4   Collaboration in Inquiry for Sustainability

As suggested at the end of chapter 3, there is a considerable deficit in the majority of research into sustainability, organisations and business where "intense coercive and mimetic pressures" have induced a "homogeneity of organisational forms and practices" (Srikantia & Bilmoria, 1997). These pressures have resulted in interpretations of sustainability that are consistent with the dominant worldview rather than enabling researchers to develop epistemological and ontological alternatives for sustainability. It seems that PAR is an appropriate methodological and epistemological consort to sustainability and may help researchers overcome these "mimetic pressures".   In this chapter I seek mainly to describe action research, giving indications along the way as to how it has ontological assumptions, experiential background references and physical/practical demands of inquiry that are commensurate with the need for catalysing a "sustainability transformation".

4.1   Primacy of the practical?

As discussed in chapter 2 sustainability recognises the need for developmental changes, changes to how we learn and for fundamental transformations in our visions of society and relationship. It has been suggested that for the action researcher the practical is primary (Heron & Reason, 1997). However, whilst there is a focus upon practical issues of concern in action research, it seems to me that this does not occur in splendid and exalted isolation. Instead the orientation towards the practical opens out onto the need for continual reflexivity and critical transformation. Maguire suggests the decision to "attempt participatory research grows out of a deep *belief* in the ability of people, ourselves included, to grow change, challenge injustice and apprehension and take increasing control of our lives and communities through collective action, however small" (1993: 176, italics mine). By making belief a figural issue, the action researcher is required to work through an emergent developmental process of inquiry that is open ended and always subject to change, reframing and revisioning, both in-the-moment and over-time.

For example, co-operative inquiry is a form of action research in which a group of practitioners - say, alternative health care practitioners - mutually inquire into aspects of their work by cycling through repeated movements of action and reflection (Reason & Rowan, 1981). There is no "setting up" of such a group for "co-operative processes have to be negotiated and re-learned by every group in every new instance" (Reason, 1988a: 19). This evolving

conceptualisation allows those involved in the inquiry to change the way that they view "knowledge" during the process without endangering the "outcome". In fact the very notion of outcome is moved away from something dependent upon the successful application of a template that has been predetermined. As Freire described his work "by doing it, you learn to do it better, because putting this methodology into practice, you are creating methodology" (1982: 37). Thus, action research, in attempting to include uncertain realities (Torbert, 2000b), moves towards a notion of outcome as a processual issue concerning the engagement of others by a "self" in the continual process of becoming. Writing about the reflective practitioner, Schon describes this as "a paradox which is at the heart of learning any new, any really new skill which is at the heart of learning a kind of artistry when you cannot in principle know what it is you're supposed to be learning and yet you must learn it"(1987).

In this way the envisioning process about ways of being sits, not only comfortably, but nagging-ly alongside a concern for action. As I have suggested in chapter 2, sustainability seems to call for a dialectical interweaving between developmental changes, changes to how we learn and for fundamental transformations in our visions of world, self and relationship. Such a view accords with the call by Montuori and Purser of the need for research into sustainability and organisations to acknowledge that

> "we simply do not really know how to deal with the ecological crisis at the present or how organisations may best address this problem, and that the search for one answer is part of the problem. We assume that "more of the same" will most likely not work, and we therefore need to engage in a process of collective, contextual discovery to see what might work in our situation…and how that relates to the work of others. In other words rather than calling for experts we are calling for participative learning process with members of organisations and their communities generating knowledge that may or may not involve bringing in experts" (Montuori & Purser, 1996: 195).

The orientation that action research takes towards the practical, then, sits comfortably alongside the urgent and pressing concerns that are foundational for sustainability and the kinds of beliefs about change and reorientation that drives the search for sustainability.

4.2   Expert knowledge, power and locally grounded forms of knowing

Whilst I have largely talked about action research as a single body, it is perhaps more like a family of practices whose inter-relating can be considered across a number of different dimensions[1]. One distinct grounding for action research has been that undertaken with a developmental perspective in Southern countries. Participatory Action Research (PAR) has become firmly embedded in development discourse and practice (Chambers, 1995, 1997; Selener, 1997; Fals Borda, 2001). There is a more explicit reference to the need to address the issues of powerless communities and individuals in the light of oppressive structures that affect basic livelihoods and physical security than in say the organisation-focused action research in the North (e.g. Whyte, 1988, 1989). This community element of participatory research has been paralleled in the North by considerable and diverse work of the Highlander Research and Education Centre (Merrifield, 1993; Gaventa, 1993; Lewis, 2001). As Peter Park writing from this North American perspective suggests "participatory research is a means for putting research capabilities in the hand of the deprived and disenfranchised people so that they can transform their lives for themselves" (1993).

In close relation to this forum for action research is the work that has emanated from race and feminist perspectives. Marja-Liisa Swantz' work with participatory development in Tanzania was an early example of participatory inquiry for "community" where research conducted by women's groups created "knowledge from living in specific circumstances" (Swantz & Vainio-Matitila, 1988: 137; Swantz, Ndedya, & Saiddy Masaiganah, 2001). Maguire has wondered whether some of the things that make "participatory research unique, for example, involved participation, organisation creating and action aimed at structural change, might…make different demands of women than men" (Maguire, 1993).

Ella Edmundson Bell suggests that the emergence of a Black Liberation Social Science Movement at the end of the 1960s in USA arose because the racist views that white sociologists were promulgating clashed against the presence, existence and experience of young African-American social scientists (Bell, 2001). The communicative bind from both the race and feminist perspectives seemed to say "if the basis of good sociology is an objectifying,

---

[1] Think of an extended family unit. We may like to consider the individuals according to shared age groups, members of separate family units, their physical and emotional traits, interests and activities or the inter-relation between types of individuals (elder-younger, male-female, blood-married) or to a specific individual (e.g. to a matriarch). In a slight aside, it is interesting to note that Indian languages, such as my native Gujarati, have individual appellations for various relations which are undifferentiated in English. For example there is no such simple thing as an "Aunt" - I would identify my mother's sister with the title "masi", my mother's brother's wife with "mami", my dad's sister as "kaki" and my dad's brother's wife as "faeba". And given the size and extended scope of an Indian "family" it is not unusual to have a masi or faeba who is younger than yourself!

link to: http://www.bath.ac.uk/carpp/publications/doc_theses_links/r_shah.html

academic-self, how can that sit with my being a social scientist and my simultaneous experience of being an objectified other." Female sociologists came to notice 'a line of fault' between their experiences and the dominant conceptual schemes (Harding, 1990:95). The result of such disjunction was that inquiry based on universal truth claims by disinterested, objective scientists was revealed variously as political, power-serving and oppressive. Writing from a feminist standpoint Nancy Hartsock adds

> "the studied object becomes another being with regard to whom the studying subject becomes transcendent…what we see is the construction of the social relations, the power relations, which form the basis of the transcendent subject…who can persuade himself that he exists outside time and space and power relations"(1990:162-163).

The corollary of such a situation for members of oppressed groups in the academic community was a need to reconstruct the basis of a science that denied their identity-group voice and legitimacy. The silencing of voice through continuous recourse to "single truth" by powerful groups had lead to a concern in these various race, gender and ethnic discourses of language and action with how other forms of knowing may infiltrate the concept of "science" and be validated. The soft blanket of oppressions that had objectified the "other" also constructed the researcher a transcendent Subject who's experiences were the benchmark against which to measure all others. In part this dehumanisation/super-humanisation dynamic seems to have come from an exclusion of everyday lived reality and identity from the range of "valid" experiences. Now, each discourse - developing country, race, feminist - has in its own way sought a redefinition of science and the knowledge system so that they can and increasingly must accept people's knowledge (Bell, 2001; Maguire, 2001; Hartsock, 1990; Park, 1999; Lewis, 2001; Chambers, 1997). This is done in such a way that we can translate "common sense" into "good sense" (Fals Borda, 1991a) and move towards a "knowledge democracy" (Gaventa, 1993).

A range of other textures to the fabric of knowledge have been opened up for the constructivist and participatory researcher through this epistemological critique of the subject-object binomial. Eikeland returns to the subtle variation of types of knowledge defined by Aristotle from broad theoretical knowledge - a kind of spectator knowledge with truth 'for its own sake' - to poetical knowledge which comes from a producer or manipulator knowing "how-to…" and practical knowledge, for an actor knowing "ways of-doing-things" (Eikeland, 2001). Feminist academics have highlighted interactive knowing or affective "relational"

knowledge in contrast to purely instrumental or objective knowledge (Park, 1993; 1999 155; Clements, Ettling, Jenett, & Shields, 1998). Such relational perspectives recognise that "the real work of human organisation occurs within the space of interaction between its members" (Bradbury & Lichtenstein, 2000). In addition to this relational knowledge and the traditional "representational" knowledge, (with "functional" and "interpretive" subtypes) Park adds "reflective" knowledge (Park, 1999). This is based upon self conscious and critical activity towards creating change which is "social and dialogic" (Park, 2001). Through their participatory worldview, Heron and Reason suggest four ways of knowing - a pyramid from "practical" at the top, to "propositional", "presentational" and "experiential" knowing at the base (Heron & Reason, 1997).

A subtle difference amongst the various authors cited above is the way "knowing" is framed as an active verb compared to "knowledge" as a noun. But each of them, as for participatory action research in general, looks to bring theory and practice closer together by extending the knowledge creation process beyond the traditional academic concern for cognitive rationality in understanding a phenomenon as an object (Fals Borda, 2001; Gustavsen, 2001; Levin & Greenwood, 2001; Torbert, 2000b). Experiential sensing and feeling and an orientation towards action with critical subjectivity in a shared, critically intersubjective field are seen as bright lights, not shone in the "search" for knowledge, but in the midst of which incandescence the continually creative dance of knowing-being takes place.

Thus, an important aspect of any form of action research is the sense in which the inter-penetration of research and practice goes beyond the traditional academic audience. Reason and Marshall (1987) suggest three "audiences" for such research/practice – "for me", as the individual researcher and her being in the world; "for us", as the group of individuals in the social setting who are inquiring into their action in a timely and relevant praxis; and "for them" as a wider body of researchers and practitioners not directly involved in the inquiry but to whom generalisable ideas and outcomes are directed. These are three inter-penetrating "communities of inquiry within communities of practice" and parallel the notions of "first-person research/practice" as critical subjectivity, "second-person research/practice" as critical inter-subjectivity, and "third-person research/practice" as subjectivity-objectivity. Similarly, Rowan has suggested that participatory research changes the world in three ways - in making a difference to the researcher, to whoever is included in the inquiry process and to those who come to know about the research (1981). I explore each of these various research/practices and their affinity with sustainability in some more detail below.

4.3   Critical subjectivity and first-person research/practice

As described above, action research has challenged the unquestioned status of truth claims coming from the reified knowledge of the expert and sought to replace it with knowing that is grounded in and oriented towards the lived reality of people. Concomitant with the increased access given to the "other" upon academic inquiry and the introduction of alternative ways of knowing has been the elucidation of alternatives to the transcendent, purely objective researcher. As Bell comments, black social scientists were, in 1960s USA, required to act both as scholars and social activists (2001). The result of such insider-outsider standpoints has been to force the researcher/academic from out of his "viewing-hide" and to drop the claim of being an objectifying and disinterested self.   For the action researcher this leads to the recognition that:

 "one does not first learn the truth then act upon it, but rather research itself and
our lives as wholes are actions; thus, we act before we deeply care about the truth,
we act as we seek truth (and as our sense of the truth we seek transforms), and we
seek truths that will inform, not just a reflective concept of the world and future
plans, but present awareness and action" (Torbert, 2000b).

In different ways the researcher is jogged out of her slumber and reminded that she is "always already" participating in the world. The call for the inquirer to cease inquiring *about* and *over* people is a grounded concern for increasing the capacity of the marginalised to understand and to take control over their own life situations away from non-accountable and powerful elites (Gaventa, 1993). However, we are reminded that it is powerful elites who hold much of the opportunity and resource to initiate a transition towards inquiry *with* and ultimately *by* the people. We are also reminded that inquiry into sustainability occurs against a background reference of deeply inter-connected society and an environment in change - all parts are present and involved. We are reminded that the "knower" has been "asleep" for some time now and always threatens to nod off again. Finally, given the potential transformation of society and actors/observers "an epistemology that is accepted now may, in time, have to be replaced by another, more satisfactory one by new criteria for which it has laid the intellectual and experiential foundations" (Harman, 1996: 37). Thus, with the researcher present in positions of power it is not only the capacity "out there" that needs to be changed, but also the one "in here"; there needs to be a "pedagogy of the privileged" (Reason & Bradbury, 2001). This "first-person research/practice" is ultimately about taking a self-reflexive attitude, not only to the ground on which one is standing, but also one's posture and relation to the other.

Thus, following on from the critique of the subject-object binomial, as well as attempts to re-humanise the "other", the inquirer must also come out from behind her veil of objectivity and be made more human, more fully a subject. While the positivist researcher was treating others as fragments she was also fragmenting herself. The action researcher cannot logically accept a reified "role" for herself nor her own alienation, and instead must treat herself as a changing self rather than static and fixed "Researcher".

With no "hide" in which to conceal herself and from where to watch the world, the action researcher is forced, not only, to ask the question "How am I choosing to be in the world?", but also then to do something about this in her present acting. For Selener "the researcher is a committed participant, facilitator and learner in the research process and this leads to militancy, rather than detachment…the commitment is likely to go against the "class" interests of the professional researcher, but he or she learns and develops through the process" (Selener, 1997:21). But it is not only because of this anti-class interest that such activity is challenging. Whilst ultimately one of the aims of action research is to bring theory and practice into close unity (both physically and temporally), the situation at present remains one in which there are numerous researchers who are outsiders - people who initiate and conduct inquiry from outside of the practice/clinical setting. This is a problem since "the bottom line is that most researchers operating in this mode have little or no training in how to assess the consequences of their research interventions for the participants. The assumption that research is benign allows researchers to proceed without worrying too much about the effects that they may be having on the participants" (Schein, 2001: 231). Additionally,

> "most persons do not sense that they can apply their ideals to their own immediate behaviour. Their ideals are always aimed at others or at the future. They are too busy in the present moment formulating and expressing these ideals to pay attention to the actual quality and effects of their behaviour….More destructively, their attitude does not recognise the possibility of experiential contradictions and therefore forecloses inquiry into them rather than encourage it…So instead of gradually reducing such contradictions they tend to propagate the very inconsistencies between thought and action which they ideally abhor" (Torbert, 1976: 14-15).

Perhaps such business is dangerous for the researcher working for sustainability because of the ease with which a moral higher ground may be assumed and the presumptions of doing good

for the abstractions of the environment and society. Sustainability research requires us to recognise the inescapable role of personal characteristics of the observer, including unconscious and unaware ways of thinking. Heron and Reason suggest a move away from naïve subjectivity in such a way that "we do not suppress our primary subjective experience but accept that it is our experiential articulation of being in a world, and as such is the ground of all our knowing" (1997:283). They are also aware of attempted objectivity of egoic awareness and suggest that if naivety is merely accepted it is likely to be open to distortions of defensive processes. The injunction is that the action researcher, in order to become a 'thinking-feeling person' (Fals Borda, 2001), must conduct some continual internal heuristic inquiry (Douglass, 1985) to know her own practice as an individual in a society (organisation or institution) in transition, where the very notions of thinking, feeling and person-hood are in movement.

First-person research/practice offers much towards this end. It calls for "critical subjectivity" (Heron & Reason, 1997), or consciousness "in the midst of action". It encourages us to go from noticing our role bound alienation to enabling us to learn new ways of acting, seeing and inquiring (Rudolph, Taylor, & Foldy, 2001). As Torbert suggests it is something which "each of us can only do by and for ourselves by dividing and otherwise stretching our attention" (2000b). For Senge when such personal mastery "becomes a discipline - an activity we integrate into our lives - it embodies two underlying movements. The first is continually clarifying what is important to us….The second is continually learning how to see current reality more clearly" (1990:140).

This kind of personal frame refining and changing "autoethnography" (Ellis & Bochner, 2000) has many roots in wisdom and spiritual traditions where they are considered through notions and practices of "attention", "mindfulness" and being fully "present" in the moment. At the heart of many of these inquiry approaches is cycling between action and reflection. There is an attempt to increase attention *to* inner processes, coupled with a desire to, then, use this new awareness in one's acting. The cycles may or may not be very compacted in time, but movement between action and reflection is important for the action researcher.

One of the tools for first-person research/practice is simply for one to begin "noticing", to bring certain aspects of one's lived experience - a specific word that one may use, an emotional response - to the foreground of one's attention, to rest on these things in one's mind as subjects worthy of attention. This noticing or "indwelling" (Polanyi cited in Douglass, 1985) may initially just be a repeated naming of the experience or phenomenon, which may then result in deeper, appreciative, considered noticing. This is similar to what Judi Marshall has

called "inner arcs of attention" in her engaging description of her own reflective practice. There she seeks to "notice her perceiving, making meaning, framing issues, choosing how to speak out" (Marshall, 2001: 433). Such self studying may occur in the midst of action (Torbert, 2001) or whilst one is speaking or feeling the emotion. However, this is a skill like any other that requires attention and cultivation outside the heat of the moment.

"Off-line" reflective practices, such as reflective journal writing, diary writing, note taking, personal narrative or autobiographical accounts, are important for working with such noticing and inquiry (Richardson, 2000). The sense-making that is associated with this may look "upstream" back in one's life for potential sources of the themes and noticing of today. Equally, first-person research/practice may look "downstream" to critically consider day-to-day behaviour (Reason & Torbert, 1999). Reflective writing may also be akin to "downloading" one's thinking as it flows to hand as a stream of consciousness (Goldberg, 1986). The writing can also be more intentional, looking to pick up specific themes, concerns or relationships. For example, it may be possible to use a simple tool such as the Ladder of Inference to draw attention to the ways in which one frames and acts upon issues and relationships as a result of the beliefs that one holds[2]. Working with such mental models one can appreciate the inference making process and develop reflections into fundamental beliefs about self, work and power (Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, & Smith, 1994). Off-line reflection, as well as in-the-moment reflection, may also take a more outwardly oriented attitude. Marshall describes "outer arcs of attention" where she actively questions, raises issues and engages with others or seeks ways to test out developing ideas (Marshall, 2001). The use of a two-column format for mapping conversations may help one become more aware of thinking and reasoning, and make this more visible to others (Senge et al., 1994). Ultimately one may begin to understand the gap between one's espoused theories and theories-in-use (Argyris & Schon, 1974), across four territories of experience - intentional attending/visioning, thinking/strategizing, sensing/performing and outside world/assessing (Fisher & Torbert, 1995; Torbert, 2001). "Off-line" reflective practice to this end may also include meditation, whilst Tai-Chi, Gurdieff work and other ritual type activities offer on-line gateways into "self-observation-among-others" (Fisher & Torbert, 1995; Torbert, 2000b).

I spent a couple of paragraphs of this section suggesting why first-person research/practice may be important and necessary in the context of sustainability. But one wonders whether such

---

[2] This simple model was used to considerable effect in a first-year undergraduate class here at Bath lead by Steve Taylor. Students were asked to pick up some aspect of their relational practice with significant others and engage in action experiments towards increasing the effectiveness of these relationships.

first-person inquiry may have more than just instrumental value, as some absorbing examples of the outputs of this kind of inquiry bear testament (for example Hanrahan, 1998 ; Maguire, 1993). The notion of "living life as inquiry" (Marshall, 1999) takes the ideas of "research as a personal process" (Reason & Marshall, 1987) and first-person research/practice to their ultimate resting (moving?) place. This is where inquiry is "an expression and actualisation of human capability…to be celebrated and encouraged in its own right" (Reason, 1996). For Torbert, "the primary question becomes, not how to create an off-line community of inquiry among scientific writers and journal editors, but how to create a real-time community of inquiry within one's family, at work or within the voluntary organisations to which one belongs" (Torbert, 2000b).

Ultimately, such practice is to a considerable extent defined by what works for the individual. My first-person inquiry has become increasingly important and significant over time. In subsequent chapters I expand upon and display the methods that I have been learning to use for this research/practice - including reflective writing, action experiments, drawing and meditation.

4.4   Critical intersubjectivity and second-person research/practice

Second-person research/practice is one "in which the inquiry is focused through a group which is normally established for the purpose of collaborative learning and inquiry" (Reason, 1999) and concerns an ability to inquire face-to-face with others into issues of mutual concern (Reason, 2000). It flows from the critical subjectivity of first-person inquiry, since this personal knowing is set within a context of both linguistic-cultural and experiential shared meaning with others (Heron & Reason, 1997).   Whilst this may suggest a largely "academic" practice setting, Torbert suggests that second-person research/practice occurs at "all times when we engage in supportive, self-disclosing and confronting ways with others in shared first-person research/practices" (2000b) .

One example of such collaborative research/practice is co-operative inquiry, where the distinction between researcher and subject is suggested to dissolve (Reason, 1988b). As part of her doctoral research, Kate McArdle, in the School of Management at the University of Bath, is currently facilitating a co-operative inquiry group of young women managers who are exploring their experiences of working in large companies. The group meets at monthly intervals in such a way that the research cycling between action and reflection enables participants to "develop their critical awareness of theories and ideas they bring to their action in the world" and "to the

extent to which their behaviour and experience are congruent with these theories…both theory and practice are developed" (Reason & Heron, 1995: 124). The co-operative inquiry group seems to alternate between rehearsal and performance with regular feedback about perceptions and feedforward about vision and strategy (Torbert, 2000b) and seems to move towards greater overlap between "clinical" and "research" agendas (Schein, 2001).

A considerable amount of work has been conducted in Southern countries with Participatory Rural Appraisal and Participatory Action Research (Fals Borda & Rahman, 1991; Selener, 1997; Chambers, 1997). This form of second-person inquiry follows strongly the dual tracks of conscientização as proposed by Freire (1993; 1982) through collective self-inquiry and reflection. In significantly materially deprived settings, where practical change is an issue of fundamental livelihood, there is a desire to both raise the critical consciousness and awareness of the people with regard to their own life situations, as well as to awaken their conscience and will.

Whilst co-operation amongst subjects is important for followers in this tradition, Freire was also clear to point out the tactics of divide and rule, manipulation and cultural invasion which prevent the oppressed becoming Subjects (Freire, 1993). The awareness of co-optation and conflict is less evident in "appreciative inquiry". Whilst it draws upon similar traditions to PAR and co-operative inquiry, appreciative inquiry focuses upon generative and constructive meanings and always begins with the unconditional positive question that aims to guide inquiry agendas in life sustaining patterns (Barrett & Cooperrider, 1990; Ludema, Cooperrider, & Barrett, 2001). The work is conducted in numerous settings including development work in the South. The second-person research/practice of appreciative inquiry revolves around a positive topic of choice that links into "discovery", "dream", "design" and "destiny".

In contrast to this last, the awareness of and attention to co-optation is an important underlying theme for those engaged in Participatory Action Research (PAR) (Rahman & Fals Borda, 1991) particularly given the fact that, unlike say a co-operative inquiry amongst a group of professionals in the North, the initial "resources" emanate largely from outside of the community setting. This does not mean that PAR is not appreciative nor that the group cannot continue with their "inquiry" after the intervention. However, the mutual dependency from such inquiry, which may have emancipated people from other dimensions, locations and forms of power, is often a significant factor in this kind of participatory development practice and is acknowledged and addressed as such.

link to: http://www.bath.ac.uk/carpp/publications/doc_theses_links/r_shah.html

Often, given the rural settings and work with the dispossessed in this pedagogical movement, the tools used in PAR do not match the "sophistication" that may be used in Northern country settings. However, by working with the people's ways of knowing, PAR tools often tend to be far less abstracted and more grounded in lived realities so that "capacity building" can have more significant meaning for the people. For example, rural appraisals often start with simple problem identification, ranking and preference exercises.

In her description of work with fishing communities, who were experiencing severe declines in catches, Mwajuma Masiaganah suggests that it was important for women's groups to make their positions clear. They were enabled to do this by literally being given the "stick" to draw out their problems on the ground (2000). There is a wonderful tradition in such research/practice of drama and oral story telling, where the community uses theatre, dance and sensuous /experiential expressing to take the people's understanding of the issues facing them forward into action contexts. These various practices have recognised the important intersecting play between language, literacy and culture. As such practice has flowered and grown there have been attempts to retrieve and correct official or elitist history in a way that reinterprets it in terms of class interests (Fals Borda, 2001). In valuing and working with folk culture, oral tradition, drawing and appreciating differences in literacy Fals Borda has developed a method for conveying research results and meanings across these different types of knowing. He has explored this through a two-column style of writing both in his book *Historia Doble de la Costa* (Double History of the Coast) and again in exploring the convergence between Northern and Southern approaches to action research (Fals Borda, 1996).

4.4.1 Learning History

The rhetorical and writing skills that Fals Borda uses in this work are, in some ways, remarkably similar to the learning history methodology as forwarded by Roth and Kleiner from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Drawing upon the idea of a "jointly told tale" the learning history records the lived experience of those in the research setting - their thinking, experimentation and arguments - in a two-column format document. The document text of the learning history is then used in conversations and dialogue that allow an organisation to reflect collectively upon the particular experience.

Two basic types of learning history have been delineated (Kleiner & Roth, 1997; Roth & Kleiner, 1998): one that occurs after an event or specific project has taken place and the other which attempts to create and write the history during the actual lifetime of the project. The

aim of both types is to reach a point at which individuals within the participant group can reflect upon their experience and bring others from outside into this reflective process. Both also work from a position in which academics and practitioners work together (Bradbury & Mainemelis, 1999). A typical learning history would revolve around a six-stage process as set out by Roth and Kleiner in their research with various businesses (1998; Roth & Kleiner, 1995; Roth, 1996; Kleiner & Roth, 1997) and exemplified by Hilary Bradbury's work with the Swedish Natural Step (Bradbury, 1998; Bradbury & Mainemelis, 1999) and Rob Farrands in his work with the Soil Association and Shell EXPRO (Farrands, 2000).

The initial planning stage determines the scope and range of the history with participants. At this time a number of champions who are willing to invest effort to develop the process within the organisations need to be identified. These insiders are an important component of the learning history team since they have the ability to provide deeper meanings and interpretations against the "removed" perspective of the external historian. At this stage, working with the insiders, "noticeable results" from the collaboration would be identified in order to be used as a point for inquiry in the subsequent interviews.

The next stage would be a series of reflective interviews with participants and key individuals. These retrospective and reflective conversations will allow for focused exploration of the issues with participants relating to their actual experiences. As Roth and Kleiner suggest "we want to know, simply, the story of what happened from their perspective" (Roth & Kleiner, 1998). The tangible outcomes established earlier are used as springboards from which to develop the story from everyone's individual perspective.

Subsequently, the raw data is "distilled" into "a form that the organisation can hear", using techniques of qualitative data analysis, coding and the development of grounded theory. In the writing-up stage that follows, both insiders and outsiders combine to develop an organised account of the material around the developed themes. Learning histories are drawn up in two side-by-side columns. The right hand column contains a "campfire narrative" in the participant's own words. Meanwhile, the left-hand column contains evaluative comments and questions about assumptions and implications written by the historian(s). In writing the document there is an attempt to retain the mythic voice from the participants and the "story" of the relationship, whilst also ensuring rooting in the data and ultimately retaining a pragmatic focus which will enable it to be "heard" and acted upon in the organisations. This seems similar to the process of 'imputation' where the researcher "sums up related data gathered from different persons and adjudicates them stylistically to one of them" (Fals Borda, 1996: 84).

After this stage the draft would go back to the organisations involved, where participants will see their quotes, approve and validate the material. In addition, in validation workshops small groups of key participants come together to discuss their learning effort. Finally, and significantly, the history is disseminated in reflective workshops, which actively attempt to encourage review and reflection through group discussion. The aim is to elicit responses to questions such as "what have we learned from this experience?" and "how do we build on what has been learnt to move forward with other initiatives?"

It has been suggested that the learning history method, as an organisation development-oriented and action research approach, can contribute to the "fostering of sustainable development by facilitating dialogue in spaces that allow for a multiplicity of perspectives" (Bradbury, 2001:312). The learning history seeks the active scheduling of time for individual and group reflection. Given the opportunity to spend time thinking about their experiences and their actions it is expected that participants make connections and insights about their past actions during these reflective interviews. The use of the learning history document in workshops, then, seeks to create first-person inquiry in second-person contexts so that readers develop shared understanding before they press on into more action. The juxtaposition of text in the document and the relative "nakedness" of the participants words are designed to create reaction and reflection upon reading of the document. The workshops help one speak-and-listen-with-others (Torbert, 2001) and are often cathartic forms of second-person research/practice.

I explain my application of the learning history method as a form of organisational second-person research/practice in more detail in the next chapter. Whilst the form of inquiry has been used in a number of different contexts - multinational business and medium-sized NGO and educational establishments - these have all taken place within one organisation at a time. The learning history that I have practiced has sought to conduct the second-person inquiry across a network of four organisations in relationship with one another. The document that emerged from this process is presented in chapter 7. In addition to this I have also adapted the format of the learning history document, the left-hand-side exercise (Senge, 1990; Senge et al., 1994) and Fals Borda's double-column work (Fals Borda, 1996) to write up a personal learning history in chapter 8. This traces my own first-person research/practice in the context of change and sustainability. Finally, in chapter 12 I make a critique of the method as a tool for learning about sustainability.

4.5   Subjectivity-objectivity and third-person research/practice

The third strategy for research/practice is what Reason and Marshall (1987) have called "for them", in which the small scale projects of first and second-person research/practices are extended beyond their initial local foci. These practices aim to create a "wider community of inquiry involving persons who, because they cannot be known to each other face-to-face…have an impersonal quality" (Reason & Torbert, 1999).

Following on from the earlier discussion in chapter 2 about deep interconnection, local grounding and various other characteristics of the participatory worldview which informs the inquiry paradigm, action research approaches to third-person inquiry are more than simple dissemination exercises. Whilst the aim may be diffusion (Palshaugen, 1996), Gustavesen suggests that it is a more active process that pushes them beyond purely "scientific happenings" into "political events", which have links to broader debates in society (Gustavsen, 1996).

Muhammad Rahman (1991) describes a number of group processes that have involved a large number of people in self-mobilisation in Senegal, Burkina Faso, Rwanda and Tanzania and which might be conceived as examples of third-person research/practice. For example, in the village zone of Bamba-Thialene in Senegal a group of individuals had been concerned about a potential decimation of agricultural and pastoral livestock from an approaching drought. The group had some initial conversations with family and friends and followed this up by a census of population, livestock and agricultural inputs in the sixteen village zone. The results of the survey spread through the local villages and lead to the development of sub-committees in the villages. Initially, the committees did not work very well and there was considerable frustration with the result that the committees either disbanded or remained non-functional. But following experimentation with collective poultry farming by the Bamba village sub-committee, other villages began to initiate their own self-help projects in agriculture and animal husbandry. According to Rahman after 11 years a focus had been maintained upon collective reflection in the villages aimed not simply towards "material change but…towards the evolution of the totality of the people's lives" (1991).

It seems that one important aspect of this was the way in which the initial survey work and the experimentation of one-sub-committee drew people and other committees into their own reflection and activity. As knowledge of the survey's formal "results" spread through the villages, people developed some understanding of the situation they would be facing and

sought to experiment with the development of sub-committee structures. Initially, these were highly restrictive and failed to work for the villages. However, as these efforts of Bamba village came to light, the other villages sought to develop locally appropriate practices rather than merely replicating the original structure.

Traditional positivist forms of research assume that the inquirer is able to provide sufficiently generalised analysis and conclusions that allow translations to be made from the one studied context to another in third-person relationships. However, this is to a large extent based upon the assumption of similarity between sending and receiving contexts as well as the assumption of an objective voice. Since constructivist and action research paradigms assume that authoring and voice are significant in the process of inquiry the nature of third-person inquiry plays out differently. Both paradigms reason that there is idiographic uniqueness in social situations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Denzin & Lincoln, 1994); time and context dependencies mean that situational specific factors cannot be known a priori. Additionally, as I have suggested above, axiomatically, the action research paradigm aims to create knowledge for practical purposes. Inherent in such a value base is that knowledge created in a timely and appropriate manner in a local context is more relevant than knowledge created at arms length from practice. Torbert suggests third-person research/practice in action research is expected to differ from positivist research because its structures create dilemmas and choices for participants and not just constraints (2000b). "Moreover, even though subordinate/participants are initially expected to conform to the pre-defined structures, they are simultaneously encouraged and educated to confront them, if they appear to be incongruous with the organisational mission" (Torbert, 2000a).

It is, thus, important for third-person research/practices to create spaces and opportunities for people, who enter their doorway, to engage in on-going first- and second-person research/practices. The link between "research" and "practice" for the villages in Senegal was, quite clearly, urgent and inextricable given the potential threats to livelihoods and village-life from severe drought. As Rahman suggests, this example gives us sight of the "Other Africa", where people are participating in their own on-going material and personal transformations and avoiding the traps of "forced", external development assistance by mobilising domestic resource and indigenous knowledge. It seems to give an exciting example of a third-person research/practice that was transformed into on-going first- and second-person inquires.

The learning history has been identified as a form of research/practice with a structure that has the potential to foster such first- and second-person inquiries. The reflective interviews and

workshops provide considerable data for thick description which then needs to be translated in a way that maintains the wholeness of the information in document format. Presenting wholeness in textual format from author to recipient is a difficult task, partly because of the linear flow from left to right and top to bottom, and also because of the reification of what has been said by the sender. However, Roth and Kleiner suggest that readers of text "interpret and do not automatically accept "authored" meanings. They bring their own background, experience and knowledge to what they read. As readers interpret words they read to create meaning and there are likely to be multiple meanings that arise for different readers" (Roth & Kleiner, 1995). With the documentation presented as partial - open ended and biased by certain perspectives - the written text can be seen as an transitional object more able to tap into the inherent wholeness of dialogue (Bradbury & Mainemelis, 1999).

Additionally, it seems to me that the presentation of the document with two parallel columns is a structure that coaxes the reader out of traditional reading patterns; the two columns contain communication and information of different types and styles - the specific words of participants, the reflexive questions of the historian, the mythical story of the situation that comes out through the juxtaposing of questions, story and participants words. The reader can decide how to switch between left-hand and right-hand columns and, thus, interweave her own situation specific challenges and dilemmas with the one provided. Thus, a learning history can provide open spaces and invitations to a reader, whilst also providing a thick layering of description. It may do so in such a way that third-persons can be encouraged to engage in their own critically, subjective inquiry, where their experiential knowing remains the base from which this inquiry takes place (Heron & Reason, 1997).

More generally, participatory action research makes a considerable emphasis upon the way in which "scaling up" takes place; there is an attempt to emphasis idiographic translation compared to universalisation. The way it seeks to do this strikes me as something similar to the tacit and indirect but always grounded and locally dependent ways in which metaphors work. As suggested previously, for sustainability there is a sense of "journeying without knowing". Since one half of the "equation" is an unknown" it is unlikely to be solved in any strict mathematical/mechanical sense. On the other hand metaphorical approaches to this may prove useful as we seek transformational and developmental change. As Nisbett and Ross have suggested,

> "metaphor is, at its simplest, a way of proceeding from the known to the
>
> unknown. It is a way of cognition in which the identifying qualities of one thing

are transferred in an instantaneous, almost unconscious flash of insight to some other thing that is by remoteness or complexity unknown to us. The test of essential metaphor…is not any rule of grammatical form, but rather the semantic transformation that is brought about" ((1985) in Barrett & Cooperrider, 1990).

4.6 Self-criticality, praxis and powerful actors

The notion of metaphor as a transformational change agent is an attractive one. However, metaphors may also become reified to the extent that they are repeated and their 'rightness' shielded by their meta-communicative status. Moreover, as I have suggested sustainability concerns a journeying without knowing; thus, the metaphors we hold and through which we might transform need to be open to transformation themselves. Perhaps a metaphor that can translate from one context to the other but also be aware of the translation process could be useful; it would be somehow self-critical, ironic.

It has been suggested from numerous postmodern quarters that positivism, with its mechanistic guiding metaphor, is beyond such self-reflexivity mainly because it does not permit the tools that would enable it to recognise that it is standing on a particular piece of "ground". The concern with such forms of research is that they do not permit the researcher to look at how her own actions and practices reify structures and oppression (Lather, 1993). If the positivist was to make such an inquiry it would cut at root the very basis of the claims to knowledge within the paradigm. The result is that positivism is always likely to produce isomorphic replication. It has been suggested that action research and a number of other postmodern forms of inquiry are able look down and recognise that where they are standing and the posture that they have adopted are one of many couplings between position and stance that are possible. These forms of inquiry are hermeneutically self-critical, self reflexive and dialectical (Torbert, 2000b; Fals Borda & Rahman, 1991; Kemmis & Wilkinson, 1998). The action research inquiry paradigm seeks to continually stand apart from a stance that regards research as having an *a priori* position in society to one which frames research strategies in general and action research in particular "in terms of a discourse [about] the social role and purpose of research" (Gustavsen, 1996: 25; Fisher & Torbert, 1995).

This social role in participatory action research has always had a particular concern for involving people as authors of their own transformation (Freire, 1982). For many action researchers this search for a praxis of everyday living has followed the lines of Edward Said's emancipatory assertion that "the intellectual belongs on the same side with the weak and the

unrepresented" (Said (1994) quoted in Storey, 1999). Therefore, the researcher should be someone "to raise embarrassing questions, to confront orthodoxy and dogma (rather than produce them), to be someone who cannot be easily co-opted by government or corporations" (Said (1994) quoted in Storey, 1999). Rural/development-, feminist- and race-standpoint action researchers place a central and explicit concern upon working with the those sections of society deemed least powerful (in terms of control over material and knowledge production). However, this has not meant that the powerful are disregarded because it is recognised that:

> "we need a theory of power that recognises that our practical daily activity contains an understanding of the world….A theory of power for women, for the oppressed is not one that leads to a turning away from engagement but rather one that is a call for change and participation in altering power relations" (Hartsock, 1990:170-172)

Thus, similarly conceived in the context of sustainability, there is a need to engage with powerful actors, to engage in a pedagogy of the oppressors (Reason, 1996) in order to transform power relations that currently threaten the survival of global ecosystems.

In the postmodern and post-structuralist context, unproblematic academic assumptions about representation, neutrality and reason, which would have previously given the researcher firm ground upon which to stand in justifying such an approach to the powerful, are revealed to lack any final authority or certainty. The deconstructionist will claim that the attempts to engage the powerful are merely the self-serving, self-aggrandising and entrenching attempts of an already powerful actor to maintain, enhance and legitimise an ideological discourse of oppression, in cahoots with other powerful actors.

However, the constructivist and participatory worldviews, do not force us to ring our hands in despair and freeze in the light of the hall of mirrors where we must "doubt doubt" and "doubt that we doubt doubt". Instead through such lenses/kaleidoscopes we can marvel at the opportunity for emancipatory play and understanding as we come to perceive the relationships between self and world in a newly, self-reflexive space. This is not to deny the fear and reality of co-optation or to suggest that everything will be alright in the end. Instead, for the would-be system catalyst seeking to working with powerful actors, "alrightness" comes to be located in the continual state of "getting." To this end, an action research approach offers the inquirer the chance to remember and work with "the thesis that science is not a fetish with a life of its

own or something which has an absolute pure value, but is simply a valid and useful form of knowledge for specific purposes and based on relative truths" (Fals Borda, 1991b:7).

4.6.1   Vignette

The following short vignette brings together a number of these issues and I use it here to set the scene of my inquiry in a manner that is more local and particular than the rather generalised frame of reference that I have provided until now. It is hopefully an interesting and useful bridge into the subsequent sections of my thesis. The vignette concerns the relationship between a group of academic geographers who, as part of a larger membership association, found that their espoused values with regard to academic inquiry and research had become compromised by the provision of sponsorship from Shell to their association.

In 1994 the Royal Geographical Society (RGS) and the Institute of British Geographers (IBG) merged into one umbrella organisation. Prior to this coming together both institutions had slightly different cultures and orientations; in particular IBG was an organisation of academic geographers, while the RGS had more institutional and establishment roots (as the name suggests). However, despite a minority of academics who were concerned with the merger, the members of the smaller IBG voted to join the RGS.

As part of its funding base the RGS (the non-academic majority) had been accustomed to receiving funds from corporations, particularly those with operations associated with issues of geographic interest. One of these benefactors had been Shell who used to provided £45,000 per annum to the RGS. In 1995, following the execution of nine Ogoni environmental activists by Nigeria's military dictatorship, members of the Critical Geography Forum in the newly formed RGS-IBG expressed concern about the sponsorship arrangement with Shell. In the light of the alleged implication of Shell in the abuses of human and environmental rights in Nigeria the group, mainly consisting of academics from critical traditions such as feminist, development and environment standpoints, called for a motion to end RGS-IBG's sponsorship arrangement with Shell. In June 1996 the Council of the RGS-IBG voted by a 'substantial majority' to retain Shell as a sponsor.

Whilst the dynamics concerning the RGS-IBG involvement with Shell provide an interesting overlap with my research into NGO-business relationships, the main point that I wish to bring out here concerns the subsequent publication of a series of short communications in *Ethics, Place and Environment* (Vol. 2 Issue 2, 1999). In the short pieces academic members of the RGS-

IBG discussed various aspects of the relationship with Shell and its implications for geography and the academy.

In one of the papers Michael Woods described the problems of maintaining a relationship with Shell for the way that the relationship acted as a "symbolic resource" that contributed to "environmental legitimacy":

> "Though a discourse of academic authority helped to empower Shell through its association with the RGS-IBG, in considering calls to end Shell's sponsorship many Council members drew instead on a different discourse which prioritised the 'practical' 'real-life' experience of businesspeople, diplomats and ex-military officers, above intellectualised argument. Alongside this, a discourse of objectivity and neutrality was employed to argue that Shell could not intervene in Nigerian politics, could not oppose the military regime and therefore was absolved of any charges of complicity in human rights abuses; and that the RGS-IBG also was unable to adopt a political position" (Woods, 1999).

In another piece Ian Maxey challenged a dualistic framework of activism and inquiry that "constructs rigid boundaries between those who 'act' and those who, apparently, do not". He suggested that

> "having been socialised with the mind set of 'right' and 'wrong' it is easy to slip into the pattern that criticises others for not attaining 'our' level of awareness, commitment and indeed adopting our position and strategy…it is helpful, then, to remember that we are all on different stages of different paths….it is important to take clear positions against the oppressions…(but to also) recognise our different starting points and to encourage a sensitivity to this, so that in working against one set of oppressions we do not perpetuate another"(Maxey, 1999: 244).

There is considerable richness in all of these short papers; they are passionate and critical. The pieces question the relationship between commercial sponsorship, academic integrity and independence. Associated with this is a concern with respect to the embedded-ness of commercial sponsorship in structures of power and exploitation and the relationship between academy and activism. Finally, there is also a wider concern about the capitalisation of knowledge as represented by the sponsorship arrangement. The contributors sought to "recognise the diversity and contingency" (Gilbert, 1999) of their situation, engaging with the

challenges that were brought out in the relationship with Shell rather than merely acceding to any number of critiques by maintaining a silence. Together the project of the short communications exhibits the kind of self-reflexive inquiry/discourse toward critical transformation that seems to be required in the context of the increasingly familiar challenges to our expectations of "knowers", to the need to change a presently unsustainable human presence on the planet and to our distinctly stumbling uncertainty about how to 'go on'.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1974). *Theory in Practice: increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barrett, F., J., & Cooperrider, D., L. (1990). Generative Metaphor Intervention: A new approach for working with systems divided by conflict and caught in defensive perception. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 26*(2), 219-239.

Bell, E. E. (2001). Infusing Race into the USA Discourse on Action Research. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 48-58). London: Sage.

Bradbury, H. (1998). *Learning with the Natural Step*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Boston College, Boston.

Bradbury, H. (2001). Learning with the Natural Step: action research to promote conversations for sustainable development. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *The Handbook of Action Research*. London: Sage.

Bradbury, H., & Lichtenstein, B. (2000). Relationality in Organizational Research: exploring the space between. *Organization Science, 11*(5), 551-564.

Bradbury, H., & Mainemelis, C. (1999). Learning History and Organizational Praxis, *Working Paper Series* (Vol. WP 99-21). Cleaveland, Ohio: Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University.

Chambers, R. (1995). Paradigm Shifts and the Practice of Participatory Research and Development. In N. Nelson & S. Wright (Eds.), *Power and Participatory Development: theory and practice* (pp. 30-42). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose Reality Counts: putting the first last*. London: Intermediate Technolgy Publications.

Clements, J., Ettling, D., Jenett, D., & Shields, L. (1998). Organic Research: feminine spirituality meets transpersonal research. In W. Braud & R. Anderson (Eds.), *Transpersonal Research Methods for the Social Sciences: honouring human experience* (pp. 114-127). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Introduction: Entering the Field of Qualitative Research. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Douglass, B. a. M., C. (1985). Heuristic Inquiry: The Internal Search to Know. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 252*, 39-55.

Eikeland, O. (2001). Action Research as the Hidden Curriculum of the Western Tradition. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research*. London: Sage.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. P. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative and reflexivity. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 733-768). London: Sage.

Fals Borda, O. (1991a). Remaking Knowledge. In O. Fals Borda & M. A. Rahman (Eds.), *Action and Knowledge: breaking the monopoly with participatory action research* (pp. 146-164). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Fals Borda, O. (1991b). Some Basic Ingredients. In O. Fals Borda & M. A. Rahman (Eds.), *Action and Knowledge: breaking the monopoly with participatory action research* (pp. 3-12). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Fals Borda, O. (1996). A North-South Convergence on the Quest for Meaning. *Qualitative Inquiry, 2*(1), 76-87.

Fals Borda, O. (2001). Participatory (Action) Research in Social Theory: origins and challenges. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research*. London: Sage.

Fals Borda, O., & Rahman, M. A. (Eds.). (1991). *Action and Knowledge: breaking the monopoly with participatory action research*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Farrands, R. (2000). *Safety, Learning and Leadership in EXPRO. Perspectives on the Platform Safety Management Review* (Learning History). Oxford: Farrands Consulting.

Fisher, D., & Torbert, W., R. (1995). *Personal and Organizational Transformations - the true challenge of continual quality improvement*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Freire, P. (1982). Creating Alternative Research Methods: learning to do it by doing it. In B. Hall (Ed.), *Creating Knowledge: a monopoly. Participatory Research and Development* (pp. 29-37). New Delhi: Society for Participatory Research In Asia.

Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Original text 1970, 1st ed.). London: Penguin Books.

Gaventa, J. (1993). The Powerful, the Powerless and the Experts. In P. Park & M. Brydon-Miller & B. Hall & T. Jackson (Eds.), *Voices of Change* (pp. 21-40). Ontario: Oise Press.

Gilbert, D. (1999). Sponsorship, Academic Independence and Critical Engagement: a forum on Shell, the Ogoni dispute, and the Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers). *Ethics, Place and Environment, 2*(2), 219-228.

Goldberg, N. (1986). *Writing Down the Bones: freeing the writer within*. Boston: Shambala.

Gustavsen, B. (1996). Development and the Social Sciences. In S. Toulmin & B. Gustavsen (Eds.), *Beyond Theory: changing organizations through participation* (pp. 5-30). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gustavsen, B. (2001). Theory and Practice: the mediating discourse. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research*. London: Sage.

Hanrahan, M. (1998). Academic Growth through Action Research: a doctoral student's narrative. In B. Atweh & S. Kemmis & P. Weeks (Eds.), *Action Research in Practice: partnerships for social justice in education*. London: Routledge.

Harding, S. (1990). Feminism, Science and teh Anti-Enlightenment Critiques. In L. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism* (pp. 83 -106). London: Routledge.

Harman, W. (1996). The Shortcomings of Western Science. *Qualitative Inquiry, 2*(1), 30-38.

Hartsock, N. (1990). Foucault on Power: a theory for women. In L. Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism* (pp. 157-175). London: Routledge.

Heron, J., & Reason, P. (1997). A Participatory Inquiry Paradigm. *Qualitative Inquiry, 3*(3), 274-294.

Kemmis, S., & Wilkinson, M. (1998). Participatory Action Research and the Study of Practice. In B. Atweh & S. Kemmis & P. Weeks (Eds.), *Action Research in Practice: partnerships for social justice in education*. London: Routledge.

Kleiner, A., & Roth, G. (1997). Learning Histories: A New Tool For Turning Organizational Experience Into Action. MIT Center for Organizational Learning.

Lather, P. (1993). Fertile Obsessions: validity after poststructuralism. *The Sociological Quarterly, 34*(4), 673-693.

Levin, M., & Greenwood, D., J. (2001). Pragmatic Action Research and the Struggle to Transform Universities into Learning Communities. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research*. London: Sage.

Lewis, H., M. (2001). Participatory Research and Education for Social Change: Highlander Research and Education Centre. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 356-362). London: Sage.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverley Hills: Sage.

Ludema, J., D., Cooperrider, D., L., & Barrett, F., J. (2001). Appreciative Inquiry: the power of the unconditional positive question. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 189-199). London: Sage.

Maguire, P. (1993). Challenges, Contradictions and Celebrations: attempting participatory research as a doctoral student. In P. Park & M. Brydon-Miller & B. Hall & T. Jackson (Eds.), *Voices of Change* (pp. 157-176). Ontario: Oise Press.

Maguire, P. (2001). Uneven Ground: Feminisms and Action Research. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research*. London: Sage.

Marshall, J. (1999). Living Life as Inquiry. *Systemic Practice and Action Research, 12*(2), 155-171.

Marshall, J. (2001). Self-reflective Inquiry Practices. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 433-439). London: Sage.

Masiaganah, M. S. (2000). Participatory Action Research, Analysis and Planning with women in fishing communities. Bagamoyo.

Maxey, I. (1999). Shell and the RGS-IBG: oppression or opportunity. *Ethics, Place and Environment, 2*(2), 242-246.

Merrifield, J. (1993). Putting Scientists in their Place: participatory research in environmental and occupational health. In P. Park & M. Brydon-Miller & B. Hall & T. Jackson (Eds.), *Voices of Change* (pp. 65-84). Ontario: Oise Press.

Montuori, A., & Purser, R., E. (1996). Ecological Futures. Systems theory, postmodernism and participative learning in an age of uncertainty. In D. Boje, M. & R. Gephart, P. & T. Thatchenkery, J. (Eds.), *Postmodern Management and Organization Theory* (pp. 181-201). London: Sage.

Palshaugen, O. (1996). 'This is not the whole story...'. On the demand for scientific reports of action research. In S. Toulmin & B. Gustavsen (Eds.), *Beyond Theory: changing organizations through participation* (pp. 137-158). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Park, P. (1993). What is Participatory Research? A Theoretical and Methodological Perspective. In P. Park & M. Brydon-Miller & B. Hall & T. Jackson (Eds.), *Voices of Change* (pp. 1-19). Ontario: Oise Press.

Park, P. (1999). People, Knowledge and Change in Participatory Research. *Management Learning, 30*(2), 141-157.

Park, P. (2001). Knowledge and Participatory Research. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 81-90). London: Sage.

Rahman, M. A. (1991). The Theoretical Standpoint of PAR. In O. Fals Borda & M. A. Rahman (Eds.), *Action and Knowledge: breaking the monopoly with participatory action research* (pp. 13-23). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Rahman, M. A., & Fals Borda, O. (1991). A Self-Review of PAR. In O. Fals Borda & M. A. Rahman (Eds.), *Action and Knowledge: breaking the monopoly with participatory action research* (pp. 24-34). London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Reason, P. (1988a). The Co-operative Inquiry Group. In P. Reason (Ed.), *Human Inquiry in Action: developments in new paradigm research* (pp. 18-39). London: Sage.

Reason, P. (1996). Reflections on the Purposes of Human Inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry, 2*(1), 15-28.

Reason, P. (1999). Integrating Action and Reflection Through Co-operative Inquiry. *Management Learning, 30*(2), 207-226.

Reason, P. (2000, 4/5 May 2000). *Action Research as Spiritual Practice.* Paper presented at the Learning Community Conference, University of Surrey.

Reason, P. (Ed.). (1988b). *Human Inquiry in Action: developments in new paradigm research*. London: Sage.

Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2001). Introduction: inquiry and participation in search for a world worth of human aspiration. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *The Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 1-14). London: Sage.

Reason, P., & Heron, J. (1995). Co-operative Inquiry. In J. A. Smith & R. Harre & L. Van Langenhove (Eds.), *Rethinking Methods In Psychology* (pp. 122-142). London: Sage.

Reason, P., & Marshall, J. (1987). Research as a Personal Process. In D. Boud & V. Griffi (Eds.), *Appreciating Adults Learning*. London: Kogan Page.

Reason, P., & Rowan, J. (Eds.). (1981). *Human Inquiry, a sourcebook of new paradigm research*. Chicester: Wiley.

Reason, P., & Torbert, W. R. (1999). The Action Turn. Toward a transformational social science. Centre for Action Research in Professional Practice, University of Bath and Carroll School of Management, Boston College.

Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: a method of inquiry. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 923-948). London: Sage.

Roth, A., & Kleiner, G. (1995). Learning about Organizational Learning - Creating a Learning History. MIT Center for Organizational Learning.

Roth, G. (1996). Learning histories using documentation to assess and facilitate organizational learning. MIT Center for Organizational Learning.

Roth, G., & Kleiner, A. (1998). Developing Organizational Memory through Learning Histories. *Organiztional Dynamics, 272*, 43-61.

Rowan, J. (1981). Dialectic Paradigm for Research. In P. Reason & J. Rowan (Eds.), *Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

Rudolph, J., W., Taylor, S., S., & Foldy, E. G. (2001). Collaborative Off-Line Reflection: a way to develop skill in action and action inquiry. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 405-412). London: Sage.

Schein, E. (2001). Clinical inquiry/research. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 228-237). London: Sage.

Schon, D. (1987). Educating the Reflective Practitioner. http://hci.stanford.edu/other/schon87.htm.

Selener, D. (1997). *Participatory Action Research and Social Change* (2nd ed.). New York: Global Action Publications.

Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: the art and practice of the learning organisation*. London: Century Business.

Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, G., & Smith, B. (1994). *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook*. New York: Doubleday Currency.

Srikantia, P., & Bilmoria, D. (1997). Isomorphism in Organization and Management Theory. *Organization and Environment, 10*(4), 384-406.

Storey, D. (1999). Shell, Sponsorship, Academic Independence. *Ethics, Place and Environment, 2*(2), 239-242.

Swantz, M.-L., Ndedya, E., & Saiddy Masaiganah, M. (2001). Participatory Action Research in Southern Tanzania, with special reference to women. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 386-395). London: Sage.

Swantz, M.-L., & Vainio-Matitila, A. (1988). Participatory Inquiry as an Instrument of Grass-roots Development. In P. Reason (Ed.), *Human Inquiry in Action: Developments in New Paradigm Reseach* (pp. 127-143). London: Sage.

Torbert, W., R. (1976). *Creating a Community of Inquiry: conflict, collaboration, transformation*.

Torbert, W., R. (2000a). *Brave New World: the social alchemy of transforming OD &C into the 21st century*. Available: http://www2.bc.edu/~torbert/1_social_alchemy.html21 February 2001].

Torbert, W., R. (2000b). Transforming Social Science to Integrate Quantitative, Qualitative and Action Research. In F. Sherman & W. Torbert, R. (Eds.), *Transforming Social Inquiry, Transforming Social Action*.

Torbert, W., R. (2001). The Practice of Action Inquiry. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research* (pp. 250-260). London: Sage.

Whyte, W., F. (1988). Participatory Action Research : integrating research and technical assistance in industru. *Industrial and Labour Relations, 26*(1), 28-33.

Whyte, W., F. (1989). Advancing Scientific Knowledge Through Participatory Action Research. *Sociological Forum, 4*(3), 367-385.

Woods, M. (1999). Power, Professors and Protest: Reflections on the RGS-IBG/Shell debate and activism in 1990s academe. *Ethics, Place and Environment, 2*(2), 228-233.