



Transcript

10 October 2024, 12:35pm


🕒 **Ale.Okada** started transcription

 **Mark Childs** 0:04
Shut up.


 **Ale.Okada** 0:08
Hello everyone. Welcome to this special webinar with Rumpus group and we are delighted to invite Kieron to, you know, open the session and then invited the authors to the floor.


 **Kieron.Sheehy** 0:26
That's a very interesting strategy.

 **Rebecca.Ferguson** 0:30
Yeah.


 **Kieron.Sheehy** 0:30
Come to the seminar. Yeah. Hello. Hello. Lovely. Well, I I'm very pleased that we've got the pedagogzilla. I was going to say team unit force Pentagon. Similar force. What are The Avengers are their team.


 **Rebecca.Ferguson** 0:45
N.

 **Kieron.Sheehy** 0:47
Group ensemble. The paddock. I've enjoyed the pentagons in the podcast, so I remember before they were famous in the early days. In fact, a bit like what most rock bands the early albums were the better ones, I think, and stardom has gone right to their heads now they've got books and merchandise, spin offs, tours, you know, Aberystwyth Tour T-shirts, you know? But so I very much enjoyed the the.


 **Mark Childs** 0:48
I'm staying.


 **Kieron.Sheehy** 1:13
Podcasts, and so delighted that they were that we've got them.
To come and just talk about their latest hit publication, which is on the shelves as we speak, flying from the shelves.
Like yes.

 **Mark Childs** 1:30
It's only it's only flying because we're giving it away.


 **Kieron.Sheehy** 1:35
It's very good. I would, yes. So I highly recommend the book, so I've I enjoyed the podcast. I love the book, so I'm delighted the team are here today.

 **Rebecca.Ferguson** 1:35
It's flown as well.

 **Kieron.Sheehy** 1:46
How about this? Is that a sort of introduction? Ale, is that OK?

 **Mark Childs** 1:48
Yeah, and.

 **Rebecca.Ferguson** 1:51
Yeah.

 **Mark Childs** 1:51
OK. What we were gonna talk about specifically, what we're asked to talk about specifically is our process in maybe going from the podcast to the book and about how we kind of integrated playfulness into the, the sort of scholarship and the and the book writing process and where it failed and and what we learnt along the way and that sort of stuff really. So I my glamorous assistant that I'm pointing to because

he's in the bottom is going to pull up the slides. So and that's basically.
The the thing.



Michael.Collins 2:21

And I'm your glamorous assistant. I thought it was the other way around.



Kieron.Sheehy 2:27

Oh, this is what this is what happens.



Michael.Collins 2:27

Seems.



Mark Childs 2:30

So yeah, I so yeah. Should we just kick off? I'm not sure. I've. I've got my notes here, but I. But I'm obviously referring to them. Who's kicking? Oh, God. So yes, I've already talked about the first slide. There we go. So we are making up largely as we're going along. So what we're going to do as we go through it is if we go on to the next one is.



Michael.Collins 2:40

Thank you.



Rebecca.Ferguson 2:40

You will.



Mark Childs 2:50

Yeah. So we'll just briefly introduce you. We are we are one of the one of the things that we.

Well, I'm have to be up front about right from the start. Is the whole aim of Pentagon Zilla is to link and explain different things about learning theory through popular culture. And this is a very European North American pop and sometimes Japanese popular cultural references. So there's not much you can do about this this now because we're doing it five years.

And so if there's anything that like the word Kaiju or whatever, we apologise in advance that all these things might not connect.

But we're very happy to support you to create your own version that's appropriate to your own culture. But I think we're a bit too reluctant to sort of back out and fail to admit that actually we did something that was very global north and and particularly European, North American, Japanese. So anyway, So what are we doing this different? What's different about the playful pedagogy stuff and how, how do we get playful when we're doing the publishing and things?

And then our own recommendations, if you wanted to adopt this kind of approach for what you're going to be doing, that's kind of what we'll talk about as we go through.

It's informal we're making up as we go along, you'll see that that's actually a jam. This is our particular model is make it up as we go along. It works. It's slower. Perhaps it's a bit more of a. It's maybe an effective in places. This is the way we're doing. The Seminole does mean it's participative. So if you've got any questions at any point, we'll stop. See if you want to ask us what's going on, what the Kaiju is going on. And and also drop the chats into the drop the questions into the chat. We'll keep an eye on that and we'll make it as.

Inclusive and everything as we can. OK, next we'll do the next one where I've got to. I do have notes as well. It's not completely made-up. Problem is.



Michael.Collins 4:46

Feel like you shouldn't need notes for who we are. I feel like if we have trouble with this one, then we probably shouldn't be doing. Yeah.



Mark Childs 4:50

Oh, OK, well, who we are? Who? I maybe, I don't know. Sometimes I know I would need a heads up display to tell me which day of the week it is most days. So. OK. Do you want to kick off then, Michael? Because you started the whole thing rolling.



Michael.Collins 5:01

I was gonna say should we do it in order of appearance on the slide?



Rebecca.Ferguson 5:04

Alright, so I am the one on the left wearing the glasses. That's Beck sealer.

 **Mark Childs** 5:06

OK.

 **Rebecca.Ferguson** 5:10

Who represents me throughout the book? I'm Rebecca Ferguson.

I am or I was a professor at the Open University looking at Learning futures. I'm now professor emerita at the Open University.

So I know quite a lot about pedagogy, but I'm not as good on popular culture as the others are.

So I'm hand over to the next one.

 **Michael.Collins** 5:34

Encyclopaedic on Pokémon.

 **Mark Childs** 5:36

Yeah. And Buffy? Yeah. So are you not. You're not backing away from that pop culture geekiness there, Rebecca.

 **Michael.Collins** 5:38

Buffy.

 **Rebecca.Ferguson** 5:38

Yeah.

I can do some of it.

 **Mark Childs** 5:45

There you go.

 **Michael.Collins** 5:45

By the way, it was you were like, oh, you know, I'm too cool for that popcop stuff. I'm really into football. I thought that's where you're going with that. Yeah, I'm the middle one. I'm Mike seller. I am Mike Collins. I'm a senior learning designer at the Open University. I'm also still, despite several years of experience now, impostor

syndrome Incarnate. I'm the progenitor of the podcast and the general prodder of Pedagog is.

 **Mark Childs** 5:49

No, you're not. No, you're not.

 **Michael.Collins** 6:11

I make things keep going. I'm normally the Wangler mark has recently taken over wangling duties.

 **Mark Childs** 6:16

Trying to not making a good job of it at the moment, but we'll come back to that. Yeah, I'm Mark Childs. I am. I was a learning designer at the Open University when we started this. So it's it's pretty altered still largely an Open University sort of group and I moved to Durham about three years ago, four years ago.

And carry on doing learning designers, senior learning designer there do bits of academic stuff often around virtual reality and that sort of thing. And but my main involvement in this is.

Desire to talk about movies and films and comics that I like and trying to find somebody that will listen to me when I'm doing my particular rants about different things. So that's how we came together in the mix of different interests and stuff like this. What we're doing, what have we got on the next slide. Anybody want to know anything a little bit more about us.

 **Michael.Collins** 7:10

So Next up is what's?

Oh, that's that. Seems like more than enough.

 **Mark Childs** 7:14

OK. Oh, we're on it.

More than enough. What? So what is pedagogzilla then? Mike, that's that's over to you, isn't it?

 **Michael.Collins** 7:20

That was a lovely segue there, mark. Thank you. This is the podcasting experience

coming in the close Co host dynamic well, well. Mark, let me tell you what pedagogodzilla is. Yeah. So it's the basically it's as Mark described earlier, it's pedagogy meets pop culture, hence the pedagogzilla, which is probably the best thing I'll ever name. And I've named a person.



Mark Childs 7:22

Yeah.

Yeah. Over to you. Over to you, Michael.



Michael Collins 7:42

My daughter. And yeah, this is probably still the name I'm more proud of. Essentially, it's pedagogy and pop culture being smashed together to create some sort of glorious understanding.

Usually through a silly question for there's no laughs on that. One day I'm going to deliver that slide and there's going to be raucous applause, usually delivered through some manner of silly question that leads us through our episodes. Something along the lines of how does X pop culture thing use Y pedagogy to, and then the intersect point between the two, which could for example, be something like how does Arthur Dent use the Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy?

To help him take a cognitive load off the pop culture thing, there of course being hitchhiked the Galaxy and the pedagogy thing being cognitive loads.

And insect, of course, being how it's reducing that load in taking this approach, we've answered some of the really big, important questions in life, such as how do spooky Muppets guide Scrooge through transformative learning? How does problem based learning help Buffy the Vampire Slayer slay vampires? How do communities of practise provide a route into World of Warcraft? How does behaviourism help you catch them all in Pokémon Go? Like I say, all of the really big questions that have been plaguing humanity for literally.

Minutes. Seconds.

It's not just the podcast, though. As Kieran mentioned earlier, we started off with kind of like a cool indie album, you know, putting it out on on Spotify and the likes or band camp, whatever it was, the kids are doing those days.

And it started literally just as a as a small, essentially development project for myself and mark without any particular expectation of audience or listeners. It was just the process that was the the useful thing. But since then it's evolved and it's grown and

it's been fabulous. It's opened a lot of doors. We've been giving presentations at conferences. We do some regular conference pieces and activities. We've been at a playful learning conference for the last few years, for example.

It's actually allowed us to connect with the wider podcasting community, and not just in the UK, but globally. We've worked with podcasters in Canada. We've worked with academics in Japan, we've been speaking to people all over. And of course, some of the uks top edgy bolts we've published some journal papers off of the back of it.

That's been strange, but one of our episodes about the matrix and experiential learning led to a paper on the same subject. We've done a journal purpose. Mark has led on journal papers.

Around the use of podcasting by professionals as a professional development tool. We've both sort of as kind of the proxy people who know what a podcast is being drawn into, delivering workshops on podcasting for colleagues, how to actually make them, how to use them as your own development tool, and a book, which is what we're kind of here to do. And also there's we've done badges, which you can see in the background. I think I've still got like 3 badges kicking around in my bag somewhere. If anybody wants one.

Resume be emailed to them. I don't know how we'd do that.

So.

Why did we do any of it? Is a question I asked myself quite regularly.

First of all, why start a podcast and why start a book? I mean, Mark, do you want to start off with why on the podcast and then do you want to pick up?



Mark Childs 10:50

Yeah, OK, sure. OK.



Michael.Collins 10:53

So the podcast started for me essentially because I'd started in a learning design role and I'd previously been in a series of production roles and I felt really confident around the sort of the telling practise side of things, the tools, the technology side, more kind of learning technologist domains, and I felt desperately under equipped when it came to pedagogy. And obviously the people using this language and things around you that you're not quite connecting with, you're not quite sure if you're doing the right thing. And it was dreadful.


Suffered from atrocious impostor syndrome, so I decided that I would try and learn


about it by talking to a pot plant in a room on my own. I find it really hard to just read papers and actually assimilate anything from them, so I thought, OK, I'll have a conversation with a pot plant about pedagogy, and then I'll record it and I can listen back to it afterwards, and hopefully that'll help me somehow get these things into my head. Fortunately, because this was a terrible idea, I ran into mark on my way to the the room with the pot plant in.

Mark mentioned that he would like somewhere warm to drink his coffee.

As as was his wants during his OU days and then we did something better.

 **Mark Childs** 12:00
Delays.

 **Michael.Collins** 12:01
I don't know. Mark, do you want to pick up anything? Is there anything I've missed there?

 **Mark Childs** 12:07
No, I think that was it. We sort of. Well, I think the key thing, I mean this all sounds like a plan in retrospect. And I'm guessing it wasn't. I think if one thing and this is something we'd suggest to take away, if you're looking at scholarship in your own practise and playfulness and things is look at what you're doing already and then add a little bit more on to that. So it's not like we think, Oh my God, we've got to write a journal paper and then pick something. It's like we're already doing this. How would that expand next?
And this was just completely coincidental in that.
Mike was talking about communities of practise.
My knowledge of community of practise just happened to be. Specifically I came to it through somebody using talking about communities of practise in World of Warcraft and so I use that as an example. And then Mike had played World of Warcraft far more effectively than I had and so then it grew into a conversation around communities of practise as explored through World of Warcraft and then that became basically the Bay the coler of.
Of a of the first episode. And so then we thought this has worked. Let's do it from. With lots of other things, I mean, it's not a new idea. You know, there's the physics of Star Trek. There's the philosophy of Family Guy. There's all these sorts of books that

have explained a concept through popular culture, and I don't even know if there's nobody else has done education theories and things before, but that's how we got into it, really. And that's how the podcast evolved. And we kept on coming back to it and thinking of more things. And then.

Again, it was prompted by.

Partly we weren't producing transcripts.

For the podcasts and accessibility wise, that's not good. That's not ideal. That's not what you should be doing. We should be produced at least having a transcript for people who are hard of hearing or just can't be bothered to listen to us waffle. I didn't want to just do transcripts, though, because I thought there's actually the medium itself of text brings in an opportunity to explore the ideas more, to structure the conversations better.

The point of the podcasts is a lot of the well. Apparently, people find entertaining. I can't believe this, but people find me and Mike doing the bantering and the talking around stuff. They find that entertaining.

I think particularly during lockdown, it grew. It grew a lot because I think people are feeling socially isolated a bit. I know I did. And so the social interaction with Mike was important. People getting social interaction vicariously indirectly through just listening to us, but that wouldn't trend. That would translate to a transcript. So what's the point of a transcript? So for me.

So as the turning into a book would be maybe a bigger audience, but also a way to explore the ideas more in a more coherent idea.

Maybe more academically, but at least bringing in scholarship and then also maybe getting a book published out of it because it looks good on the shelf and it's something to, you know, when your mum's telling her friends what it is that her son does for a living, she can go. Oh, look, he's done this. That's like as she sounds. I don't know why I did that voice.

But you know it's it's it's something that you can actually physically show to people and people understand books, even if they don't understand what podcasts are. And in the end, Rebecca talked, talked to Sarutov going down the let's find an academic publisher, let's actually self publish it. Mike had roots to self-publishing and in retrospect that worked out way better as well. So another tip is self-publishing works that way better. So yeah, so that's basically it. It wasn't like a grand plan to turn it into this as well. It's like what have we got? What's the next simple way to make it more effective in in another way really.



Michael.Collins 15:44

Oh.

And then let's I guess sort of connecting it to the rumpus group as well. We should really point out that we the reason that we carry on doing it is that we have fun doing it like most of it happens outside of work hours because well, I mean owe you life no time in work hours to do professional development. So most happens outside of work hours and because of that, it's got to be fun. Otherwise, it's just more work. So we have a great time doing it. We got to speak to really interesting, exciting people. And I think one of the reasons why people connect with it is that it's not a read off of script saying Mark and I have a lot of fun with it. We kind of we play.



Mark Childs 16:03

Yeah.



Michael.Collins 16:25

Take the mic out of each other. We bounce it around and we do some really silly things with these pedagogies and these ideas and banging them around. And then, yeah, we we have a good time doing it and that's kind of I think the thread that's kept us going with it for five or six years now, Mark.



Mark Childs 16:39

Five. Yeah, five years.



Michael.Collins 16:40

Oh Lord.

And hopefully we'll also sort of brings, inexplicably, listeners and readers. So yeah. Hopefully that's their sort of the what's it the golden strand.



Rebecca.Ferguson 16:51

If we didn't enjoy doing it, we wouldn't carry on with it so.

That shows what fun it is. I mean, I'd say when I've got some boring piece of work to do, I'll go. Oh, I can put this off by working on pedagogzilla.

MC **Mark Childs** 16:57

Yeah.

 **Rebecca.Ferguson** 17:08

Because that'll be fun, but I can also say claim that that's that's work as well.

MC **Mark Childs** 17:14

Well, and also I find it to also I mean like we started on the second book and I've written a first chapter because I just found the whole process grounding and relaxing. And it's like I've had a stressful day and the process we'll talk about it more. But I found personally the process that we had of taking a podcast and turning into a chapter.

Circumvented some of the more stressful areas of writing for me. I don't know if it was, it wasn't the same for everybody else. I know this, but for me it helped so.

Again, a tip on how to bring into playfulness, into what you do is find out what you're doing. Find out what the next simple step would be, and make sure that you've built in enough fun into that process because it won't be all fun and the fun offsets the things that aren't really. Shall we go into the next slide unless anyone's got any questions at that point it would be good to does anybody got anything they want to chip in on this? OK, cool. OK, who's next?

 **Michael.Collins** 17:58

Yeah, we can. Yeah, let's. I was going to say we've got some, we've got some good bits on the bits that aren't fun.

MC **Mark Childs** 18:10

Oh, it's me again.

 **Michael.Collins** 18:10

Book, yeah.

MC **Mark Childs** 18:12

Book. What are books? OK, well, OK. What are books?



Rebecca.Ferguson 18:16

Oh, Karen's got his hand up.



Mark Childs 18:18

Yeah. OK.



Kieron.Sheehy 18:20

Sorry, so I I see Mark as the part plot was like plant pot was like Pete best in The Beatles and Mark was like Ringo. He pushed him out the replace the plant pot. How did Rebecca get involved then?



Mark Childs 18:23

Yeah. No, that's good.

Oh, special guest star initially.



Michael.Collins 18:39

Yeah.



Kieron.Sheehy 18:40

Oh, OK.



Michael.Collins 18:42


Yeah, this kind of. I'm sorry, I was going to say, yeah, we've kind of, we've had lots of people on and we've had a couple of people on multiple times to the show because we we have a lot of like, you know it's it's it's a nice playful way to actually chat with somebody about practise and be like, OK, this is a nice idea. What's your kind of? What's your thing, what's your specialisation? Let's bring you in, let's get and then yeah, Rebecca's awesome. And we wanted Rebecca to be on the show more and in the project more and just brilliant. I mean, sorry, Rebecca, we're put. We're probably answering for you here.





Mark Childs 18:42


So yeah, go on.


Please.
And yeah.

 **Rebecca.Ferguson** 19:08
And and Liz as well.

 **Mark Childs** 19:08
Well, I could not say why I wanted Rebecca in as well as well, because that that's possibly why I might belittor at the initially or pressure on it was, yeah, it was fun to have her on the podcast, but I mean, I've got an academic background and got PhD in education, that sort of stuff. But it's it's kind of bitty in a way in that I know a little bit about this or know a lot about that. I know something about this and I'd got a model for learning and all this sort of thing. But what I wanted was somebody with a broader and deeper understanding across the board.
And also about how people understood pedagogy as a whole to come in as a pretty much as a as a safety net for all the ***** I'd written on my chapters and go, I've written this. I think this is right, is it right? And as it turned out, it wasn't entirely or it wasn't necessarily as right as it could have been. So that was why I think we needed it, wouldn't have worked without Rebecca.
It wasn't just that it was another voice. It was a different kind of level of expertise. I mean, you know, we'll say.

 **Michael.Collins** 20:12
You did. We needed an adult.

 **Mark Childs** 20:14
We needed. We did well. No, because I don't. Don't don't tell Rebecca with that particular ignominy. I don't think. I think that's quite an it within our field, adult isn't entirely a complementary. But yeah. So yeah, it was. It was, yeah, it was. It was an. It was another perspective. Really. Yeah.
That would have been really, really, that was really helpful does that.

 **Michael.Collins** 20:37
I feel like Rebecca should dance to this as well.



Mark Childs 20:39

Yeah. Oh, yeah. Rebecca should as well. But I think that's what it meant for me. But yeah, Rebecca, what about you know?



Rebecca.Ferguson 20:45

I was keen to come in because it was fun and I'd enjoyed listening to it and I thought I'd like to do something about that. Let me find some bit of popular culture I can talk about and come along and do it.



Mark Childs 20:49

Hmm.

Yeah, but why the books then as well. 'cause, you've done the podcast, but bought the book.



Rebecca.Ferguson 21:01

Oh, why the book?

I think I was sort of led into thinking the book was going to be slightly more straightforward than it was.



Mark Childs 21:12

Great. Oh, no. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. This is where the this is where the playfulness broke down a bit.



Michael.Collins 21:12

You and me both, Rebecca.



Rebecca.Ferguson 21:16

We had the transcripts, you know, and and AI can turn turn a podcast into a transcript. And so it just seemed like, oh, you can tidy up the transcripts, and that will be fine. And then when we, when we did target the transcripts we found was quite a lot of Mike and Mark waffling on a bit.



Mark Childs 21:30

No woman at all.



Rebecca.Ferguson 21:38

And also there wasn't the sort of really solid you're really going to learn something from this. Let's put in some references and let's let's give you all the detail you need. So we have to go and do you know a bit of research, bit of background. Not only in pedagogy, also in the pop culture, sometimes you know checking, checking what order the films are in, and if the person with we thought starred and then did star in them and things like that.



Mark Childs 21:59

Oh dear.

And that's entirely my fault, because this is part of the the issue I found about my own leadership style, which is woefully inadequate in ways, is that in my head when I said a book chapter, I meant like a book chapter like it, you'd see any other book chapter just happened to be talking about something else as well. So yeah, I thought of it as being an academic exercise right from the word go, but did not communicate that effectively in my initial communication. So we were working in quite different ways initially.

And it was only when and we'll see this later. It's only when I kind of felt I'd turned in the first chapter in a way that I felt was was, was it. And it wasn't. It still needed tweaking until we came up with the format that there is what we do for everything pretty much.

That I felt we nailed it and then we had something as an exemplar for everybody else to work from, but that but by that stage it seemed like other people had gone in different directions, I hope.

People think this was the right direction to go in. Ultimately, I still haven't checked that. Maybe I was. Yeah. OK. Yeah, but OK, so.



Michael.Collins 23:10

Well, let's show, shall we? I think we get to that in a bit, don't we? We should also mention, by the way, that Liz in the call was involved in the project as well as our incredibly talented editor.



Rebecca.Ferguson 23:13

Mm hmm mm hmm.

MC **Mark Childs** 23:17

Yes. Let's please.

 **Michael.Collins** 23:22

And I guess we'll get to that in a bit, but just want to shout out that Liz was like yeah, instrumental in the book making sense by the end.

MC **Mark Childs** 23:28

Instrumental.

Yeah. And again another tip is if you're bringing in a, if you're putting together A-Team and you still want it to be playful, OK one is have somebody get that bounce ideas back? I mean, what I should have done was say, this is what my idea of it is. What's yours and then talk that through initially so that we've got a clear idea rather than wait until there was a chapter and which was a bit late, but also make sure you've got a good.

Well, you can't really. It was it was. It was accidental, in a way, maybe, but it was.

No, it was like, what else do we need? Well, again, it was putting that team together was I think bringing together people that we knew had different talents and different areas that we could that combined to form everything that we needed. Really. Yeah. Should we have it at the next slide then? I think we've covered most of this.

 **Michael.Collins** 24:02

Skipping ahead a bit there, mark.

Show me.

So the aim.

MC **Mark Childs** 24:21

Yeah. Again, I we needed I because I had to go at this for a while with this grand scheme of turning everything into this kind of scholarly book, which would not not heavily research ways, but at least scholarly enough, but also adapting all of the chapters. And I'd got it all laid out like this huge. It would have been 600 pages, 1000 page, long book, with everything that we've done so far turned into some sort of sequence. And when, and Rebecca and Mike, first of all said, that's ridiculous. This is going.

The best of our lives to do. Maybe just focus on the first couple of sections, so that was a huge relief. So again.

Honing down the project to a manageable size, and even this was quite big, but into a manageable size was a really useful piece of advice. That, and I think I'd have you know, it would. We wouldn't have got, I wouldn't have got anywhere at all. And then see what the interest is in the first one and then work on the second one. So making iterative and building it slowly was really helpful and really, really good advice.

So we focused on something that would form a coherent whole, and the first two sections of this crem scheme initially was all of the learning theories, so social constructivism.

Construction constructivism, constructionism a bit of cognitive load theory and stuff like that.

And so that's what it was initially.

And then it was more people to write as well, helped a hell of a lot. So yeah. So that's that's kind of where we went from this stupid idea in my head to something a lot more sensible. You know, a lot more practicable when when the others came on board.

And yes, and turn the book chapter into a turn a transcript into a book chapter.

Means so many different things to so many different people that it wasn't a good place to start from. But you know we've learnt for next time hopefully.

Yeah. OK. Anything else anybody wanted to add to that about the vision and about particularly the the experience of coming on board with the project?



Michael.Collins 26:28

I think I'll be tackled a bit more later on, so that's we'll get to the, we'll get to the reveal.



Mark Childs 26:28

No. Yeah, OK. OK. Yes, yes, do OK again, my I this is the normal dynamic between Mike and me as well is that Mike's the person with the. This is the plan. This is what we're doing. This is the framework and then I'm going off in different directions and somehow that works as well with the podcasts. OK. So yeah, which we can't do this. Yeah, it's live. This is like a live podcast and this is how awful they are. OK.



Michael.Collins 26:46

With editing normally as well, so we apologise for you listening to this unedited.



Mark Childs 26:54

So OK, so go on to the next to the next one then.



Michael.Collins 27:00

This one's a Rebecca one.



Mark Childs 27:01

OK.



Rebecca.Ferguson 27:02

Alright, OK. OK. I'll just ask another yes. So we had several ways which we decided to make the book playful. Obviously, we've got the the starting point of the podcast because the podcast itself is playful. And we were starting off with transcript of that, that podcast.

But as we developed the book, we were moving further away from the transcript and we were building in a meta narrative to the books.

Thing that would link all these chapters together.

Rather than having a series of separate podcast episodes, so as we developed the book, we began to develop the characters within the book, who you could see a couple of us there.

Having having AI don't know what I'm attacking that that Pikachu with a with a large nail that seems rather cruel.

But.

We had the characters, and we began to give them a little storyline. They were they were moving through a world, they were going on a journey.

I think going to come to the journey a bit later so I won't talk about that now, but that was that was a playful aspect. Thinking about these little characters, how they would move, what their progression would be, what would keep them moving, what would stop them that linked us up with the fab illustrations that Mike did for us. So I think that was that was one of the sort of playful, fun aspects of it.

It's always nice to see yourself.

Turning up in an illustration and like gave us some of the illustrations at the end so. Great fun and all that sort of tied together there to build some of the collaborative ethos on the books. So I don't think anybody felt, oh, I've got to wait for somebody else to make a decision. It was all, let's get together, talk things through. If things aren't working out for you, let's, let's talk about why that's not working. What we've had, what we might change, how might do it better, I think we've kept that going all the way through. You can see us doing that in this talk now. I'm just generally over over overarching. This was the intention was to be playful. It wasn't supposed to be a sort of tedious chore that we had to sit down and write. This is this is something we wanted to do that we were enjoying and that we really wanted other people to enjoy as well. So that's me on playful.



Michael.Collins 29:41

I just want to like add something to that which is sort of for me. The big thing throughout was this was the book that I wish I'd had when I'd started as a learning designer. That's what we ended up producing. And as I mentioned earlier, I'm not the sort of person you can sit down and read through academic papers on the interminable gumfuss of, you know, pedagogic grumbles. I need, I need an easy way, and I need to bloke in the pub way in. And this is kind of what? That resulted in. It was very much our sort of guiding light was this. This book is for people like me who found themselves dunking at the deep end needing to understand this stuff and may have not a lot as their starting point.



Mark Childs 30:20

Yeah, and that was key for me as well. Really was why learning theories to start from and a prompt for the journey and the map and stuff was Mike used to have on his desk at work. It was a network of hear all the difference of learning theories and how they all fit together. And one of the things that I struggled with when I was starting my PhD was we were given a book that was this thick and it was. Here's this theory. Here's this theory. Here's this theory. And suddenly you realise, hang on this theory. Is an is an exemplar of this theory. It's just a more different way of looking at the same at the thing in the same way. There was nothing that gave you. These are the grand theories that sort of break all everything down into. You know, you could break everything down into three, maybe

domains and then all the other things experiential fit learning is A is a version of social constructivism. Problem based learning is like experiential learning, but it's different in these ways. But both of them are social constructivist models.

I wasn't given anything like that when I started to do my PhD, and so why we need what? Where the podcast came really was talking about these things.

And then when it came to organising them into a book, it was to map in literally as a map to start with, but also breakdown. What are the big domains? Where are we overall looking at a kind of major thing? And where does that breakdown to the smaller things? And one of the great bits of feedback, one of the reassuring things was Kieran saying this is the first book I've read which actually nails them all. And it was like, oh, thank God for that, you know, so we, we got it right.



Michael.Collins 31:55

You kicked Kieran out the call with that comment somehow.



Mark Childs 31:55

Yeah.

You know, like Oh my God, he must have got embarrassed because I was being so grateful to him. I was back. OK. So anyway, you'll see from the transcript as being very. You'll see I was being really nice about you there, Kieran, but you missed that bit.



Michael.Collins 31:58

Yeah.

And Speaking of transcript, I believe we're on to the process.



Mark Childs 32:10

The next bit. OK, OK, OK, so this is a process, so.

Why? I said I like doing this and why I found it was easy. It was one of the things I think I find difficult when I'm writing is.

How do I approach this? How do I approach the overall structure? How do I? What is the next idea? I need to bring in to make the overall thing flow and why? I found this a really interesting process was we'd already done that with the podcast, so the podcast is built. Mike's come up with this really great structure for and we'd recommend this with any podcast.

A formula for how does that show individual episode work? And they're all the same, and it is. Let's talk about the popular culture that we like. Let's talk about the learning theory or the practise or whatever it is that we like. Now, let's talk about how those things mash up together and then look at how that works in our own practise. So everything's got that four act structure more or less the three acts because, well, four act whatever but.

However you group them and then it's always based around the question, which we then answer.

And that was that brilliant structure. And so it was. And that's so we we stuck to that and then also in the transcript it's within that it's like well how do I talk about The Avengers? Well we talked about The Avengers because we're talking about the movies and we talked about the comics so OK so we'll follow that. So when I was writing stuff what I would do is just work from the initial transcripts. The really awful AI1 that doesn't get the words right.

That sometimes that does.

Inaudible because we've sworn and that's how it transcribes in a swear word. A curse word is as inaudible, and then it's all over the place. And I go. OK, there's something from this paragraph I can use, but not the paragraph. Just something. Here's something from this paragraph.

And then start using that as a basis for reworking it. Now the very first one I did, which we'll look at later, was cognitive load and I realised when I was talking about cognitive load there was massive amounts of detail that I'd missed.

And it's like, OK, let's go back to the literature and add this in. So it's only a starting point and it's only at the bare bones of a starting point. But fleshing it out goes to the literature. It means digging into more about the Chuck's guide to the Galaxy, with some references, maybe. But ultimately it's still within that basic skeleton that came from that podcast. And so using that initial skeleton just made the whole process.

Way, way easier for me because it's like, what's the next link in the chain is already decided more or less, but then you can go off. And also there are tangents, one of the more difficult things is.

Cutting stuff and there are sometimes where we went off in a tangent and I left the tangent in and then right at the last minute after it all been paginated and so Mike had to redo the entire thing.

Was, Oh my God, this tangent helps in no way whatsoever, completely useless, so

abandoned it. It's like murdering your darlings, which is the first instruction you get as a writer is murder. Your darlings. In other words, there's something you're really fond of. Does that really fit? Is that really necessary?

If it doesn't being really fond of it is not enough, it still goes and that is the trickiest thing. I think is abandoning the lovely little bits that you had real fun with, but don't really help in any way and so.



Michael.Collins 35:38

I wish we'd abandoned it before we'd spent a whole evening debating which holy texts were and weren't canonical, and therefore needed to be italicised.



Mark Childs 35:44

And still not coming up with an. Yeah, because it's about using Canon and explaining Canon and what that means and using the Bible. And we still don't agree on whether or not it should be italicised or not because I think it should be. And everybody else thinks it shouldn't be. But anyway, so that's kind of what we did. So it was keeping it reading like a proper book. And what really helped here is we wanted to keep. We didn't want to have Mark said this. And Mike said that.

Because that's too transcriptive and that doesn't help. It's not helpful.

So we I think one of the first decisions I can, I think I I did be when we when I was writing it up the initial chapter was we will talk about if we we are a group and this is your thought or real tone and we're still an author for most of it but still chatting having a dialogue with the audience or you'll see from this or in this this happens now where I got that from was from the OU and that's the OU writing style with its teaching thing. I talk about the teacher in the text.

And so I wanted the author in the text, so it partly came from the OU and partly came from.

Thackeray, Vanity Fair. He does that all the way through Vanity Fair. He's talking about being a writer, writing his book while he's writing it. And I love that as an approach, and it's something I learned from the MA that I did at the OU as well. And it's it's a Thackeray thing, which is to not read Vanity Fair. Go away. Read it. It's great. It's great. Really good English. It's not a novel, but it's sort of. But it's.

And that's what he does. And that connection you have with the author.

I wanted to is the same as you have with a listener as a podcast, as a podcast listener, and I wanted to convey that in the actual text. So, but that's what the OU does when

it does. Teaching the text as well. So those are the kind of models for what we were doing and why it's still transcriptive and might feel like a transcript or feel like a monologue, even though it's a book chapter.

Anyway, that was that was my approach, but I don't know if anything else. Has anybody else has got anything that was playful about that as well. But that's where the play comes in. It's playfully talking about to the audience while you're creating what it is that you're doing. Playfully Thacker, Thackeray stuff.



Michael.Collins 37:53

The one thing I'll add in on sort of the playfulness and the authenticity, in fact, Rebecca, sorry you had something to add in there.



Rebecca.Ferguson 38:01

No, I'm. I'm one of the things that came out of transcripts I'd say is that the AI did such a weird job in some places. It was, it was really struggling with some of the things we were saying. And so that always added an element to fund.



Mark Childs 38:19

True.



Rebecca.Ferguson 38:19

Just sharing weird bits of AI speak that was turning up in the transcripts and sometimes going just anything. Remember what you were talking about here? Because I have no clue from this transcript.



Michael.Collins 38:34

I just want to quickly throw in the one bit on the translation. This is sort of responding to Ale's comment on the translation of the transcripts to that thing we did in places. Keep that conversation. Anyway, we've got these little call out boxes with our little zilla heads in where we literally like where there was like a disagreement or interjection or unique thought or reflection. That's very personal to us. That's what we brought in our little zilla's basically, to make sure that we kept that because it's often important to kind of the lessons we learn or sort of the narrative that we're trying to kind of weave.

In the chapter I'm just going to the times, I'm going to move on to the next bit.

MC **Mark Childs** 39:08

OK.

And I think that's important because you know this map that we were talking about and the idea was it's structured as a journey through that map to take the learner through that journey. And one of the things Mike said that was it shows just different way different brains work and whatever is he said. Well, I don't get this because who's doing the journeying then? I'm going. It's the reader as they're going through. And they go. No, I don't. I don't get that it has to. I have to see somebody travelling through it. And that's where the Zillers came in. And the meta narrative and I think. Not only did that as Mike just said, embody us within the text.

So it's like here's an inbot. This is Mark talking. And here's Mark Zilla. And he's got his coffee and he's half asleep and all that sort of stuff.

Which is really cool and then makes it come alive to the audience because it makes us come alive as authors, but also we see these zillas and they're all drawn and we can see the map and they're all walking through that map and it's a journey of three characters that the audience is then following through. So it's not an abstract journey, it's a physical. It is physical. It's a physical, geographically located, embodied. And I'll keep on coming back to embodiment because that's my that's my research specialism, but it's embodying that journey for people, as you're going through and that that was a really playful way of doing it. The illustrations make it fun, but also it's centres and grounds. That journey, I think for the audience in a way that wouldn't have happened otherwise because the idea of it being a journey is just too abstract. So yeah, and we the map itself was was screwed. We have found that out, but we can talk about that later.

Does that anything else to add on there for anyone?

Embody it. Embody it in many ways as possible as a tip.

 **Rebecca.Ferguson** 40:51

I think we should. I think we shouldn't keep adding things, so we're never gonna get the engine this.

MC **Mark Childs** 40:55

Yep. OK. Yeah. OK.



Rebecca.Ferguson 41:01

Yeah.

So practical playful is saying in terms of me.

Yeah. So.

The journey gave us a sort of playful way of of moving through space, but it also gave us a practical way of thinking about the relationships of the different subjects to each other, and how one would expect to move through those those subjects.

And I came to. I came to this.

And expectations of the sort of order that you tend to encounter pedagogies in Mark came with different ideas about the idea about how they'd be organised. So having the the notion of the journey actually forced us to begin to tighten up our ideas. So it was from taking that metaphor and trying to put it into practise, really began to shape the book for us.



Mark Childs 42:04

So should we do or we do? We've got one on the conceptual map clashes.



Rebecca.Ferguson 42:04

And I think I think, I think if we go on to the conceptual map clashes.



Mark Childs 42:10

Yeah. Well, just briefly because this is a bit nerdy and maybe a bit bit behind, but inside baseball. But yeah, I'd written, I'd structured this book around these different things. What happened when we did that mapping exercise was that Rebecca pointed out that we didn't have behaviourism, it was implied in the cognitive map chapter because cognitive mapping is a neurological thing, and behaviourist and all that sort of stuff. But it wasn't. It's the big domain. And we didn't have anything focusing specifically on the big domain.

Similarly, social constructivism and what emerged was that I.

Richard, the book around these three domains was talking about these three domains all the way through and they were different than the three. That and This is why we needed a safety net of Rebecca was she was. I'd drawn it from a very niche area, which is what the learning tech people do on the whole digital learning people use. But that's not what most people use. And thankfully, Rebecca said, OK, this is not

what most people use, but people use this domain and this is what I'm used to and it's dividing it up in this way. And you can see that from the slide.

So we had the drunken and I think Mike pointed out when we planned this seminar that beer helped.

So that's another tip is beer helps. So we had and we've got a recording of it. It's quite a drunk, drunken at at times heated discussion around these weights.



Michael.Collins 43:27

I was going to say if 3:00 crosses into blazing row territory in one or two places.



Mark Childs 43:30

Only when Rebecca got me onto taxonomies and that's another issue and we can do an entirely different, we'll we will be nowhere near we we we have touched on taxonomies.



Michael.Collins 43:38

Even more off paste.



Mark Childs 43:40

Because yeah, yeah, because but I I focused it all around what I realised was that I based it on these papers that I'd read, which drew on which divided them up along epistemological lines, basically.

Behaviourism tends to be almost exclusively positivist. Social constructivism tends to be largely interpretivist and then situative because it's based on the environment and it's based on people interacting with the environment tends to be a mixture of you can see the environment positivist, you can and measure it. You can talk about people's experience of it.

Interpretivist. And then so this is a mixed kind of thing. And then Rebecca came from a more historical perspective was behaviourism's rooted in how people responded to these sorts of things. And it doesn't break down that way. So what we realised was that we could actually, by moving things around a bit, break it up into four that were all more or less discrete. And just when we were writing them up, emphasise that how that the.

Differences between them rather than the overlaps because there's more overlap than anything. Anyway, that's kind of what we did.

But the problem was we did it 3/4 of the way through the writing process. So that was that was kind of a tricky times. So our main tip is.

If you're working with people.

There's a message, there's a thing about called Messy Talk, which is where, which is what. Basically what we did, which is get. We should go a big bit of paper, we write it all out how we see all these things. We've plotted it all out on the mirror board. If we've done that right at the start to make sure we're all coming from the same conceptual map initially.

We'd have saved ourselves a lot of issues later on, but we'd skipped. I think that messy talk phase right at the start when you all get together and you all scribble on a big bit of paper and then you all clarify what's going on. But it turned out OK in the end. I think we we managed to turn what was a floor into, we managed to flip it. So what wasn't initially a negative, I think we drew something positive from that for the book, but.

It does, which is well, yes. Yeah, that's the map. That's the rid. That's what we ended up with. And that's also great because it's got pictures and it's got little people doing the moving. And also I think Mike suggested that we embody those different places. We can't have constructivist place. What you need is people in that place who behave in a constructivist way. So we came up with the Elves and dwarves metaphor stolen from Tolkien. But if you're going to steal, steal from the best.



Michael.Collins 45:47

Which is this.



Mark Childs 46:15

And so we had the.

I always see dwarves as being more positivist anyway, so that was a great easy map to make. What a easier place to put it was dwarves are like this. Elves are like that.

We have different sorts of elves and that's the way wolf and that's why dwarves and elves hate each other. Basically in the same way social constructivists and positivists don't get along either.

So that all that fell into place when we got that map together.



Michael.Collins 46:42

The kogmeyer of Neimaths and learning styles, which you can see is fenced off because the chapter we had planned for that didn't get made.

 **Mark Childs** 46:46

You didn't.

So that says Rebecca's slide there. So I don't know if.

We had no God, sorry.

 **Rebecca.Ferguson** 46:55

But yeah.

 **Mark Childs** 46:58

That was great as well. We had somebody saying that they're a little girl, was looking at it and wanted to know why it wasn't coloured in. So we might next time what we might do is have some stuff for your kid to colour in while they're looking through the book.

 **Rebecca.Ferguson** 47:11

Yeah. And so it gives, it gives you a sort of overview of the book quite quickly because pretty much all of that turns into different chapters. You can see how they're structured because at the top left, the zilla's arrive, they work, they go down through the land of posthumous, they walk through the land of constructivism, they get into social constructivism, where they go to the pub, at the pedagogues arms and.

 **Mark Childs** 47:12

OK.

 **Rebecca.Ferguson** 47:39

Then they hang out in situativa and constructionism.

But one of the nice things about the map is you can see it's sort of at the edges, so there's lots of room for us to go on to other things if we would like to.

There's some mist there which partly hides aspects of the matrix, but also there's there's possibilities there, so we saw it as as a map that could be expanded in future books or in future theories.



Mark Childs 48:16

Like 'cause, this segue's on really nicely from. That was again, why playfulness helps and why that playful dialogue with the audience helps is that there's one chapter in particular that when we read through those lines, needed to be rethought completely because it was entirely based on implicitly assuming that we'd be working with the three domains that I'd.

Thought we were doing and we deferred to Rebecca's thing because it's more generally accepted.

And so therefore, that chapter got relegated a bit because it was a more niche way of looking at the the pedagogues. So then what that was OK, because then what we could say was like as you can see what we've done through this is we've built up the map, but the map came in too late. This chapter therefore doesn't fit quite. Therefore this is the niche kind of way of dividing them up that we've used. And therefore this is how that fits into that niche element that.

Work necessarily across the whole book, because we've redrawn the conceptual domains. So what, so and then that was followed by a chapter on constructionism. So then when we're talking about constructionism, we could say, well, actually a good example of constructionism at work is this book, because these are the changes that happened. So basically, it almost works. Like there's an, there's an internal narrative going through which is.

This is the overall structure of the book. This is the map. This is the.

Board stepchild of the initial domains that now doesn't fit and has to be explained away in terms of another thing that doesn't exist anymore, like it's popped in from a parallel universe. But this is what the parallel universe looks like and now this is constructionism and This is why this thing doesn't fit and how the map has helped us to conceive it all. So anyone reading it's all through in order will see these conceptual clashes.

See the way that the nature that they formed, see how they were resolved.

Through a constructionist approach, so the the book is itself an example of one of the.

Theories that we are trying to explain, so it kind of works on 3/3 levels it simultaneously, which is the theory level, the practise level and then the reflecting on the practise level as an example of the theory. So we didn't set out to do anything that nuanced, but that whole element of we're making this up, we're building it as

we're going along. We don't know what we're doing. We're having to rethink it because we've got that playful element between ourselves. So it was OK to admit. Well, we got differences here, but that's OK.

And we got playful relationship with the audience. Hopefully the reader then that gave us the space to screw up and actually turn it into something that was perhaps more valuable in the in the in the, at the end. So again, why would we recommend playfulness in this kind of thing and playfulness in the writing is you're not experts, you are learning. And if you are, if you're modelling learning for your audiences, then showing the failures and showing the hiccups and how you resolve them.

In your writing, if you're writing a book in your podcast, if you're doing a podcast. Or I'm guessing in your teaching if you're teaching doing all of that and being, you know, not an an expert, but being somebody who's working it through at the time. And foregrounding that is.

Books for your own it works, helps everybody out really.



Michael.Collins 51:46

Thinking of being transparent in the things that maybe aren't going so smoothly, I'm conscious of the time and that we're still got a few slides to get through. So do you mind if I giddy us up for it? But I'm conscious. Rebecca, did you have some bits to add to this one?



MC **Mark Childs** 51:55

K yeah, sure.

OK.

It's not going until three, though, aren't we?



Michael.Collins 52:04

Be time for time for questions and cake and everything and everybody's have a wee.



MC **Mark Childs** 52:06

Yeah, sure. Yeah. Yeah. OK. Yeah, yeah, yeah. OK, cool. Fair enough.

Yeah. Well, I think we're more less done, though, aren't we?



Michael.Collins 52:15

The halfway through.

 **Mark Childs** 52:16

OK. OK, carry on.

 **Michael.Collins** 52:17

There's 97 slides left. We've got, there's the readings.

 **Mark Childs** 52:20

Looks like oh, sorry, inaudible inaudible's sake.

 **Michael.Collins** 52:27

I mean, this one's down as a mark slide.

 **Mark Childs** 52:28

Go on then the pictures.

 **Michael.Collins** 52:31

The pictures you've seen some of them.

We have not started. Is there anything this we actually covered?

 **Mark Childs** 52:38

Think it's the embodiment thing? That's you. I mean, the fun and also the colouring in stuff and all that. Yeah, pictures. Books. Need more pictures. You know. What's the use of it? What's the point of a book without pictures?

As Alice said in looking left.

 **Michael.Collins** 52:56

They do. They do help with the tone they are, they are *****, a draw. They help with the tone. They help add sort of character and they're a good kind of way to characterise ourselves. When we do need to pop up and say something in the books and like with Muppets, there's things you can say with a tiny dinosaur that you can't say yourself as a professional. So always worth bearing in mind.

 **Mark Childs** 52:56

Yeah.

Yeah.

Yeah, absolutely.



Michael.Collins 53:16

What we ended up with, we did a book.

Here with my neighbour Totoro, or, I suppose, just called him Totoro in this context.

Earlier, pictured against a Guinea pig.



Mark Childs 53:31

Yes. OK. Well.



Michael.Collins 53:31

And we were going to do a quick tasting platter.

To give you a flavour of the book.



Mark Childs 53:36

OK, so this is the one. This is the one where it all gelled for me. 'cause I think this is the one that I'd sent. Rango. This is what it's gonna look like. Oh, it all works. And it was cognitive load. And I mentioned this and we didn't really go into cognitive load very well. And that's where I realised that we had to go in and dig into it. And that was fine is to just use the overall structure. But dig into what the what the science was for. This was quite scientific. What the science is a bit more what the different forms of cognitive load are. None of those we went into, but we expanded all of that. We used a few references I dug into a few things about the growth of the Hitchhik's guide to the Galaxy, and I think through that as a model we got 90% there. There was some flaws, one was.

You haven't answered the question.

So it's like you, we need to have a section in there which answers the question.

Specifically, how does the jokes go to the Galaxy? Help Arthriten take the cognitive load off. So we've got a good answer there. It's because and I can't remember what the answer is, but it's it's somehow it's it's just in time learning. So it's like I don't know what's going on here. I'd just be I'd just be on a.

Spacecraft. I don't know what's going on. Press a button on the book and it just gives you exactly what you need to know. No more detail than you need. And it's that's why it works as a as a book. And so we needed to answer that and to just to create

that narrative closure as well. And I think the other tweak we made was to have stupid names for the references. So rather than making it all official and academic, he is a academic, is about a page of references, but it's like.

Some of those references are about to, I don't know, intersit washing machine instructions, and they're too.

And the two books about the Chuck's guide to the Galaxy. So we're having fun with some of the things we reference, but there's also loads of stuff, proper stuff on cognitive load, and then a stupid name for it. And then also you can see there's an example of the meta narrative which came in afterwards, but it's weaving all them together.

That was me. That was it. That was key for me.



Michael.Collins 55:41

I had. I had a different approach to the tasting platter. I thought we were doing. Like kind of like a Cliff. Notes like a digest of the chapter. So I've I was just going to go so like this one on chapters I wrote. So how to speaking muffits guide screws through transformative learning. That's right. You get different flavours, you get different styles. OK. So as like a real digest of a flavour of the book. First of all, we talk about what is The Muppets, The Muppets, Christmas Carol. So Muppets, obviously, Jim Henson's wonderful felt puppetry creations.



Mark Childs 55:49

Oh, OK, I can't remember. Well, OK, well, go on then. Do that for you then. Do that as an example then OK.



Michael.Collins 56:09

Wonderful childhood love, family fun. All of that turned in 1992 into the musical comedy adaptation.

Of Charles Dickens A Christmas Carol, in which Scrooge at a miserly old businessman is visited by three spooky ghosts, three spooky Muppet ghosts, the ghosts essentially showing the negative impact of his actions on others.

For example, Bob seeing the impact of his dreadful greed on his employee Bob Cratchit and his family, and in doing so throughout the movie, throughout the original story, he undergoes transformation resulting to be more kind and generous, and The Muppets themselves have this lovely kind of warm, fuzzy fun feel to the

whole thing. Transformative learning, as you may know, a theory. Originally expounded by Jack Mesereau focusing on challenging and reflecting a person's personal beliefs involves reflection. How people change their world view either sort of gradually or through sort of light bulb and challenging moments has a couple of distinct stages. So the disorienting dilemma that change your beliefs that would make you challenge your existing beliefs. Self examination where you reflect on your own beliefs and experiences critical assessment where you're evaluating your past Ascension.

Assumptions, recognition of shared experiences. So finding common ground with others, exploring new behaviours. So seeing how you might apply your new insights and then planning new actions. So basically what are you doing?

One of the behavioural changes you're making based on your new understanding and there's some other steps, but we ignore those because they're not as much fun. And then we go to answer our questions. So how do speaker mummets guide screws through transformative learning? By the end? Well, in Scrooge is journey in the Market Christmas Carol. It essentially mirrors the phases of transformative learning. The ghosts present disorienting dilemmas which challenge his worldview on generosity and community, and Scrooge himself undergoes a period of self examination.

Critically assessing his past assumptions, taking him to recognise.

And the shared experiences, particularly his impact the impact of his actions on Cratchit's family and the hardships that causes, he explores new behaviours and eventually resolves to change and be more generous, which we see at the end of the movie with the the fabulous tune, the love we've shared and the lovely muppete dinner and throughout the ghosts serve as the educators they serve as us, as the catalysts for scooch's transformation and essentially guide and facilitate his journey. So that's the digest version of that chapter.

And I've got the behaviourism 1 here as well, and this is where we find out if I was on the.

And tack to everyone. Or if Rebecca had a similar thought with what we were doing with this.



Rebecca.Ferguson 58:35

Oh, I I think we all thought we were doing slightly different things. So I think that's fine. So so I think that's good.



Michael.Collins 58:37

Oh, cool. OK, here's the third version of what you could get with this then.



Rebecca.Ferguson 58:42

So behaviourism is one of the ones which we actually added in fairly light to fill a gap.

And I know people who come in through a psychology route probably spent quite a lot of time on behaviourism, but if you come in through an education route, you tend to go, oh, it is behaviourism that was around, sort of at the beginning of the 20th century.

And since then we've come up with constructivism and social constructivism and constructionism and all sorts of things. So we'll just tell you about behaviourism in a nutshell, and then we'll move on. And the implication is it's something quite old fashioned.

There's also point that a lot of people confuse it with rope learning, and so have this idea of Oh well, nobody would dream of doing behaviourism anymore. So one of the things we were doing here is saying no, this is still a really.

Powerful theory, which is being used all the time.

And part of it was to say, look, we can look at the development of these theories over time and we can think about why people came up with the different theories.

So one of the reasons that Behaviourists came up with behaviours was they they said, well, actually we can't see what's going on in people's heads because they came up with this before. You could see what was going on in people's heads. You couldn't do an MRI scan on somebody.

So I actually we're gonna be looking at behavioural changes and from those, we'll work out if if people have learnt anything or not.

I think one of the things that we wanted to do in the book was really give these things a solid grounding. So as well as having this sort of fun, let's look at Pokémon Go and do the relationship there. It's it's also, well, what are the classic things that people would want to know and thinking about in these terms? You know, they they were thinking about Pavlov. They were thinking about Thorne ****. They were thinking about the Little Albert experiment.

So we wanted to get that in there.

Or anybody who was actually, you know, sent away. Go and find out about

behaviourism. We wanted all the stuff to be there, but we also wanted to show how it relates to life today. So one of the big ways in which behaviourism relates to Pokémon Go and Duolingo is another parallel we made in chapter is is the idea of a conditioned response.

That people get feedback.

Straight away.

On their responses and they get they get nice things.

If if they do well, you know, they'll get praised, they'll get good marks, they'll get approval. They'll get badges, they'll get stickers.

Or they'll get things won't go as well if if they they don't do it successfully. So I'm encapsulating behaviourism rather briefly there. There's a lot more to it than that, but.

We wanted to show that yes, if you play Duolingo today, you have engaged with behaviourism. If you have got Pokémon Go out today, you have engaged with behaviourism. It's an important thing and you can view what's going on in the other chapters in relation to that.

And something else, another point we're making in the chapters is that none of these all these theories have good points in their bad points.

None of them are entirely everything.

So I think in every chapter we'd say, well, yes, pedagogue. You were talking about here. It can do these things. It's great. But actually if we bring in elements of these other pedagogies, it probably works even better. And I think that's something that we kept coming back to in every chapter. And it's something that we would definitely coming back to here.



Mark Childs 1:02:53

Another thing to add to Mike's thing on transformational learning was that it almost it also set up another narrative, which is Mike's learning as he went through it, which was really I didn't know the playful element, but I did another personal and embodied element in the Mike talked about transformation, transformational learning and then in the conclusion he wrote the all of them are collaborative things. Apart from the conclusion, which was Mike's personal journey and reflecting on that. And I thought that brought the book alive as well was that.

Relating it back to that chapter.

But also to the the the the sort of the the personal growth as well through transfer of

transformational learning. So it's nice little narrative call back to that, but it wasn't just stuck in there, it was it. You know what each book each as Rebecca said each chapter more or less was slot was put in there in order to serve a purpose for the overall narrative. So behaviourism from the basis for the cognitive load chapter, but then also for the.

We did a chapter which was epistemological conflict between the positivists and the constructionists.

Constructivists and that then formed the conclusion of that entire section was we had a whole chunk of behaviour as to hold ***** on constructivist, and then we ended with behaviourism versus constructionism. What's the truth? And it's like, well, it's both a bit of both is the right answer. But then we've got an overall kind of narrative arc there as well.



Michael.Collins 1:04:16

We were just going to tail this off. I think with some of the things that we've learned along the way, I'm conscious of the time though. We've got a few questions in. So shall we just maybe do one thing each?



Mark Childs 1:04:24

Yeah. OK.

Yeah, OK. Well, I've talked about mine for quite a lot, but it was mainly.

The lead leading trying to wrangle it all and being really appalling at it. We used WhatsApp and it was like a chat and what that didn't help was because then a decisions made and it gets pushed right up the screen. And then Liz, Liz, me, Rebecca, Mike, all chatting away and not capturing the key elements. So what we're trying this time is to have a landing page. Everybody can bookmark this particular. Do Google Doc and it will be.

Here's where all we've well, we've got to so far and capturing all the different ideas and putting them all into one place. The only problem is, is that it's still not working in very well, because when I think I've explained something, it's not got across to everybody else. So we still have to have conversations. We still have to enhance it, be with our own perspectives. It's still, it's still not. We need to find a better way to cohere the ideas to make sure.

Everybody is on board with the same things because, but anyway, it's difficult, it's difficult.

Anyway, that's my main thing as I'm not very good at it, but we're a bit of a bit of help. It'll be better. OK, sure. That's yeah.



Michael.Collins 1:05:36

I'll, I'll do mine. I'll do mine, which is very quickly that. Yeah, I never imagined five years ago that I would have contributed to the self-publishing of an OER. Academic e-book. A bit scary, but it turns out with lots of little steps and a village. So lots of people involved who are good fun to work with and are also critically more talented than you. It'll happen. So yeah, that's my that's my lesson learned. It takes a village. And don't go from nought to academic book with pictures in takes an intervening steps in the in between. And then let them build on each other.



Rebecca.Ferguson 1:06:16

I think one of the things that that we've learned together was this the sort of meta aspects of.

Especially when we got onto constructionism because we were constructing a text together which was about constructionism and that's got us to thinking and talking about what construction isn't is what it means to us, how it works in practise, how it mixes up with other things.

So.

And I think with all the chapters, it really deepened our knowledge and our thinking about the pedagogy's within them.

And as a result of that we, you know, we've started having conversations. So Ally said in that discussion. Oh, it's interesting about the shift from oral discourse to written discourse. It was also interesting, the shift from, you know, the thoughts in your head to putting those into words. So Vigotsky an element to that.

You know, and because you're all talking together about learning theory, you're beginning to put it into learning theory terms and to see possibly where gaps are in those theories and possibly where next next steps are in those series, which was exciting.



Mark Childs 1:07:42

Is there's anything you want to add?



Elizabeth.Ellis 1:07:47

Yeah, I can do. I think I think probably for me and This is why you know the next the next one will probably be easier. I think in some ways, she says.



Mark Childs 1:07:58

More difficult in others, but yeah.



Elizabeth.Ellis 1:08:00

I don't know. I do that. No, it's just I think the thing with being an editor is, is that it sometimes it's hard to come in because you're coming in as a slightly later stage than everybody else. And so a lot of the thinking has already gone into that. So you can kind of come across as a new broom who's trying to speak clean.

And could kind of go, oh, we should do this. And you should do this. And you should do this. And it's like, actually a whole lot of thought has gone into to this point. So if you're ever asked to edit, you know, do you have a bit of empathy and sensitivity for that particular thing? I think the thing I found most fun about editing pedagogzilla and what I learned most from it was just the that it was that it was about editing in layers rather than editing chapter by chapter, because every area was becoming quite a lot. I mean, one of the first things I did was basically take the take that mission narrative.

And write it out as its own document so that I could see where people were so that we weren't kind of going from over here to over here, to over here on the map and it just helped me kind of go. And this is the story of the pedagogs. This is the story of the zillers. This is what the zillas are doing and kind of deep, like, disentangling it and then and then re entangling it again. So that was quite. And then the only other thing I just wanted to add as well was what felt really important to me was about that tone.



Mark Childs 1:08:52

Oh.



Elizabeth.Ellis 1:09:14

And it links the writing with the illustrations.

With the the the kind of the narrative that we've drawn is just that kind of light

heartedness so that you've got. But it's absolutely fundamentally credible. And it was just about trying to maintain that balance, but always was. So if somebody was, if a joke was being written, does this joke further the narrative or does is this a joke just for the sake of being, of having a joke? And I did have to be the party people sometimes and go. I'm sorry. I think it's a nice joke, but unfortunately it doesn't really work. It doesn't move the director forward.

But it was it was a fantastic experience, but I definitely learned a lot from it.



Michael.Collins 1:09:54

So I think, oh, we're gonna very quickly talk about what's next. I think we've sort of talked about what's next in this. We're working another book, hatefully. We're working on another book. We've decided not to have a rest, and we're just going straight to another one we've identified.



Mark Childs 1:09:59

Yeah.

You have a bit of a rest, but only a couple of months. There was a couple of months. Yeah, you had a baby in the rest, so maybe not a rest for you. Yeah.



Michael.Collins 1:10:06

There was there arrest, I think I had a baby in the rest.

Yeah, yeah. But there's another book in the works, and we've already identified all the recordings we've got to do to plug the gaps in that. But questions we've had a couple come in throughout. One was, yeah.



Mark Childs 1:10:26

That shifting from oral discourse to written discourse.

I no, I would say no. I it's still very much a normal discourse. I think in the way that I've that it's been written, it's the Thackery thing of saying what you're doing and addressing the audience and it's it is like a kind of we're trying to get a kind of verbal monologue. And one of the things I've learnt from doing this is that if you're stuck writing, this is advice I give my students. If you're stuck right about what to write or getting your ideas together, have a chat to somebody and record it.

And then use that recording as an initial go through. It's quite a shift perhaps from that transcript to the final thing.

But one of the things that helps I think with this book with the writing is academic English is awful. Academic writing is abysmal on the whole. OK, there's some good things, but on the whole it's it's stilted. It's difficult to understand, it's not fun. And if you actually keep that oral discourse in mind, if you're having a chat and putting it aside.

Bring little things and correcting yourself or whatever.

It breaks, it makes it more accessible, and this is a feedback we've got is accessible and academic. The academic stuff is the difference. It's like, let's bring in something from a reference here, but still keep it dialogic in a way. Still keep it like half of a dialogue. But it's a dialogue you're having with the audience and you are saying, oh, this is going to be useful later on, I'll have a look at this because this might happen. This what you're doing, oral things and it's it's it's really helpful in a written thing as well. So.

Yeah. So the the illustrator was Mike. And so he's one of the authors. So it didn't. It was it was not the illustration. There was no problem. Yeah. So anyway.

That's that was, it's not. I don't foresee it that different. I think it breaking down that difference helps.

Another good question, unless somebody's got one they wanted to pick up on, but I was going to pick up on.



Michael.Collins 1:12:31

So there was one more Ale had in there about.

Did we consider different types of readers and learners?



MC **Mark Childs** 1:12:36

Yes, that's the one I was going to pick up.



Michael.Collins 1:12:39

Ally, do you wanna expand on that at all?



MC **Mark Childs** 1:12:44

No, I will say consciously, the only thing we're conscious of was that it was very much our culture and we were picked up on that by Rebecca when we started writing the book. And so I wrote a little thing and going, we're sorry, it's agriculture culture, but it would seem inauthentic if we approached a different sort of.

A different culture, you know, which we try to make it, you know, with Gen X and maybe Gen Y between us, but it's maybe edging into genes, Gen Boomer slightly. But it's it's as it's 70s, it's 80s, it's 90s culture. It's science fiction. On the whole, there's a little bit of there's, there's a Sound of Music. So, you know, I don't think we shoehorn Sound of Music and all creatures great and small, but we we try to, if there was any conscious.



Michael.Collins 1:13:16

Itching.



Mark Childs 1:13:33

It was trying to come shoe, bring in more mainstream culture than just our very science fictiony fantasy thing. But and our aim was for people like Mike was saying, who have find themselves in the educational domain, but without necessarily coming in through an educational route. So I came in from no, I was trained teacher, but without many of the learning theories, a lot of people we find in this domain, learning tech and learning designers don't have that. Media developers don't have. Background and so I can feel a bit at sea. So it was targeted specifically at them and then we find that students are listening to it because then they understand why they're studying in the way that they're studying. Why am I doing group work? Oh, here's a section on collaborative learning. I understand why I'm doing it now. So that was gratifying. But that wasn't what we were thinking of. We were pre. We had a very clear audience in mind, more or less. And if we reached more people, that was great. But.

Gender. I'm not sure.

You know it's, you know, it's it's everybody likes a quite a range of different people, like science fiction, a range of different, you know, sexualities and all. It's probably more gay than straight people are drawn towards things like Doctor Who than than, but age. Yes, there's definitely a cut off point in that any you know well no. Some of the students are in their 20s who've said we really like this because I don't think.

Definitely there's there's a lot of these traditions.

Cross cultural lines, we don't have anything to targeting younger generational cultures, but you know, kids today watch Star Wars, they listen, they watch Buffy, so it's not excluding them necessarily. It's just not targeting them specifically. But we

are, we are really cognizant of the, there's no reference to Brazilian culture in there. They're really ashamed by it. But what can we do? We are not from that area. So if anyone wants to do this and wants to develop it themselves, then that would be the way that.

Try and be more inclusive is by supporting other people to do their own, but.



Michael.Collins 1:15:40

Or or join us on the show and tell us about your cultural thing. We want to hear about it and then explain. Explain to us why it's a wonderful demonstration of social constructivism or the like.



Mark Childs 1:15:43

Yeah, absolutely. Yeah, yeah, which was absolutely great. Yeah.

Yeah, that would be great as well. But then you wouldn't. Yeah, we could do an entire book start again, but do it entirely differently with a different cultural background.

But we can't. We were really conscious that we couldn't please everybody. And we were upfront about that because we couldn't. I don't think we couldn't. We couldn't done that. I couldn't. There was a lot of things we couldn't talk about because we've done anything about it. You know, we're stuck.



Michael.Collins 1:16:14

Are there any other questions?

Here.



Kieron.Sheehy 1:16:20

Can I ask a question?



Mark Childs 1:16:22

Yeah, 'cause.



Kieron.Sheehy 1:16:22

It's related to rumpus, really. The. So one thing that I like the book does it takes a film or.

A novel or.

A graphic novel kind of, and use that to illustrate us a problem or a situation, and

then has the theory sort of matched on to it. So as problems being matched on to theories and the it's about problem, problem representation.

Is through the choice of the book. OK, So what we're doing in Rumpus, we're looking at fun in learning, and it's something that others, such as funders and other academics, dismiss as a trivial topic or not worthwhile, or it's taken for granted, and that they they dismiss it or see it as something akin to another concept. So what advice would you give us regarding?

Which film, book or novel would match the situation that we currently face?

The funders don't recognise that they often don't see this as an issue, even though it's something that children tell us. It's important that it comes through students. All your own examples here. So which film, or novel or graphic novel or TV series would match the situation, or how to find it?

 **Mark Childs** 1:17:42

Any dystopia, anything dystopian you know would work, you know, V for Vendetta or you know.

 **Kieron.Sheehy** 1:17:42

Does that give any insights for the?

 **Mark Childs** 1:17:51

What else was another one where 01984? You know, it's like.

I mean, you know any of those, I mean, I think, well, I'm saying 1994 because it's actually within reach on my shelf here because.

 **Michael.Collins** 1:18:03

Gone so bleak with that analogy.

 **Kieron.Sheehy** 1:18:03

Well, yeah, that's much bleaker than I was expecting. I was hoping something, I don't know, Narnia. Maybe.

 **Mark Childs** 1:18:07

No, but this is what happens when you take fun out of things. You end up with a dystopian environment, you know others are really good. One. What's that movie?

That's that's kind of matrixy, but has got Sean Bean dies in it again and it's the the cold and they've all got like all the windows are all boarded up. They can't see outside and then they peel it off and there's. But there's there's birds flying and that's a good one. If you wanted a movie that's a, that's a really dark one. Yeah.



Michael.Collins 1:18:08

How about?



Kieron.Sheehy 1:18:12

Yeah.



Michael.Collins 1:18:35

Whatever this movie is called.



Rebecca.Ferguson 1:18:36

Whatever it is.



Mark Childs 1:18:37

I will.



Michael.Collins 1:18:38

So, Liz, you've got your hand up. You've got a suggestion.



Elizabeth.Ellis 1:18:40

Yes, I do actually. I mean and I I will say I reach for this film quite a lot because it is it's so it's it's it's the Martian. So I really like that film for the fact that it is it's a serious thing. I mean obviously guy left behind on Mars and but the fact of him kind of needing to resolve the problem himself.

Which he does with good humour, but also a lot of intellect and having to figure it out. And he's having to learn through the process. But I really like the fact that it is quite a lot of fun involved.

Trying to get him back from Mars with lots of pop culture references and things, you know, like, you know, kind of lots of Burry references, lots of lots of of fun references back to the early days of the Mars projects and things like that. And there's a scene where he communicates by using by using. Sorry on my brain's just dropped the

dropped the term.

The Hicks keys. He uses that to communicate backward to Earth.

And it's such a a great example of a tangible of teaching through the screen, not to the screen using something tangible, but it going back through a screen in order to be able to be understood. So I don't know. I think that that's a really great example of a film, I think, which it which I don't know, so maybe a slightly slightly flaky connection, but I think it's got a good. It's a good example of a process that is fun. There is a lot of argument from the, a lot of arguments about money and who owns it.

Who's going to bring the guy back? But actually, when it fundamentally comes down to it, it's working the problem and finding the answer. And if that's not higher education in the UKI, don't know what is really.



Michael.Collins 1:20:24

I've I've got one throw in the mix as well. In fact I've got 2-1 would be Mary Poppins. Because if you think about it, Mr Mr. Banks, Mr. Banks, he's all he's all about the money and none of the joy. Whereas Mary Poppins comes in, she starts injecting this. You know the the play, the imagination. And suddenly the kids flourish.



Kieron.Sheehy 1:20:34

Yeah. Oh, yes.



Michael.Collins 1:20:43

And then it, you know it, Mr. Banks sort of has to be won over by and then when eventually by the end of the movie he is then the whole family kind of come through and and and grow as people. Yeah, let's go fly. And also it means you get to do a bit of **** Dyke's fantastic cockney accent.

And that as well, my other one would be.

The I think criminally overlooked Christopher Robin film, which is Christopher Robin. When he's grown up.

And the the people of the 100 acre wood come out to, to find him and bring him back. And it's sort of again, it's a similar sort of narrative of somebody who's become a little bit too kind of drawn down in the real world and being reconnected with the, you know, the things that really matter.

And of course, there's a huge I mean, from from an academic perspective, there's a

massive body of evidence around sort of the the benefits of both playful learning but also using play to decontextualise learning and how that by decontextualising people are removing them from their kind of everyday situations allows them to engage more fully or more. What's the not critically, possibly more critically with it. So you know, asking people to apply this thing, for example, to your module.

Carries with it a lot of.

Or like you know, your practise carries with a lot of emotional baggage. Sometimes you suddenly think, oh, well, what about the money? And what about, you know, Gavin, who hates change? Recipe go. What about?

Play or applying this pedagogic principle on the bridge of the Starship Enterprise and Spock's got a gold. Then suddenly you're able to kind of do it without the same level of baggage and more sort of fully engaged with the problem. I hope that answered your question, Kieran.

We're just about to hit 3:00. I think we should probably hand back over to Ale and Kieran to tail us off.



Ale.Okada 1:22:39

I still would like to say that, wow, that was amazing. And yes, we'd like to clap to you guys. Please, if you can just.

Stop sharing the final slide. So yes, this is was fantastic.



Michael.Collins 1:23:03

1st for having us. Yeah, that's good. That's fun.



Kieron.Sheehy 1:23:05

Yes, lovely.



Rebecca.Ferguson 1:23:07

Yeah.




Mark Childs 1:23:09


Transcript could also form the basis of a book chapter, so you know of a research paper so you know it's always looking to ways to maximise and double everything that you do. So we'll be taking the transcript and turning that into something


publishable as well. Probably at some point. So yeah, don't throw anything away ever. It's my biggest tip.

 **Kieron.Sheehy** 1:23:09
It works.

 **Michael.Collins** 1:23:29
And you can find all of the resources and links mentioned today on the pedagogzilla website [orapedagogzilla.com/the book](http://orapedagogzilla.com/the-book). You can also find us on Amazon or Spotify.

 **Mark Childs** 1:23:37
Yeah.

 **Kieron.Sheehy** 1:23:38
We do have a voice.
You do have some you do have that voice. Sometimes the good voice, the podcast voice.

 **Mark Childs** 1:23:44
Oh yeah, we switch into it. Yeah, yeah, absolutely. There. Yeah.

 **Michael.Collins** 1:23:44
I do slip into it.

🕒 **Ale.Okada** stopped transcription