, for flourishing amidst arduous circumstance. If we have encountered the image before, we might recognize it as cliché. But this is not a lexicalized metaphor. So, although this metaphor is dead to us, it might be alive for some. This aspect of the death process, because it is determined by the proximity of cliché, is more explicitly a cultural than a lexicalized death and therefore we can never be entirely sure when these metaphors die. Many of these dying or dead metaphors can be resurrected through mindful play if we ponder them through new perspectives. Furthermore, if metaphor and thought are inseparable, as Zwicky (2008) and Frost (1972/1930) suspect, then our thought is likely swayed by living and dead metaphors in much the same way that our reality is shaped by time and historicity. As the *ponytail* example suggests, etymological attention, or looking back or below, might reveal an appellation’s analogical origins.

Metaphors can be expressed in literature through structures and forms unavailable in other forms. Literature can hold sequential connected events like the story of *Jack and the Beanstalk*; whereas, in the following section, as the reader will see, a scarf with a vine could simply be a representation of foliage or much more if the reader knows it is Jack’s beanstalk. Grossly, the structural differences are partly a product of genre and partly a product of approaches to truth. This knowledge reminds us that literature has
structures which the non-literary has not, and therefore literature can express metaphor in ways the non-literary cannot; and it reminds us that metaphor and literature share an ability to invent—exactly what the creative wishes for.

Metaphor’s ability to invent, or deceive, is particularly important. If the statement \( A \ is \ B \) is metaphoric, then the statement \( A \ is \ B \) must also be false. Yet, through that falsehood, metaphors can point to greater truths, to “wider natural laws” (Punter, 2007: 35). McKay (2001) expounds this idea by examining some striking parallels between metaphor and trickster figures from Indigenous myths; consequently, he likens metaphor to the trickster of a language system. Literature, with its possible fictive ability, is comparably tricky and honestly dishonest. Frye (1968), for example, considers literature a specialized form of language, defined and empowered by its ability to lie:

The apparently unique privilege of ignoring facts has given the poet his traditional reputation as a licensed liar, and explains why so many words denoting literary structure, “fable,” “fiction,” “myth,” and the like, have a secondary sense of untruth, like the Norwegian word *digter* which is said to mean liar as well as poet. But, as Sir Philip Sydney remarked, “the poet never affirmeth,” and therefore does not lie any more than he tells the truth. (75-76).

Although the discursive divide between literary and non-literary metaphor might seem self-evident, it does have some use, even if that use is limited to two reminders: that metaphor can be expressed in ways which partly depend on genre conventions; and that metaphor, like literature, lies.

To paraphrase Heidegger, when we set out “to reveal the real,” if we were to change “our mode of ordering,” the real reveals itself to us (Heidegger, 1977, p. 20). The openness to revelation is simply the acknowledgment that there are possibilities that exist beyond our current frameworks. Such acknowledgment is the basis of research, that there is knowledge yet be discovered, that we do not and cannot yet completely and fully understand. We add too, that this aporic view leaves all revelations, findings, and knowings ongoingly incomplete. (Wiebe and Sameshima, in Press)

Just as an aporia (an irresolvable disjunction) requires alternate route-taking, the metaphor require flexibility of mind. In returning to the ponytail, Frost (1972) encourages us to treat metaphors like horses, a matter of appreciating their grace and swiftness while respecting their limits in terms of reach and terrain. In other words, as the metaphoric storied landscapes are constructed in the scarves, we acknowledge
that metaphors can take us to new perspectives, but those vantages might preclude or eclipse other perspectives; like horses, they can take us to some places but never all places.

**Constructing the Metaphoric Landscape**

The above considerations informed the creative process in important ways. The making of three silk and wool nuno felted scarves in response to the book represents a process-oriented contemplative practice that supported Pauline in better understanding the themes in the book. In this form of contemplative data analysis, metaphor is prominent. This example attempts to illustrate the Buddhist concept of dependent origination, or *Pratītyasamutpāda* in Sanskrit, which describes the way in which all life, beings, and existence, are interdependent. The metaphoric landscape is a constructed space the creative generates through stories. For example, in the first artefact, the space of investigation takes place within a fairytale. The creative compares the character’s actions to the actions of a researcher using a contemplative research method. Within the fairytale landscape, the creative traverses the juxtapositions or structural aporias encountered in the constructed landscape to generate questions, the basis of knowledge production in this research methodology. While this is a co-created project, the following section is written from Pauline’s perspective, based on her journals during the making process. In this article the focus is predominantly on the first scarf titled “Jack,” to demonstrate the use of metaphor.

![Figure 2. Artefact 1: Jack’s Singularity. 2016. Artist: P. Sameshima](image-url)
“Jack” (Figures 2 and 3) is the scarf gifted to the book co-editor, Susan Walsh. It is a representation of the beanstalk in the popular children’s story Jack and the Beanstalk (Jacobs, 1890). In the story, Jack has been told to sell the family cow. Instead of returning with coins, he returns with magic bean seeds. His frustrated mother throws them out the window and the next morning, a large beanstalk appears reaching into the clouds. Jack begins his ascent of the beanstalk to another world.

Contemplative Practice as Challenging Tradition. My initial interest in the beanstalk was my wonderings about Jack’s mindset. Why did Jack buy the beans? Is he enchanted by the imaginary? Is he taken by the promise of the beans and is seeking a story that is other than the economic-based story-line? Is he seeking something other than? Like his mother, many researchers may think Jack’s beans are a waste of money and time. In terms of value and time, is contemplative inquiry possible in academia? How has the value of time been influenced by its worth economically? What motivates researchers to become involved in contemplative methodologies that take more time and are perceived of as less valuable?

What is Jack thinking as he climbs? Is he weighed by his mother’s disappointment and is seeking to get the most out of a bad situation? Or is he simply climbing because the stalk is there? As Jack climbs, hand over hand, foot over foot—a slow methodical, meditative motion seeking steady holds, he finds presence, being in the moment. Similar to how one might walk carefully on a steep hike on loose shale, climbing the beanstalk would require being in the moment. How might routines and methods for growing a contemplative practice support this methodology? This is a methodology that requires dedication to process, a commitment to intention. The commitment and risks are high. If the stalk were small, it would not reach the sky or support Jack’s weight. Undertaking the climb is significant.

Ontological and Epistemological Views. Jack notices the vistas from above. He sees Gadamer’s (1989) horizon anew. Is he afraid, brave, courageous, daring, or foolish? What is he expecting? What lies beyond the cloud cover? Is there an end and what will the end yield? What happens when he reaches his goal? In addition to a Foucauldian (1969) perspective of surveying the landscape from the beanstalk, does Jack metaphysically embody a somatic disposition to experiencing? In other words, epistemologically, is he able to justify the truth of the beanstalk through his bodily experience of it, through his “living body (soma) as a site of sensory-aesthetic appreciation (aesthesis) and creative self-fashioning” (Shursterman, 2008: 1)?
Integration of Routine. The beanstalk vine is created on both sides of the scarf to recall Jack’s multiple travels. He traverses up and down the beanstalk, each time bringing back something from the other world until he finally returns with the means to sustain that which he was searching for (the golden egg-laying hen). How does one create sustained contemplative practices when these are based in mindful practices of presence in the moment?

The beadings represent the touchstone jewels (or treasures he takes home) of learning along the way—some so significant that they pierce through to the other side of the scarf as experiences are integrated and learned, becoming a part of the permanent, albeit, constructed landscape. The translucent palimpsest of the stalk showing through from the other side of the scarf offers climbing scaffolds based on previous experience—with time and intention, integrative practices can become routine.

Journeying. The purple striping points to the color of the crown chakra, the seventh stage at the top of the chakra ladder. In Eastern thought, there are seven spiritual energy sites on the body (Ferretti, 2014). The crown chakra is grounded in the earth and reaches upward in connection to the universe. The chakra is considered an energy node of pure consciousness where there is neither object nor subject. My intent for using the purple ladder is to demonstrate the condensing of levels, or shortening of the journey of climbing, when the aligning energies and intentions are created. The sole flower attached to this scarf represents the individuality, ownership, and independent process of the journey.
Figure 4. Artefact 2: Intention. 2016. Artist: P. Sameshima

*Intention* (Fig. 4) is the scarf gifted to co-editor, Barbara Bickel. Nuno felting was a fibre technique first developed in New South Wales, Australia, around 1992 (Ziek, 2004). The technique bonds loose wool fibre onto silk gauze. The word *nuno* means cloth in Japanese. In the physical making process, to integrate the fibres of silk and wool, aggressive agitation must occur.

To integrate the wool with the silk, the design is abraded with a wooden tool while the silk sits on an uneven surface (swimming pool cover similar to bubble wrap; see Figure 5). I use an alkaline, soapy solution to help open up the silk weave to allow for the wool fibres to inset themselves. To enable the insetting, I rub the wool fibres into the silk with a wooden tool. I then apply pressure through rolling within the solar pool cover nub material 100 times, then hitting and banging the rolled scarf 100 times, and finally throwing the scarf 100 times onto a solid surface. This process is completed for each layer of colour and pattern separately, for each side of the scarf. The physicality of the integrative processing is a reminder of how change requires distress, strain, and stretching.
As the wool shrinks during the process of agitation, the silk is drawn in, creating the wrinkled effect. My use of the 100 rolls and 100 throws for each layer of integration is considered standard practice in nuno felting. For me the number 100 is a reference to 100%—a fullness in effort and authentic intention. While working with this green scarf (Fig. 4), I explored the layered tensions in the miasma of freedom, wildness, and discovery within meditative contemplative studies. Variations of green wool were placed organically on the silk without any structured patterns. As a gardener, I am also very aware of the disciplined cultivation of nurturing a garden through weeding, care, and vigilant discipline. The practice of contemplative work may seem loose and unstructured to some, but involves intense dedication.
“journey” (Figures 6 & 7) is the scarf gifted to co-editor Carl Leggo. This scarf is much thicker than the other two scarves in this series. The multi-layers were added individually with abrading and rolling over each layer on each side to create a topographic effect. The variation in relief also creates a difference in the way the silk is gathered between the merino wool. The depressions and elevations represent relative highs and lows in a journey, a mimetic exaggeration of journeying in the present. It is only in looking back, in overview, when one might conflate or name a time as particularly smooth or difficult. In the heightened moment of the present, every noticeable high and low is exaggerated.

In this scarf, I stitched “walking lines,” imagining the way we seek to break from following pre-constructed paths but always returning to the path. The attempt to break from the familiar requires mindfulness, attention, and intention. In the following section, the Catechization Process, or the analytic questioning process that directed the dialogue between the researchers and participants is explained. Further details of this research process is offered in an article titled “Generating Self” by Wiebe and Sameshima, this issue.

**Catechizations in the Parallaxic Praxis Model**

In addition to exploration with making, the team engaged with the co-editors of the book to bring forth collective interpretations of each other’s processes. In co-creating and co-discovering, the process of sharing has an element of reciprocation in that we are giving back to the co-editors a response to what they have given to us through the book. A focus group interview was conducted using the rendered makings (scarves) as conversation prompts to allow the opportunity for additional understanding and reciprocation to occur and to keep avenues open to the full experiencing of the process.

As a means of inquiry, a mindful and artful method to investigate pedagogical and curricular questions involves an engagement that is at its root a relationship or conversation with self and with others. Using mindfulness and art as foundational pillars, we invited multiple perspectives and voices, and ways of gaining access to information and knowing, in which we envisioned the possibilities in addressing our relationships with our research, ourselves, our colleagues, and our students. To fully absorb and practice this way of research and teaching, it is necessary to acknowledge the way we can embody our work and communicate with one another. In a dialogue with the co-editors of the book, we sought to explicate the nuances of inviting mindfulness and art into the process of conducting research. We framed our review with the
overarching questions: “What does contemplative and arts-based research look like?” and “What processes are involved in contemplative and arts-based research?”

Significant discussions about contemplative arts-based research arose from the dialogue session with the co-editors when using the scarves as provocateurs. In the Parallaxic Praxis model, the analysis of artworks involves discussion structured by the Catechization Process (Maarhuis, Sameshima & Chalykoff, 2014; Sameshima & Maarhuis, 2013). As briefly described previously, this process uses questions to move ideas forward, spark new thinkings in the moment of discussion, and generate discussion and knowledge production. Initial questions are generated from the Catechization terms:

Mimesis: In looking at the scarves, how are ideas or authors’ works in your book recreated or mirrored? In what ways are the artefacts mirrors of your thinkings? What do you see in the scarves that echo themes in the book?

Poesis: How do you, as teachers, researchers, learners, and creatives respond to these artefacts now, in this moment? What do you take from the work that was created? What do you notice about the artefacts? What has changed in speaking together about the scarves compared to individual experiences in thinking about your own scarf?

Palimpsest: Consider how both the participant and the researcher can be present at once. How or when were you present as an editor with the authors? What traces are coming through from the artefacts in your lives as teachers, researchers, learners and creatives? What are the layers underneath that are more complex beyond the surface of what has been made? How does the material speak to you? In what way does your artefact echo or trace the work in the book?

Intertextuality: How do the artefacts or chapters work in combination with one another? What commonalities do they have?

Antiphona: Now that we know the commonalities, how do they work together to teach you something new? What did you learn from these commonalities? In what ways do the materials, the model, or the discussions teach?

Sorites: How do you frame or value particular aspects of the phenomenon we are studying? What themes appear to be significant? Why? What specific quotes or ideas from the book do you see expressed in the artefacts?

Aporia: What puzzles you, or challenges you when thinking about the artefacts created? How do the artefacts play with or against one another? (For more information on the Catechization process, please see Stock, Sameshima & Slingerland, 2016).
Select Learnings from the Interview Dialogue

The parallactic praxis model is generative because of the acute personalization that is possible through the catechization process. The translatival analysis is based solely on the skills and capacities of the research team and the catechization process has the most meaning to the group involved. The following are select, culled sharings.

**Holistic Integration of Research and Researcher, Research and World.** Even with mindful attention to my (Pauline) body alignment to the height of the table and the mechanics of my motions, I knew I would feel the making in my body in following days. The physical exertion and embodied nature of the making, particularly through the repetitive 100 throws and rolls for each layer, leaves trace in the body, a proprioceptive knowing that becomes memory, the building blocks of future meaning making. These traces, a layered palimpsest of autobiography become part of me. My insertion into the fibres of the co-editors’ lives become me. Barbara Bickel likens the “friction that creates that interconnection [as] . . . a tactile, bodied” merging of researcher and research. Correspondingly, Susan Walsh (co-editor) expresses the synergy, synchronicity, and serendipitous evolution of the book, and Carl Leggo describes the “intersections among diverse kinds of projects” and layering, the continuation of the integrative expansion of knowledge production as mimetic yet morphing echo. This work researches in ways that are antithetical to current dominant narratives that signal the neoliberal encroachment on higher education; and represents understandings of dependent origination, the Buddhist concept that posits the interconnectedness of everyone and everything, nothing exists in isolation, and that in research contexts, all ideas are co-generated because of the inherent holistic, embodied, and relational ways in which knowledge is produced.

**Risk.** Susan Walsh continues the discussion on risk—her resonations on Jack’s climbing. She explains that for her, risk took place on two levels: “the kind of work (i.e. bringing the contemplative and arts-based together in the research context) [and] integrating this aspect of [her] personal journey with [her] professional work.” Additionally, Walsh points out that the commodification of spiritual practices (like mindfulness) is problematic, but that if you push past the superficial and commit to the practice, it has tremendous potential. As researchers, we are reminded of how closely the personal is impacted in the research choices we make—“that is part of the ongoing process of becoming that we are engaged in, in creative work, in scholarly work, and in our own lives.” Carl Leggo continues, likening a catechizing term palimpsest to a form of becoming. The layers of the past inform who we have become; the traces remain as evidence of development and change, a haunting, honoring presence.

**Organic Nature of Contemplative Work.** The co-editors talk about their work as organic, how the “art is part of the organic processes that we have engaged in. . . . this process is organic. That’s it, that’s where I’m drawn, that’s where I’ve been trying to get to. . . . This whole project, book . . . it is living and continues to live” (Carl Leggo). The colours of the scarves remind the co-editors of the “connection to the world.” Barbara Bickel, in looking at the three scarves together suggests that they remind her of layerings and cartographic mappings that give a sense of embeddedness and anchoring.

**Historicity.** Carl, in thinking about the catechization word “sorities” shares: I think the significance of the book lies in something that emerges when a reader interacts with the text . . . the text is not complete . . . you can’t read our text and believe that this is the definitive word on anything. What this text is, again like the scarves, it is a particular composition, created
in a particular historical time. . . . The longevity [is] beautifully stunning. So the book emerged out of something beautiful . . . and I don’t mean beautiful in just a traditional sense . . . like a fire . . . like a light . . . hard hopes . . . and it’s offered in those ways and then we hope, trust that readers, viewers, seekers, spiritual seekers will come and be moved by parts of the book, by what’s not in the book . . . sit with the book like sitting at a fire. . . . I want them to sit with it like a fire . . . . I was camping this summer and sitting around the campfire for four nights with two granddaughters and their parents and just being together, just enjoying the fire, the shapes, the colours, the music of the fire, but also realizing that thousands and tens of thousands years ago, people were sitting around fires.

Closing with Opening Questions

Examining the book *Arts-Based and Contemplative Practices in Research and Teaching*, we present the idea that arts-based and contemplative perspectives and approaches to research and teaching requires that which is seemingly in short supply in industrialized, modern cultures: time, attention, and connection. Arts-based and contemplative practices may provide pathways to new and more inclusive ways of knowing that add to our collective knowledge. And yet, despite its contributions, arts-based and contemplative practices frequently encounter resistance and friction, especially when pushed up against the established order of academia. Viewed as non-traditional and lacking in empirical (read: positivist and post-positivist) qualities, arts-based and contemplative practices suffer the stigma of not being “real” research. Nevertheless, the collective voice of researchers and academics who employ arts-based and contemplative practice grows, and perhaps offers a glimpse of a gradual change to the research (and in this case, educational) landscape that has been labelled a “contemplative turn in education” (Ergas and Todd, 2016).

The Parallaxic Praxis model is a cyclical process. The constructed renderings are intended to derive new investigative directions. As a closing, we draw from our discussion with the co-editors and the questions that arose from the scarf makings:

- As academics, how do we do this kind of practice with regards to time?
- What are the constraints of doing this type of research?
- How do the values of contemplative research align with the values of academia?
- How are contemplative practices, when intentionally not tied to any Eastern root, situated in relation to morality?
- How is morality a driving force behind Western conceptions and interest in Eastern wisdom traditions?
- Can research be gifting?
● How might art for economic growth impact the value of art?
● Do we need social innovation on new ways to experience art?
● What is the value of art? Are economic translations too fixed to capture the inestimable?
● Can we theorize the value of art in non-economic ways?

This paper presents the argument for greater inclusion of contemplative and arts integrated research in the academy through an examination of metaphors and making. Mindfulness presents the opportunity for teachers/researchers to give value to the possibilities that time, attention, and connection, through making processes, can enrich the traversal process towards greater understanding. Contemplative making and arts-based contemplative practices demonstrated by the editors and authors in this book, are born out of a divergence from the traditional research path. Contemplative practices seek out the generation of possibility, the creation of the not yet.

Like Guiney Yallop (2016), we point to William Pinar’s foreword in the book asking “How shall I live?” (xviii). Contemplative arts-based research can provide valuable insight into educational philosophy and curriculum implementation. The addition of reparative making further contributes to relational community building. We believe reparative gifting “makes” love and hope for the world (Sameshima, Wiebe & Hayes, in press).
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