

Marshall, J and Reason, P. 2008 'Taking an attitude of inquiry', in Boog, B., Preece, J., Slagter, M. & Zeelen, J. (eds.), *Towards quality improvement of action research: Developing ethics and standards*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers B.V. pp61-81.

## Taking an attitude of inquiry

Judi Marshall and Peter Reason

### Abstract

This chapter offers the notion of 'taking an attitude of inquiry' as a quality process in action research, enabling researchers to be aware of and articulate the complex processes of interpretation, reflection and action they engage in. This is considered as a complement to more procedural quality approaches. We draw on 25 years experience in an action research community to articulate and illustrate what 'taking an attitude of inquiry' can mean. Action research is depicted as both disciplined and alive.

### Introduction

When we try to describe our work as action researchers to people we often find the standard definitions—'it's about cycles of action and reflection' or 'it's a collaborative process in which we are all co-learners' - miss something of the essential quality of the work. There is a depth and range to good action research, an integration of the disciplined academic with our existential being in the world which at times feels almost beyond definition. One good attempt to capture this was Judi's development of the notion of "Living Life as Inquiry"

... I have an image of living continually in process, adjusting, seeing what emerges, bringing things into question. This involves, for example, attempting to open to continual question what I know, feel, do and want, and finding ways to engage actively in this questioning and process its stages. It involves seeking to monitor how what I do relates to what I espouse, and to review this explicitly, possibly in collaboration with others, if there seems to be a mismatch. It involves seeking to maintain curiosity... about what is happening and what part I am playing in creating and sustaining patterns of action, interaction and non-action... It also involves seeking to pay attention to the 'stories' I tell about myself and the world and recognising that these are all constructions, influenced by my purposes and perspectives and by social discourses which shape meanings and values (Marshall, 1999, p.156/7).

As with many aspects of this chapter, this notion is, of course, highly aspirational.

Then we noticed a phrase that was used a lot in the community of colleagues which is the Centre for Action Research in Professional Practice (CARPP) at the University of Bath, which seemed to have emerged without us willing it, which maybe contains something of this essence: "Taking an attitude of inquiry". It is something we are seeking in our own practice and that of others. We found ourselves wondering what we really mean by this, and whether we use it to articulate some of the less tangible qualities of action research practices.

We want to explore this notion in this chapter by identifying some of the qualities of ‘taking an attitude of inquiry’ and illustrating these from our ongoing inquiries as senior members of the School of Management and the University of Bath who are committed to raising questions of justice and sustainability in our educational practice and amongst our colleagues, and doing our best to raise the quality of inquiry about the School and University’s contribution to these issues. We reflect on successes and failures, of when we feel we have and have not walked our inquiry talk. This notion applies, of course, in action research projects as well as in everyday living practice.

But first more about why the idea of ‘taking an attitude of inquiry’ is a significant issue for action research.

When we wrote the brochure for our MSc in Responsibility and Business Practice, which is formally described as a programme, based on action research, that “addresses the challenges currently facing society as we seek to integrate successful business practice with a concern for social, environmental and ethical issues” we added later our aspiration that participants would “become explorers and potentially pioneers” in this territory. In doing so, we were trying to add some living flavour to the formal description of this highly engaged, educational programme.

We see taking an attitude of inquiry as a core facet of first person action research, which is itself foundational for more participative forms of inquiry. Taking an attitude of inquiry is a necessary companion to more procedural quality processes in action research. It is not primarily about self-reflection for its own sake, although that certainly has value in illuminating our lives, but about self-reflection in the service of other purposes – a focus for inquiry in itself. In these activities we seek to be appreciative of systemic qualities and dynamics, aware that there is information we do not know. We recognise our limited agency, but are continually exploring how to live with integrity our belief that we each see, and act by, only arcs of circuits (Bateson, 1972), and yet want to participate influentially in the unfolding worlds we inhabit.

It is so easy for accounts, and perhaps practices, of action research to lose their living quality and become bland, prosaic, almost mechanical. We don’t want a living practice of action research, which is at times wild and unformed, to be tamed, contained and controlled. We want to express a quality which is both disciplined **and alive**, which points toward the underlying continual challenge of living in the world as a question; which points out how, if you think you know what you are doing as an action researcher, have it comfortably in hand, you are really not doing it, are not on a learning edge. Yes, action research is cycles of action and reflection; yes, it is a process of collaborative learning, and yes, it takes us right to the edges of our identities and our lives.

John Heron drew on the contrast between Apollonian and Dionysian inquiry cultures (Heron, 1996):

The Apollonian inquiry takes a more rational, linear, systematic, controlling and explicit approach to the process of cycling between reflection and action... The Dionysian inquiry

takes a more imaginal, expressive, spiralling, diffuse, impromptu and tacit approach to the interplay between making sense and action. (Heron & Reason, 2001, p.183)

While any effective inquiry will have some elements of both cultures, even when the emphasis is tilted toward one pole rather than the other, we would suggest that it is often the Dionysian element that brings the additional edge of liveliness to the rationality of the Apollonian and brings what we are calling here ‘an attitude of inquiry’.

Recently Peter Senge, with his colleagues Otto Scharmer, Jo Jaworski and Betty Sue Flowers (Senge, Scharmer, Jaworski, & Flowers, 2005) have expressed something similar about the requirement for alert, deep attention in their book *Presence*. This book, in some ways, says what all action researchers already know. It is a rearticulation of much that has entered our vocabulary about systems, parts and wholes, levels of learning and so on. But they go further, inviting us to link with the unfolding future (a little bold, perhaps) and showing their concern about values and purposes in relation to current world challenges - with which we empathize - and advocating a radical, necessary, deepening that we are seeking to express here.

One thing they do is fully grasp the radical quality of the idea of participation, our participation with each other and our participation in the whole cosmos:

When we eventually grasp the wholeness of nature, it can be shocking. In nature, as Bortoft puts it, “The part is a place for the presencing of the whole”. This is the awareness that is stolen from us when we accept the machine worldview of whole assembled from replaceable parts (Senge et al., 2005, p.7)

What this means, they argue, is that we need to deepen and widen our understanding of learning as we participate in these wholes. They argue that the formulation of learning through cycles of action and reflection, which they attribute originally to John Dewey, can so easily become superficial and unable to “generate the depth of understanding and commitment that is required to generate change in truly demanding circumstances” when genuine invention in the face of novelty is required of us. They describe a three phased theory of: sensing, presencing, and realizing - all extensions of what takes place in the normal learning process but with a quality of deepening and widening in connection to the whole - which they represent in the shape of a ‘U’.

*Sensing* involves suspending taken-for-granted assumptions and perspectives and fully immersing ourselves in the whole. *Presencing* means retreating, reflecting, going deeper, becoming one with, so that we are “seeing from the deepest source and becoming the vehicle for that force... seeing from within the living whole” (89-90). From this sense of in depth identification comes *Realizing*: bringing something new into reality which is a co-creation between human actors and the larger world.

You need to read the book to get a full sense of what they are pointing toward. What we take from it is that they are advocating a form of learning which incorporates qualities of attention that you can touch/smell/taste, that are part of the breath of life. And they articulate a sense of the person not being a separate “skin encapsulated ego” to use Alan Watts’ phrase (Watts, 1978) but see the person as part of a wider interconnected web of being. We will return to this sense of participation as being and

living as part of the whole later in this talk. We believe this shift in the experience of the human person is essential if we are to address the unbelievably urgent issues of justice and sustainability which confront us at this time. Reaching toward this is the essence of “taking an attitude of inquiry” which we now would like to articulate in our own way drawing on our own experience.

Peter had been pondering the phrase after it was used in a workshop discussion and woke up next morning with it playing in his mind. He went to his computer and spontaneously wrote a list, which developed into nearly 20 items, seeking to articulate our use of this notion. For this presentation, we have honed this list down to the following:

- Curiosity and commitment
- Willingness to articulate and explore purposes
- Paying attention to framing
- Dancing in Beauty rather than fighting ugliness
- Participation
- Practices of Power
- Systems and Wholes
- Evidence
- Humility

Maybe the last is the most important, especially for those invited to give keynotes at World Congresses! In some ways that first list—overwhelmingly long, overlapping, idiosyncratic—has important qualities in it, pointing toward aspects without any pretence of tying them down, rather like Patti Lather’s ‘simulacrum of a list’ which while making a list undermines the deterministic quality of a list (Lather, 1995). We don’t pretend our list is definitive, but hope it offers threads into your own reflection, into what you might like to consider about your own practices of ‘taking an attitude of inquiry’. We would like to emphasize that this notion is aspirational, something we are seeking and occasionally experience as hints of possibility.

### **Curiosity and commitment**

An attitude of inquiry starts with learning to ask good questions and a commitment to a serious exploration of the implications of asking (Torbert, 1994). It means really wanting to find out about something of significance in our world, and paying attention to the issue through action and reflection, ‘inner and outer arcs of attention’ (Marshall, 2001) in a formal and/or informal inquiry process. In an action research approach this might mean engaging collaboratively with others on a joint inquiry—as for example a recent PhD exploring with young children their experience of having a parent dying of cancer (Chowns, 2006); or ongoing first person inquiry (Marshall & Mead, 2005) into our practices as self-appointed change agents within an organization.

We are talking about curiosity linked with commitment here rather than curiosity in the more traditional sense of contributing to the body of knowledge. The connection with values matters profoundly. For example, in our invitation to people who might want to

join the 2007 intake to our doctoral programme, which we are devoting to the sustainability challenge, we wrote that the programme “is dedicated to people who are already quite knowledgeable about the current planetary predicament and who intend to make a contribution to creating a sustainable human society.”

This kind of inquiry is an emergent process in which the inquirer seeks to maintain their reflective curiosity throughout, following chains of questioning, working in real time with emerging answers to inform and ground both practice and developing theorizing. Generic questions might be: What assumptions inform these formulations of concepts? How is power in play here? How as a researcher am I helping to keep things the same?

### *Illustrating from our practice*

In giving examples from our practice we are not claiming solo agency, the potential to shape or influence systems significantly, and are wary about the arrogance of seeming to do so. We are continually aware that we act, play, within and with contexts, that we are embedded, that what we do contributes to but does not define what emerges. ‘Living systemic thinking’ as Judi has termed it (Marshall, 2004), is part of our calling, our delight and challenge - and the crafts of doing this are our curiosity. Our examples give some flavour of activities, but it is not easy to show how alive this sense of inquiry is in the moment and through sustained cycles of long-term tracking.

We have chosen to commit our professional lives to raising questions about the responsibility of individuals, organizations and Western society in relation to justice and sustainability, and to advocating multiple ways of knowing as a partly political act. We do this through our practice as academics. We have committed to do this as an ongoing process of inquiry in which we engage in our own first-person formal and informal cycles of action and reflection. We do this by engaging with others in the design, conduct and institutionalization of formal programmes within the University which address these issues in an inquiring fashion. Our MSc in Responsibility and Business Practice and our Postgraduate Programme in Action Research both exemplify this in different ways. Further we are committed to playing our part in stimulating inquiry into issues of responsibility in the wider University context. These are the two territories covered in our examples here.

As we do this we are confronted with other questions about which we need to be curious!

- How do we design a programme which is both question-posing and has appropriate educational rigour?
- How can we create circumstances in which our educational and epistemological philosophy can flourish within the formalities of a University environment?
- When should we work publicly and openly for what we stand for, and when should we protect our endeavours and quietly get on with our work?
- How can we love, support and challenge each other as longstanding friends and colleagues in all our life circumstances while at the same time delivering demanding academic programmes?
- And so on.

But let us not be grandiose. We are hugely proud of the two programmes we have co-created with our colleagues and course participants, which are original, creative, challenging and still at the leading edge of practice. And sometimes they exhaust us. We have been among the pioneers of the responsibility agenda in the University, in particular working hard to raise the increasingly urgent sustainability challenges. We do have some successes in getting these issues on the institutional agenda. But we can also feel ignored, or co-opted, or the “token environmentalists” as in “if Judi and Peter are worrying about this, the rest of us don’t have to”.

We now offer examples of questioning with commitment.

Following a sustained phase of self-questioning and inquiring with close colleagues into whether and how to do this, Peter ended his inaugural professorial address, which had set out the challenges of justice and sustainability, posing a challenge to ‘the University’:

Suppose we began a debate about how to place as central to our educational and research mission the practical understanding of the twin crises of sustainability and justice? Suppose you, Vice Chancellor with your senior colleagues acted to initiate and sustain such a debate amongst all our colleagues as to how this University can devote its extraordinary talents to making a strong intellectual and practical contribution to these issues?...

I think we in this University should put these twin crises at the centre of our educational and research effort on two counts. First of all, because to do this would be good for us. It would place this University in a unique position in higher education, provide us internally with an inspiring mission, and externally with a unique selling proposition to attract creative students and staff, and to bid for research funding...

Second, we must do this because it is demanded of us. We can no longer pretend that the industrial north has created a world safe for my grandchildren or your grandchildren. We can no longer pretend that there is not a relationship between business and a healthy ecosystem. (Reason, 2002, p.27)

The lecture went down well with many people. Since then, however, there has been absolutely no, formal or informal, response from ‘the University’. Is this an example of failed questioning? In some ways ‘yes’, but in some ways ‘no’. Peter challenged himself to raise the issues – and he did. Perhaps his questioning has contributed, alongside other people’s efforts, to helping senior people in the University be ready to pay more attention to issues of sustainability.

Example 2. It is several years later. I [Judi] had an opportunity to question and advocate again, off stage. I did so as an experiment, having limited expectations of outcomes, but I could not resist just trying. I was invited to put my case to the newly appointed Pro-Vice Chancellor for Strategy – who took it on with interest, and then convened an internal working group on corporate responsibility for the University. I supported her in this, not trying to move faster than is possible. More of this later.

Asking questions and claiming to commit oneself to issues of such magnitude is extremely challenging. Are we really committed to putting ourselves and our lives on

the line in this way? Are we really making a contribution? Or are we simply comforting ourselves and salving our consciences? These are issues we also explore.

Developing and maintaining one's sense of curiosity requires continual attention. It is a practice of keeping oneself alive to what are important issues in one's life and in the wider world. One might say it is part of one's spiritual discipline in responding to the calling of the world, to the question "how can I contribute?", as Marge Piercy puts it, "to be of use". The opposite of curiosity and the greatest danger, as Joanna Macy emphasises, is 'apatheia, the deadening of the mind and heart... the inability or refusal to experience pain' (Macy & Brown, 1998, p.25-26)

Maintaining our curiosity, paying continual attention to how we formulate questions, and developing our practices for public questioning and discussion is demanding work. It is important to have a 'back stage' with people of like mind, friends willing to act as enemies (Torbert, 1976) and friends (Marshall & Reason, 1997) with whom to discuss these choices, and be challenged. It is important to be as open as we can to feedback, and yet maintain our own grounding. It is important to be willing to try again, see opportunities, explore when to persist and when to desist (Marshall, 1999) and treat our activities as system diagnostic rather than seeking to 'get it right' all the time (Meyerson & Scully, 1995).

### **Willingness to articulate and explore purposes**

Awareness of their perspectives and purposes offers the opportunity for the inquirer to locate themselves and their work. This is a project with an ever-receding horizon rather than a state that can be easily achieved. Being willing to explore purposes, and being open to renewed insights into these, however provisional and shifting, is an underlying value in much action research. This also requires attention to the processes through which the researcher constructs things as 'good' or 'true'.

Action research is explicitly value-oriented. Our purpose, as Orlando Fals Borda puts it, is to 'understand better, change, and re-enchant our plural world' (Fals Borda, 2001:31); or in Robin McTaggart's words it is 'to change practices, social structures, and social media which maintain irrationality, injustice, and unsatisfying forms of existence' (McTaggart, 2002). There is a close match here with the purposes of post-modern qualitative research as articulated by Denzin and Lincoln:

'The seventh moment [in the development of qualitative research] asks that the social sciences and the humanities become sites for critical conversation about democracy, race, gender, class, nation-states, globalization, freedom, and community... We struggle to connect qualitative research to the hopes, needs, and goals of a free democratic society.'  
(Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p.3)

Working with purposes means necessarily working with values. If, as Reason and Bradbury hold, action research is about working for a world 'worthy of human aspiration' (Reason & Bradbury, 2001, p.1) action researchers must be willing to engage in the contested territory of what is worthwhile, what purposes are worthy. This might mean exploring what it means to be inquiring whilst simultaneously either engaging in strong framing advocacy about what is good and true, or tacitly holding

such notions in ways which influence the practice and outcomes of research. Appreciation of these issues in itself requires a continual, explicit, inquiry which includes what Rorty calls 'irony': both a commitment to the values one holds and for the researcher to have 'a sense of contingency of their own commitment' (Rorty, 1989, p.61).

But to do this requires continual reflection. As Torbert asks (Torbert, 2004) we need to ask what purposes are worth pursuing now, and when might other purposes compete for our attention? And how should we respond when two maybe contrasting purposes compete for attention at a given moment?

### *Illustrating from our practice*

Working with purposes requires attention to both the macro, system wide and overarching, purposes and to the intimate, immediate, here and now requirements. We need to know where we are going, and how what we are doing now contributes to this. While broader, strategic purposes can often be articulated in a grand vision (as to some extent we have done in our description of our curiosities) immediate purposes can be messy and contradictory

We are devoted to our educational work which demands our skill and attention. So at times we see our primary purpose in terms of doing this work well, maintaining a boundary around it and protecting it against the demands and regulations of the University. We tell ourselves we need to protect our space to do this good work, that we should get on with what we do well and not be diverted by wider organizational concerns. At other times we want to use our experience and the reputation our programmes have developed to influence our institutional environment, even though this can be exhausting and at times unproductive. How do we decide? How do we monitor signals that we have gone too far in once direction or another?

In the design of our degree programmes or a workshop we are committed to the development of collaboration, to growing communities of inquiry in which all concerned contribute learning and teaching. We also feel responsible to the wider institution for the academic quality of our, albeit innovative, programmes. At times there is no tension here, or what tension there is can be creatively resolved. But at others we feel an acute pull, and course participants might ask if we are really walking our talk. For example, course participants might challenge us about whether the multiple ways of knowing we advocate and allow can really be adequately portrayed within the PhD thesis format. However much the specification for these is extended (and Judi and Jack Whitehead were recently members of a small University sub-committee – an example of timely inquiry - which willingly re-wrote the regulations expansively), someone will challenge that we have not gone far enough. Are we then caught out? Espousing certain purposes and yet imposing rules on people's creativity? Or are we appropriately protecting the space for enhanced scholarship that we and others have nurtured? We share the question with the PhD student, inviting their creativity rather than conformity. There are few limits really, but going beyond current frames and expectations has to be done well.



In a School meeting our Dean outlines the School, and University, strategy of building a greater international profile and invites discussion. I [Peter] raise a question about the carbon costs of air travel implied in the strategy, trying to point to both the implications for climate change and the consequences for the School if, as is possible, costs may increase dramatically. The Dean responds that he cannot imagine a time when air travel will be restricted, apparently indicating he is not interested in this point. What purposes should I pursue at this moment? I am poised between retiring slightly wounded and continuing to argue my point. The point I am making is important but I don't want to be seen as always banging on about climate change unproductively. At the same time I wonder how/if I could point out the apparent contradiction between the Dean's espoused invitation to comment and his behaviour. How courageous do I feel and do I need to be? Can I act fast enough with a skilful response? How much ego is attached to my 'winning'? Is it enough that the point has been made (and will need to be made again and again)?

Attending to purposes demands attention to how awareness is shaped by the wide possibilities of each moment of life. We need to learn to notice those times when we get overly focussed and attached to a single point—like my [Peter's] cat, when she is attending to what she thinks may be a mouse, she is completely hooked on one point: still, silent, eyes wide open, ears forward, and only the tip of her tail twitching. We can all be like this. We get hooked onto one perspective, forgetting the range of potential in each situation. In the worst cases of this we get driven by mission statements and short terms goals, even 'key indicators'. To misquote Tennyson, we should beware "lest one good purpose should corrupt the world".

So attending to purposes requires a continual unhooking from the obvious, from the taken for granted, from the socially expected (although this too must be honoured), a continual noticing of how one's view has been formed by one's positioning, a continual noticing of the multiplicity of possibility in this moment.

I [Peter] am on the phone having a difficult conversation about a very major project. Relationships have gone badly wrong, and I am trying to tell another senior professor that I don't want him on the project. This is not just between him and me but involves formal relations between our different Universities, research councils, expectations of our Dean, and the different perspectives of members of my research team. I have spent good time reviewing my position with colleagues, and I know I need to be firm for the sake of the project. I also know that these circumstances could develop into a very nasty situation with recriminations all round and maybe legal action. As the conversation progresses I feel as though I am surrounded by the voices of all the different stakeholders as I carefully pick my way along a narrow path between being firm, being reasonable and being open to emergent possibilities.

### **Paying attention to framing and its pliability**

Closely associated with examining purposes is an ability to be open to different framings. How we frame is often tacit, beyond immediate awareness (Fisher, Rooke, & Torbert, 2000). Seeking to surface our framings, whilst recognising this as an infinitely regressive activity, can offer us more choice and flexibility. Meadows argues that we

cannot unilaterally change the world around us, but can only change our, and our systems', ways of seeing and responding to that world (Meadows, 1991). Articulating framings also allows discussion, the opening of potential participation, and the opportunities for re-framing, in concert with others. We can seek to:

- Increase awareness of the frames we and others are employing;
- Understand their origins in the personal, collective and political histories of those involved, and their impacts on what is going on (Torbert, 1991);
- Foster an ability not to be attached to frames (Bateson, 1972), to move flexibly between frames, and to hold several frames simultaneously;
- Increase our awareness of taken-for-granted frames (Senge et al., 2005); and Engage actively with the perspectives of others.

### *Illustrating from our practice*

Inquiries into our University's potential to take sustainability more seriously, show some of the complexities of working with framing. The Pro-Vice Chancellor's working group of interested people from across the campus discussing what corporate responsibility might mean to the University met three times in the academic year 2005-06. I [Judi] supported the Pro-VC in this. Our initial meetings showed the diversity of definitions of sustainability and corporate responsibility round the table, and the range of actions people might think appropriate. Whilst this diversity is interesting to hear, we could lose ourselves in seeking to agree our framings. There is the whiff of potential tiredness and futility in the air, despite the commitment of those involved. Will we get bogged down in our potential differences (which may only be figments of specialised academic languages)? As we discuss at the second meeting, a meta level of alignment becomes available. There is some agreement that issues of sustainability are not clear-cut, that there is much to debate. For example, how can the University deal with high, and rising, energy costs when many of its buildings are mid 1960s and inefficient? What can we next do about traffic now that the initial gains from a more ecologically minded transport policy have been reaped? We do not have immediate answers. We can reframe these from University failures to real dilemmas and therefore inquiries, and open to wider participation. So we plan to organize some campus-wide debates, to bring together interested people, air these issues, generate more awareness and discussion, and sow seeds for future action. This will allow movement forward that encompasses differences and allows framings to be debated openly. I [Judi] and Peter, who is an invited member of the working group, foster these suggestions, hoping, advocating, that the proposed way forward will simultaneously encourage inquiry as an approach. [Note: the working group did not meet at all in 2006-07. Neither the Pro-VC or Judi found the capacity to push it forward.]

Often we need to work on our own framings, as a matter of health or survival. Even the seemingly trivial can trip us up, dull our senses, narrow our attentions inappropriately. This is an everyday matter.

For example, how upset should I [Judi] get, as Director of Studies for the MSc in Responsibility and Business Practice, about the latest threat to room availability for teaching the course? An MBA accreditation panel has been allocated our teaching rooms (because they are recently decorated) for two days during a workshop week. Is it

worth fighting? I decide not. Several admin people would have to do unproductive work if I were to push. There is an acceptable enough alternative. I would not succeed. But does that look as if I concede the importance of my course in relation to other School activities? Will the tutors be mad at me or feel let down? Will there be practical problems? In these everyday self-checks on my framing, I seek not to get unproductively upset, but to keep a sense of a bigger picture.

Living in inquiry in our institution often requires readjusting, questioning any habits of mind, realizing how one can create the stirrings of opposition or despair (and seeking to refrain from doing so), re-framing one's ways of seeing and one's approach. We need to be open to change ourselves if we seek to influence others (Quinn, Spreitzer, & Brown, 2000).

### **Qualities of participation**

It goes without saying that action research is about participation, which is espoused as a key value and purpose. As Kemmis puts it, it is about 'opening communicative spaces' (Kemmis, 2001), or as Heron has it it is a situation in which all those involved can contribute both to the thinking that informs the inquiry and to the action which is its subject (Heron, 1996). This is especially clearly articulated in participatory action research (Fals Borda, 2001) which concerns "self-investigation by underprivileged people [which] naturally generates action by them" in a "truly "subject-subject" relation with the outside researchers" (Rahman, 2008).

Of course, participation is more than a technique. But it is also more than an epistemological principle or a key tenet of political practice. An attitude of inquiry includes developing an understanding that we are embodied beings that are part of a social and ecological order, that we are radically interconnected with all other beings, not bounded individuals experiencing the world in isolation. We are already participants, part-of rather than apart-from. Writers such as Jorge Ferrer (2002) and Richard Tarnas (2006) have pointed to this deeper quality of human participation in a creative and intelligent cosmos. In a more immediately human sense, the social constructionist perspective emphasizes a shift of perspective from the individual to relationships in which we all participate (Gergen, 1999). Thus an attitude of inquiry seeks to recognize the profundity of this active and increasing participation with the human and more than human world.

At a more immediate and practical level, participation in inquiry means that we stop working with people as 'subjects' and build relationship as co-researchers; it means that participants on our educational programmes are co-learners in a joint exploration into justice and sustainability. Researching with people means that they are engaged as full persons, and the exploration is based directly on their understanding of their own actions and experience, rather than filtered through an outsider's perspective. Participation is also political, asserting people's right and ability to have a say in decisions which affect them and claim to generate knowledge about them. And, in addition to producing knowledge and action directly useful to a group of people, it can also empower them at a second and deeper level to see that they are capable of constructing and using their own knowledge (Freire, 1970; Reason, 2005).

### *Illustrating from our practice*

Our aim is for participants on our educational programmes to be co-learners in a joint exploration into justice and sustainability. At Open Days for the MSc in Responsibility and Business Practice we invite applicants to become explorers and pioneers in the field of responsible business practice.

We insist on running the MSc in Responsibility and Business Practice in a flat room in which participants, staff and visiting speakers can sit in a circle or at round tables. (This is far more difficult to achieve practically in our institution than it should be, as lecture theatre formats are by far the norm.) We pay explicit attention with participants to the evolving quality of relationships in the group through regular process reviews. While the course objectives and content are pre-determined in outline, we articulate and develop them anew with each group. As each group progresses through the course, the participants become increasingly influential in deciding the content and focus of each module. We engage students in mutual critique of their practices and of their written work.

In addition to these structural choices, we aim to model high quality inquiring and participative behaviour as staff. This means, for example, that we try to be explicit about the purpose and framing of sessions and contributions; and also transparent about our interventions in the group as they take place (drawing for example on Torbert's four parts of speech: framing, illustrating, advocating and inquiring; Torbert, 2004). We actively seek review and feedback moment to moment. While seeking to hold appropriate power, we allow ourselves to be vulnerable to critical comment and disconfirmation. Judi and Gill Coleman are currently researching graduates' views of the MSc. (Our first graduates were in 1999.) Many say that learning action research has been fundamentally important to them, and that they did so partly through watching how the tutors conducted themselves and from experiencing course processes.

In the wider context, as we seek to influence the broader community of the University and raise questions about justice and sustainability we are working for change as insiders (Coghlan & Brannick, 2004) with the kind of 'preunderstanding' as participants in the organization that Coghlan and Shani discuss (2008). We certainly are not unilateral actors, but part of an evolving network of faculty, students and administrators, shifting alliances of people who, for a whole variety of reasons, are paying attention to the evolving agendas of sustainability and justice. As participating insiders we need to find an appropriately influential place within this network, which means developing an understanding of the purposes, framings and intentions of other actors, choosing when and how to participate in the light of our own position. We have a sense of cautious excitement at what is beginning to happen as people with commitment come together through the Pro-Vice Chancellor's working group and other forums.

### **Practices of Power**

Participation necessarily involves power (Gaventa & Cornwall, 2001) and an understanding of the dynamics and practices of power. Taking an attitude of inquiry means we attempt to:

- Understand the different kinds of power involved in the research/practice context and how we use them.
- Actively create mutuality, ‘power with’, so that others participate on equal terms in the research engagement (Kemmis, 2001).
- Attend to and moderate our own ‘power over’ which derives from unearned, or earned, privilege.
- Attend to the inevitability of hierarchical social power and how it is handled.
- Appreciate the potential of such power for good *and* profoundly understand its limitations and degenerative qualities.

### *Illustrating from our practice*

As MSc programme participants take increasing responsibility for decisions about the conduct of the programme our subtle use of our own power remains important. As one group moved toward its final workshop, a subgroup was appointed to decide the location of the final residential. Alternative options in the UK and other countries were identified and considered; different people’s views discussed; and a complex but apparently democratic voting system agreed. As the voting proceeded, it was apparent that the rules were being interpreted in different ways by different people so that the decision reached suited the views of a vocal minority to go outside the UK. While the decision was accepted by all, it became apparent that some people were upset by the process, some even feeling that the minority had intentionally manipulated the voting.

As staff we wondered about our responsibility, in particular whether we had the right or duty to intervene in a participative process at this late stage in the course group’s development. We decided that while the group as a whole had apparently accepted the decision, flawed though it was, there was sufficient unhappiness that some kind of action was needed by us in our formal capacity as tutors. It was clearly not appropriate for us to use our power to overturn the group decision and insist on a second vote (especially since we ourselves were unhappy with the decision to go abroad). However, it was appropriate for us to use our formal and personal power to raise the issue, to point to the dissatisfaction, to insist that it be discussed. And it was our responsibility to do this in a way that modelled an attitude of inquiry so that the issue was framed not as “some of you have manipulated the system” but as “this seems to be the situation we have got ourselves into and we need to decide together how to proceed”. Further, we needed to do this in a way that was openly transparent and reflective about our own choices and how we were choosing to use our power and where we regarded the power of the group as paramount. Our purpose at that moment was complex: to revisit the issue, to avoid blame and recrimination, to assert the right of the group to make the decision and to use our own position to meet what we saw as our responsibilities. We were successful in creating a space in which participants could express their different views, and in which the group collectively decided to take a simple vote (which was carried) on whether to accept the decision that had been made.

At a time like this my [Peter’s] experience is of heightened presence: determination to address the issue, accompanied by genuine inquiry as to how

best to resolve it. I experience myself as wide awake, aware of different influences, and in a curious sense both engaged and non-attached.

Often change is enabled through changes in systemic conditions, so that the same person in the same situation comes to act differently (Meadows, 1991). Sometimes we seek to influence systemic conditions, working with the more elusive aspects of meaning-making and structural power (Hardy & Clegg, 1996). During 2005 an interesting opportunity arose. The School of Management put itself forward for the EQUIS accreditation conferred by the European Foundation for Management Development (efmd). The initial briefing was promising. The efmd is increasingly seeing corporate responsibility and so-called 'business in society' issues as important in business education, and in the conduct of business schools. I [Judi] was invited to lead on drafting a section of our EQUIS submission dealing with Contributions to the Community, under which heading these issues came. Our School has a good story to tell here, as the Dean affirmed – including the MSc in Responsibility and Business Practice, plenty of examples in undergraduate teaching and project work, and a new research centre dealing with business in society themes (the Centre for Business, Organisations and Society, CBOS). In the initial draft I noted question areas about how the School walks its corporate responsibility talk, hoping to prompt discussion. There was no evidence of these leading anywhere. The final Report mentioned CARPP and our MSc and PhD programmes generously in several sections. We paid attention to portraying our activities well for the added legitimation we would then receive. The efmd review praised this area of the School's work. This external legitimacy gives us credits internally. But we also need to treat such situations with care, in case we are seen by our colleagues as bragging inappropriately, playing to the audience or pushing ourselves forward.

In our experience, it is dangerous to contest the framings of those with institutional power in public, or private too – to speak our sense of 'truth unto power' (Torbert, 1991). This is often a point for inquiry. How much does this specific issue matter? How dangerous is this situation? Can I stay silent, here, now, with integrity? What are the crafts of challenging with inquiry (Marshall, 1999)? How do I judge whether pushing a point is courageous or foolhardy? How will I know if I have lived with sufficient courage, if I never reach the edge and tip over it? Of course, contesting power in a committee room or similar location is not really a life threatening situation, although the body might react as if it is. We are simultaneously aware that action researchers around the world do risk their lives in their work. So what are we afraid of? Sometimes it is how we will be seen by others. Sometimes our own safety. Often, we are wondering whether the issues that concern us will be served by confrontation in a specific situation. We may disturb systemic patterns inappropriately and encourage them towards resistance. And we are aware of a tension we feel, as senior figures, with age and experience in the system, of sometimes feeling powerless. We duck and weave, talk things through with each other and other people, keeping the sense of inquiry alive, not wanting to become habituated into any specific position such as cynic, rebel, acquiescent, or self-congratulatory tempered radical (Meyerson and Scully, 1995).

## **Systems and Wholes**

Seeking to act with integrity, in participation, is thoroughly systemic. “I” do not act alone, but in context, in concert with. In our view, this is not a clearly delineated world with fixed boundaries making something a ‘system’ and placing everything else beyond the boundary. Rather it is a shifting, fluid, emergent world with systemic patterns, connecting relationships, multiple ‘systems’ overlapping (Marshall, 2004). Taking an attitude of inquiry involves developing and holding awareness of where boundaries of the system are being drawn, however fleetingly, and by whom, questioning at the edges of what might conventionally be seen as the boundary of the system, developing an ability to “see” / be aware of the “wider” system and potential connections (Marshall, 2004). It involves seeking, often, to invite into active engagement others who might be seen as stakeholders in the matters to hand, inquiring into boundaries to ascertain who this is. And sometimes we will decide that consultation is not appropriate or necessary, and take unilateral action - listening for systemic feedback.

### *Illustrating from our practice*

We have mentioned above that we often question where appropriate systemic boundaries operate in relation to our activities. Should we concentrate on our immediate education work? Should we try to influence and participate in the development of the School, of the University? If these wider systems change, for example paying more attention to sustainability issues, our immediate work becomes placed differently, with more respect – there is mutual benefit and potential for greater effect. And we can spread our resources too thinly, extend ourselves too far, so that nothing much is achieved. One of our continuing areas of questioning is how much to become involved in the School’s MBA programmes. We have contributed a course addressing sustainability and social justice issues through inquiry based educational practices in the past. (The MBA degree within which this sat was discontinued.) Is this ‘mainstreaming’ of these agendas important work? Or is there a dilution, a cooption into models of business as usual which reduces our effects? We have played ‘wait and see’. With other staff we have encouraged the integration of more attention to corporate responsibility into the MBAs, but we have not pushed hard. The timing, the context, did not seem propitious. Now our MBA portfolio has been revised, corporate responsibility has been placed more centrally, and my [Judi’s] services have been enlisted to contribute to an action research learning set stream. It is timely to push again, but continuing to inquire into when to persist and when to desist (Marshall, 1999). And I [Judi] am feeding encouragement from the wider world into our local, School, system. For example, I am making connections to the European Academy of Business in Society (EABIS) and efmd advocacies of fully integrating corporate responsibility into business education. And I am supporting moves to apply for the Aspen Institute’s Beyond Grey Pinstripes Accreditation, but resisting leading this myself so that commitment to corporate responsibility is more widely demonstrated, and shared.

## **Evidence**

An attitude of inquiry draws on a wide range of evidence in seeking confirmation and disconfirmation of sense-making and of positions held. It is iterative, feeding earlier views into cycles of active testing. What we would call radical empiricism acknowledges the paradox that the world we inhabit is largely created by our language and perspectives while at the same time being utterly unknowable.

In our view, knowing is rooted in a preverbal, unmediated encounter with 'what is'; it is given its first form as it is articulated in presentational form - verbal story, physical gesture, graphic art. Such first form may be elaborated into what we may call 'the arts' of storytelling and theatre, dance and mime, painting and sculpture. And it may also be developed as idea and theory, expressed more abstractly and symbolically in concepts and propositions. Our knowing is then consummated in practice, the skill or knack of doing things in the world, which of course gives rise to new encounters. We call this view of many ways of knowing an epistemology which is 'extended' beyond the usual narrow empiricism and rationality of Western academia (Heron, 1996; Heron & Reason, 2008).

### *Illustrating from our practice*

This means that we seek to:

- Increase the amount and range of 'evidence' brought to bear on what is going on.
- Expand our range of attention to include empirical, observational, emotional, behavioural, embodied knowing.
- Seek to uncover and articulate that which is usually tacit, as well as the explicit.
- Process and present evidence through a range of different presentational forms (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1986; Heron, 1996; Park, 2001).
- Adopt continual willingness to test assumptions. Active attempts to test the position we hold, to explore the possibility of being wrong. This is often done through cycles of inquiry.

One key example of this from our educational practice is the MSc in R&BP's deep ecology workshop, which we have described elsewhere (Reason, 2007a, 2007b).

When we designed the MSc in Responsibility and Business Practice, we were adamant that students should study the planet's ecology, not just theoretically, but with experience on field trips; that the programme, while clearly a Masters programme in a prestigious business school, should attend to questions of meaning, value, spirit; and in particular that students should be exposed to radical thinking about the nature of Earth as the originator of all human and non-human wealth. From the beginning we wanted, as far as is possible in the overcrowded British Isles, to offer students an opportunity for a direct experience of the wildness of the natural world. (Reason, 2007a, p.36)

Drawing on a co-operative inquiry model, we work with participants through cycles of experiential, presentational and propositional knowing. Many participants describe the experience as profoundly affecting, for example experiencing being part of nature.



We found beauty in ‘the wonder and magic of nature’s complex cycles’. Through cycles of birth, death and re-use we became aware that ‘everything is related in one way or another’ and deep ecology provides us with an ‘understanding of the intimate relationships which exist and which we have with nature as well’. Our ‘connectedness to the rhythms of the natural world’ is something which our urban lives allow us to forget and the experience of deep ecology places us back within our most fundamental context: ‘we are nature’. One participant elaborated on this: ‘I thought the core experience was to actually feel myself as part of the natural world. I don’t think we normally actually feel that’. (Maughan & Reason, 2001, p.20-22)

Each time we run this workshop we inquire anew, as we proceed, into how to work multi-dimensionally with participants so that the experience is invitational and alive, not prescribed and routine.

### **Dancing in Beauty rather than fighting ugliness**

In 2005 Joanna Macy, the ecological activist and writer, came to work with us at CARPP. In her model for ‘coming back to life’, and building a life-sustaining society in the face of the frightening trends of destruction that are increasingly evident, she emphasises that we need to “start in gratitude”:

We have received an inestimable gift. To be alive in this beautiful, self-organizing universe—to participate in the dance of life with sense to perceive it, lungs that breathe it, organs that draw nourishment from it—is a wonder beyond words (Macy & Brown, 1998, p.81)

Matthew Fox had earlier described the difference between the patriarchal myth of fall and redemption with its emphasis on original sin, and the creation spirituality movement which emphasises Original Blessing (Fox, 1983), affirmation, thanksgiving, tasting the beauty of life. In our own action research tradition the appreciative inquiry perspective places emphasis on generative capacity: looking for that which brings life rather than the ‘romance with critique’ which it is argued diminishes our capacity for creative response (Ludema, Cooperrider, & Barrett, 2001).

As we prepared these ideas, Peter watched a television profile of Studs Terkel which replayed an old interview with Martin Luther King:

People misinterpret the laughter of the Negro. It’s the kind of laughter that moulds creative optimism out of a very pessimistic situation

As Fox says, this is not an optimistic attitude that ignores the pain and tragedy of existence, but it is hopeful and “cosmically passionate about the blessing that life is” (Fox, 1983, p.19).

### *Illustrating from our practice*

We both experience a continual temptation to sink into criticism, cynicism, jobs-worth; we forget to see the beauty of the world and each other. While the challenges of making a contribution to sustainability and justice can be enlivening despite the quite terrifying prospects for the planet, we can allow ourselves to be run down and exhausted by the

institutional ugliness, managerialism and crazy demands of University life. And we often feed these tendencies ourselves by taking on too much, trying to do it too well, working too hard against the institutional grain, and pulling on our own managerial 'achiever' subpersonalities to get jobs done.

Taking an attitude of inquiry involves noticing our current state, gently taking its messages ("ah, I have let that unsettle me") and seeking to adjust it if appropriate. Our practices for stepping aside into dancing with beauty are simple, when we can access them. They include: noticing the breath; sitting in committee meetings in a position of meditation, allowing and noticing what comes, internally and externally, but not attaching to it; taking time; maintaining a life beyond 'work'; sailing [Peter]; being embodied; being in nature, and opening our senses; noticing and contradicting the messages of duty to workaholic behaviour and frames of mind; and meeting with people fully, not instrumentally, looking them in the eye. When we practice these approaches, and others, the world is a different place. And they need repeatedly re-inscribing, the context does not seem to foster them. Sometimes they seem beyond our reach.

## **Humility**

Adopting an attitude of inquiry means that we accept the limits of our current knowing, recognising that we do not already understand or know how to do something. It also means that we accept the limits of what we can know (Bateson & Bateson, 1987). The European-American Collaborative Challenging Whiteness express well the requirement to live on this edge of knowing and not-knowing. Through their long-term explorations into white supremacist consciousness, they suggest five first-person inquiry behaviours and a more general 'quality of being' which contribute to research quality. Of the latter, they say:

'With a hunch that this habit of being may be relevant to other inquiries that put self-concept at risk, we tentatively suggest the importance of cultivating a meaning perspective that we call 'critical humility'.... the practice of remaining open to discovering that our knowledge is partial and evolving while at the same time being committed and confident about our knowledge and action in the world.' (European-American Collaborative Challenging Whiteness, 2005, p.250).

In their experience this notion means that they 'strive on a daily basis to take confident actions that challenge racism and white hegemony.... [and] to remember that even as we challenge white supremacist consciousness, we are not immune to it. Remaining open to discovering the insidiousness of our *unconsciousness* is an ongoing challenge.' (European-American Collaborative Challenging Whiteness, 2005, p.250).

Generic research questions might be: How can I show the created and therefore conditional and potentially provisional nature of the theorising I offer? How can I offer assertive sense-making, and simultaneously leave it open to question and further development?

*Illustrating from our practice*

Showing humility is a challenge in a keynote space such as that from which this chapter emerged. Of that audience we asked: Have we shown that we speak from our passions, curiosities and challenges in the world rather than voicing supposed universal truths? Have our tones of voice, ways of conducting ourselves, shown the conditionality, the aliveness alongside the discipline, of what we are seeking to offer for your consideration? Has the clarity of message we felt we should bring, to warrant our positions here and not waste your time, allowed us also to show some flexibility and spontaneity in this space?

## References

- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. San Francisco: Chandler.
- Chowns, G. (2006). "No - You DON'T Know How We Feel": Collaborative Inquiry with children facing the life-threatening illness of a parent. Unpublished Doctoral thesis, University of Southampton.
- Coghlan, D., & Brannick, T. (2004). *Doing Action Research in your own Organization* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Coghlan, D., & Shani, A. B. R. (in preparation 2008). Insider Action Research: The Dynamics of Developing New Capabilities. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research* (2nd ed. pp.643-655). London: Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2000). *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.
- European-American Collaborative Challenging Whiteness. (2005). When first-person inquiry is not enough: Challenging whiteness through first- and second-person inquiry. *Action Research*, 3(3), 245-261.
- Fals Borda, O. (2001). Participatory (Action) Research in Social Theory: Origins and challenges. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research: Participatory Inquiry and Practice* (pp. 27-37). London: Sage Publications.
- Ferrer, J. N. (2002). *Revisioning Transpersonal Theory: A participatory vision of human spirituality*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Fisher, D., Rooke, D., & Torbert, W. R. (2000). *Personal and Organizational Transformations Through Action Inquiry*. Boston: EdgeWork Press.
- Fox, M. (1983). *Original Blessing: A primer in creation spirituality*. Santa Fe, NM: Bear & Company, Inc.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder & Herder.
- Gaventa, J., & Cornwall, A. (2001). Power and Knowledge. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice* (pp. 70-80). London: Sage Publications.
- Gergen, K. J. (1999). *An Invitation to Social Construction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Hardy, C., & Clegg, S. R. (1996). Some dare call it power. In C. Hardy, S. R. Clegg & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies* (pp. 622-641). London: Sage Publications.
- Heron, J. (1996). *Co-operative Inquiry: Research into the human condition*. London: Sage Publications.
- Heron, J., & Reason, P. (2001). The Practice of Co-operative Inquiry: Research with rather than on people. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 179-188). London: Sage Publications.
- Heron, J., & Reason, P. (2008). Co-operative inquiry and ways of knowing. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research* (2nd ed. pp.366-380). London: Sage Publications.
- Kemmis, S. (2001). Exploring the Relevance of Critical Theory for Action Research: Emancipatory action research in the footsteps of Jürgen Habermas. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research: Participative inquiry and practice* (Vol. , pp. 91-102). London: Sage Publications.
- Lather, P. (1995). The Validity of Angels: Interpretive and Textual Strategies in Researching the Lives of Women with HIV/AIDS. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 1(1), 41-68.

- 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: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 189-199). London: Sage Publications.
- Macy, J. R., & Brown, M. Y. (1998). *Coming Back to Life: Practices to reconnect our lives, our world*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.
- Marshall, J. (1999). Living Life as Inquiry. *Systematic 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: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 433-439). London: Sage Publications.
- Marshall, J. (2004). Living Systemic Thinking: Exploring quality in first person research. *Action Research*, 2(3), 309-329.
- Marshall, J., & Mead, G. (2005). Special Issue: Self-reflective practice and first-person action research. *Action Research*, 3(4), 233-332.
- Marshall, J., & Reason, P. (1997). Collaborative and Self-reflective Forms of Inquiry in Management Research. In J. Burgoyne & M. Reynolds (Eds.), *Management Learning: integrating perspectives in theory and practice* (pp. 226-242). London: Sage Publications.
- Maughan, E., & Reason, P. (2001). A Co-operative Inquiry into Deep Ecology. *ReVision*, 23(4), 18-24.
- McTaggart, R. (2002). *Personal communication*.
- Meadows, D. H. (1991). Change is not Doom. *ReVision*, 14(2), 56 - 60.
- Meyerson, D. E., & Scully, M. A. (1995). Tempered Radicalism and the Politics of Ambivalence and Change. *Organization Science*, 6(5), 585 - 600.
- Quinn, R., Spreitzer, G., & Brown, M. (2000). Changing Others Through Changing Ourselves: The Transformation of Human Systems. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, Vol.9(No.2), 147-164.
- Rahman, M. A. (2008). Some Trends in the Praxis of Participatory Action Research. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research* (2nd ed. pp.49-62). London: Sage Publications.
- Reason, P. (2002). Justice, Sustainability and Participation: Inaugural professorial lecture. *Concepts and Transformation*, 7(1), 7-29.
- Reason, P. (2005). Living as Part of the Whole. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 2(2), 35-41.
- Reason, P. (2007a). Education for Ecology: Science, aesthetics, spirit and ceremony. *Management Learning*, 38(1), 27-44.
- Reason, P. (2007b). Wilderness experience in ecological education. In M. Reynolds & R. Vince (Eds.), *The Handbook of Experiential Learning and Management Education*. (pp.187-201).Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2001). Inquiry and Participation in Search of a World Worthy of Human Aspiration. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 1-14). London: Sage Publications.
- Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Senge, P. M., Scharmer, C. O., Jaworski, J., & Flowers, B. S. (2005). *Presence: Exploring profound change in people, organizations and society*. London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Tarnas, R. (2006). *Cosmos and Psyche*. New York: Viking.
- Torbert, W. R. (1976). *Creating a Community of Inquiry: Conflict, collaboration, transformation*. New York: Wiley.
- Torbert, W. R. (1991). *The Power of Balance: Transforming self, society, and scientific inquiry*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Torbert, W. R. (1994). The Good Life: Good Money, Good Work, Good Friends, Good Questions. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 3(1, March 1994), 58-66.
- Torbert, W. R. (2004). *Action Inquiry: The secret of timely and transforming leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Watts, A. (1978). *This is IT: and other essays on Zen and spiritual experience*. London: Rider and Co.