

Who is the author of this Editorial?

Editorial by Petra Angervall

Since the journal's launch in 2018, the Editorial in each issue has been an important space for our team to voice ideas, concerns, and interests, as well as to introduce the new issue. We have used the Editorial to articulate our mission and nurture a shared sense of collective identity. I believe we take genuine pleasure in writing these pieces - their varied images and reflections - and the team shares the responsibility for creating them.

However, at times, the Editorial demands too much attention and can be time consuming to write. In light of running a fully unfinanced journal, solving all issues necessary for this task on a daily basis, and on top of that (as of last spring) engaging in constructing a new web platform, we are sometimes forced to make certain work-wise priorities. It's an act of balance to know whether one should prioritize issues concerning archiving, layout, team member needs, reviewer contacts, visions and the future, *or* writing an Editorial. Consequently, some tasks are constantly being pushed downwards on the priority list.

So, when we decided to publish our second Issue this year (JPHE, Vol. 7 No. 2), I started to reflect on the possibility to ask ChatGPT for help with the Editorial. What kind of paper would ChatGPT produce, what about the importance of critical reflections, content and argumentation, and how would it summarize each of the published papers? The idea was equally worrying and intriguing. No doubt, this is a dangerous path for several reasons: We might get lazy and start using generative AI as a quick fix service if it turns out to work beautifully? Maybe ChatGPT would write the Editorial much better than I would ever do? Would it, for example, develop a character which produces text with personality? I also worry that this pathway risk changing the idea of the journal, the standards and our engagement.

Maybe I should try it out but not tell? Still, what could possibly happen if I, for once, tried to be less worried about content and act more time-efficient? Research is about daring - right? All these questions were heavily debated between me and myself but also discussed with some of my journal colleagues. I decided to try it out and ask ChatGPT the following questions: "Would you be able to write an argumentative Editorial for *Journal of Praxis in Higher Education*, which includes a short presentation of the following five papers (...)"? This is what ChatGPT came up with:

“Praxis as a Way of Knowing, Being, and Transforming in Higher Education

The concept of praxis lies at the heart of higher education’s transformative potential. It denotes more than the application of theory in practice; it captures the dialectic between reflection and action, between the world as it is and as it might become. In a time when universities are increasingly governed by metrics, competition, and instrumental rationalities, praxis offers a vocabulary for reclaiming education as a deeply human and ethical endeavor—one rooted in critical awareness, relational engagement, and the possibility of change.

This issue of the *Journal of Praxis in Higher Education* (Vol. 7, No. 2) gathers contributions that explore praxis in its many forms: as reflection in and on action, as the negotiation of boundary conditions in learning environments, as embodied and contemplative engagement, and as critique of the institutional structures that shape academic and professional life. The five papers presented here illustrate the diverse ways in which praxis is enacted, challenged, and reimagined within contemporary higher education.

In the opening paper “Expanding Opportunity Spaces: Students as Co-Creators of Learning Environments”, Holen, Wallin and Gjøtterud investigate student engagement in shaping their learning environments through two compelling cases: student-initiated elective courses and an extracurricular innovation centre. Their study illuminates how students participate not only within pre-existing educational structures, but also in their transformation—negotiating both material and immaterial dimensions of learning. By analysing these boundary conditions, the authors expand our understanding of students as co-creators rather than consumers of education. Their work exemplifies praxis as collective, situated action that reconfigures what learning environments can be.

Cox’s autoethnographic contribution “Vulnerability and Voice: Mental Health as a Site of Praxis” shifts the focus toward the lived experiences of casual academics and the psychosocial risks embedded in precarious employment. Through personal narrative and critical reflection, Cox exposes how individual well-being is shaped by structural conditions, calling for leadership and institutional responsibility rather than individual coping strategies. This piece reframes mental health as a site of praxis—where awareness, critique, and advocacy intertwine—and invites the reader to consider how care and justice might be integrated into the fabric of academic life.

Nestlog, Uddling and Thyberg bring the discussion into the domain of teacher education in “Literacy as Praxis: Negotiating Discourses in Teacher Education” by examining how educators conceptualize literacy within and across disciplines. Their interviews with primary teacher educators reveal three interrelated perspectives—academic, disciplinary, and professional literacy—each carrying different assumptions about language, knowledge, and identity. By visualizing the relationships among these perspectives, the authors contribute a meta-language for navigating disciplinary discourses and preparing future teachers

as reflective, literate practitioners. Their work embodies praxis as dialogic inquiry—an effort to understand and transform one’s professional world through critical engagement with language and meaning.

The paper “Transparency and Equity: Praxis in the Public Face of Admissions”, by Fryer, Jones and Zhang, examines transparency in UK undergraduate admissions, focusing on the use of the UCAS personal statement. Their analysis of university websites and staff practices exposes inconsistencies between stated expectations and actual use, revealing the opaque norms that can advantage some applicants over others. The authors argue for systemic transparency as an ethical and practical imperative, particularly as forthcoming reforms reshape admissions processes. Their work situates praxis within institutional critique—an act of making visible the structures that reproduce inequality and of proposing concrete strategies for change.

In the final paper, the theoretical and experiential essay *Contemplative practice and Transformative Phenomenology: A methodology for engaging university students in praxis*, by Strohmayer and Jones they explore how Transformative Phenomenology and contemplative practice can scaffold graduate students’ development of praxis. They propose a pedagogy that nurtures consciousness, self-reflection, and mindful engagement as foundations for action. Praxis here becomes an inward–outward movement: a deepened awareness of one’s motives and assumptions that leads to intentional, ethical doing. The authors argue that such contemplative orientations cultivate researchers and professionals who are not only competent but also self-aware and socially responsive.

Praxis as Ethical Commitment

Across these contributions runs a shared insistence: praxis is not an abstract principle but an ongoing ethical commitment—to reflection, to solidarity, to transformation. Whether enacted by students negotiating learning environments, academics confronting precarity, or educators rethinking disciplinary literacies, praxis remains a dynamic process of questioning and re-creation.

In bringing together these varied perspectives, this issue of JPHE reminds us that higher education’s vitality depends on its capacity for self-reflection and change. Praxis, understood as the unity of thought and action oriented toward justice, offers both a method and a hope. It calls on us—as teachers, students, researchers, and citizens—to inhabit education not merely as a system, but as a shared project of becoming.

Petra Angervall

Journal of Praxis in Higher Education, Vol. 7, No. 2 (2025)”

Reflection

As you can see, ChatGPT does a fairly good job. On my first reading, I felt slightly worried - and even a bit taken aback - by the language and phrasing, which are far more polished than I could ever manage. The flow feels steady and confident, and it engages the reader well. On my second reading, however, I also noticed a slight lack of depth and nerve. It's almost *too* perfect, containing only what can be taken for granted - the very basic and generic. Still, small errors can be noticed: lack of quotation marks, or commas. There's no alternative or out-of-the-box perspective, either, and nothing that feels truly creative or critical. It may even become a little boring, right? Or is that just me reading it too critically - hoping, wondering about my own limitations or my need for recognition? I'm not sure. What I *am* sure of is that I probably won't use ChatGPT for the Editorial again. Unless...