

Dialogue Meetings as an Arena for Collaboration and Reflection among Researchers and Practitioners

Kerstin Grunden, Ann Svensson, Berit Forsman, Christina Karlsson, Ayman Obeid

Abstract—The research question of the article is to explore whether the dialogue meetings method could be relevant for reflective learning among researchers and practitioners when welfare technology should be implemented in municipalities, or not. A testbed was planned to be implemented in a retirement home in a Swedish municipality, and the practitioners worked with a pre-study of that testbed. In the article, the dialogue between the researchers and the practitioners in the dialogue meetings is described and analyzed. The potential of dialogue meetings as an arena for learning and reflection among researchers and practitioners is discussed. The research methodology approach is participatory action research with mixed methods (dialogue meetings, focus groups, participant observations). The main findings from the dialogue meetings were that the researchers learned more about the use of traditional research methods, and the practitioners learned more about how they could improve their use of the methods to facilitate change processes in their organization. These findings have the potential both for the researchers and the practitioners to result in more relevant use of research methods in change processes in organizations. It is concluded that dialogue meetings could be relevant for reflective learning among researchers and practitioners when welfare technology should be implemented in a health care organization.

Keywords—Dialogue meetings, implementation, reflection, test bed, welfare technology, participatory action research.

I. INTRODUCTION

A collaboration study was initiated in spring 2019 with five researchers in the research project “eTeam for welfare technology – organization, implementation and use of welfare technology in municipality health care” and two practitioners from the Care Administration in a Swedish municipality. The two practitioners mentioned in this article worked as organization developers.

The practitioners worked with an ongoing pre-study for a future implementation of a testbed at a dementia department in an existing retirement home. The results of the pre-study were intended to be used as part of their application for

Kerstin Grunden is with the School of Business, Economics and IT at University West, 461 86, Trollhättan, Sweden (phone: +46 70 678 70 88 e-mail: kerstin.grunden@hv.se).

Ann Svensson is with the School of Business, Economics and IT at University West, 461 86, Trollhättan, Sweden (phone: +46 73 500 43 06 e-mail: ann.svensson@hv.se).

Berit Forsman is with the Department of Health Sciences at University West, 461 86, Trollhättan, Sweden (phone: +46 70 346 975 55 e-mail: berit.forsman@hv.se).

Christina Karlsson is with the Department of Health Sciences at University West, 461 86, Trollhättan, Sweden (phone: +46 73 901 33 95 e-mail: Christina.karlsson.2@hv.se).

Ayman Obeid is with the Department of Health Sciences at University West, 461 86, Trollhättan, Sweden (phone: +46 75 179 16 61 e-mail: ayman.obeid@hv.se).

development funding for the testbed. Different work methods and welfare technologies should be tested in the testbed before implementation in the whole care organization. The pre-study included dialogue and anchoring of the future testbed with representatives from industry, focus groups with future clients and their relatives, and development of models and methods for organizational development. One part of the pre-study was a so-called insight study with interviews, observations/shadowing and workshops, mainly with personnel who participated in the pre-study of the testbed, such as assistant nurses and unit managers. One nurse also participated in the insight study. In the insight study, the practitioners mainly focused on administrative processes, meeting arenas, physical environment, communication, and information transmission. The insight study started with a workshop for the personnel who participated in the pre-study. The results of the workshops highlighted several areas of concern where ideas on how to make their work more effective and patient safe emerged. The persons attending the workshop then decided together which ideas and suggestions they were going to focus on. After the first workshop, interviews and observations/shadowing were used as methods, and the insight study ended with a second workshop.

The practitioners asked the researchers to evaluate the relevance of the use of their use of methods in their insight study, as methods that could be used when testing and implementing new technology and organization in the future testbed. The aim of the collaboration study was thus to develop democratic collaboration and reflection processes between the researchers and the practitioners regarding their experiences from their insight study.

The researchers were interested in collaborating with the practitioners in order to support their further testing and implementation of welfare technology, in accordance with the aim of their project. They suggested the use of focus groups with personnel who had participated in the practitioners' methods, and to discuss the results of the focus groups in dialogue meetings. Dialogue meetings were supposed to support democratic collaboration and reflection processes in order to promote mutual learning for both practitioners and researchers. From the researchers' perspective, it was interesting to learn more about how the practitioners use traditional research methods such as interviews and participative observations, and if the use could be improved. They were also interested in the relevance of their use of methods for the pre-study, compared with research methods the researchers traditionally use.

The researchers were interested to collaborate with the

practitioners in a way that enabled a democratic collaboration and reflection process in order to promote mutual learning for the practitioners and the researchers. From the researchers' perspective it was interesting to learn more about how traditional research methods such as interviews and participative observations were used by the practitioners and if the use could be improved. They were also interested of the relevance of their use of the methods for the pre-study, compared with traditional use of research methods by researchers.

The research question of the article is to understand if the method dialogue meetings could be relevant for collaboration reflective learning among researchers and practitioners when welfare technology should be implemented in municipalities. The aim of the article is to describe the collaboration and dialogue between the researchers and the practitioners in the dialogue meetings, and to reflect upon the potential of dialogue meetings as an arena for democratic collaboration and reflection among researchers and practitioners.

II. THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL BACKGROUND OF THE DIALOGUE MEETINGS

The dialogue meetings developed and used in this study were inspired by earlier theoretical and practical work. Within the theory field of organizational learning, several researchers emphasize the role of social processes in transforming individual learning into organizational learning [1], [2]. Reflection can trigger organizational learning and needs to take place in social processes where people have space and time to reflect on their work [3]. Reading and writing could be methods that could be used to trigger reflection [4], [5].

Reflection is essential for promoting development-oriented learning, compared with adaptive learning according to [6]. Svensson and Åberg [7] differ among "surface learning" and "development-oriented learning", as [1] also refer to as "single-loop learning" in difference from "double-loop learning". Development-oriented learning, double-loop learning or creative learning encourages a tentative, critical analysis and readiness for changes. The development-oriented learning could take place in project groups for development and work changes [8]. Argyris and Schön [1] use the concept "communities of inquiries" in order to describe collective forms of development-oriented learning. Bray et al. [9] also focus on collaborative inquiry in practice.

Learning and doing are often seen as two sides of the same coin; [10] and [11] mean that reflection upon action are important aspects of learning processes in organizations.

Reflection meetings were developed by [12] and used as a method for learning and reflection in a project at the County Administration in Sweden. An internal organization for the administration of in-house e-learning was developed in the project. The project group consisted of practitioners and researchers. The reflection meeting was used for some internal meetings in the project group where the participants in the reflection meetings were only one of the researchers (who had a passive role during the meetings) and all practitioners who

also participated in the traditional project meetings. The traditional project meetings had agendas, and the discussion during these meetings were as much characterized by the practitioners traditional working roles such as systems such developers, engineering e.g., and was technically oriented. The reflection meetings, on the other hand, became a freer arena for problem setting, analysis, reflection and evaluation. There were no pre-defined agendas for the meetings. The informal discussions often focused on different psychosocial aspects also highly important for the project, but not articulated in the traditional project meetings of the County Academy which more focused on technical oriented aspects. The reflection meetings became a very important reflection and learning arena for the practitioners as a complement to the traditional project meetings [12].

Group discussions and reflection could contribute to sense making "making sense", from a perspective of the community of practice [13], in the same way as the process of sense-making is related to IT-adaption, according to [14]. Sense making probably contributes to create motivation and a sense of meaning of the problems that are discussed and could facilitate creative thinking and problem solving. In the social interaction between individuals, effective communication based on cooperation and development of a shared reference frame should be obtained in a sense making process [15], [16].

Reflection discussion could be organized in different ways at the work place. Study circles e.g. could be a relevant pedagogical approach for learning together in a community of practice according to [13]. Study circles could support productive reflection at work, while emphasizing the social collective aspects of reflection; people reflecting together at the workplace [17]. Study circles have been used at work at some work places in Sweden, even if it has been more frequently been used by educational organizations, closely connected to the development of the Swedish popular movement. The Swedish popular movement was closely connected to the development of democracy, trade unions and the Social Democracy Party in Sweden [18].

Some characteristics of study circles are that the participants can decide what aspects they want to focus on, from a generally formulated focus for the circle. The leader of a study circle is more of a coacher than a traditional teacher, and the groups are often small (ibid.).

Perby [19] uses the term "research circles" for collaboration and reflection circles with researchers and practitioners. Högdin and Kjellman [20] stress the background of research circles in participatory action research and participant-oriented research. According to the results in their study, the use of the method contributed to a change process of the work of professionals in social work; created a knowledge process of more awareness of important aspects of the work, and enhanced the trans-professional collaboration. However, trust between professionals is crucial in order to establish fruitful dialogue meetings with democratic reflections and knowledge exchange [21], since trust function as the foundation for an open atmosphere in a community of practice [22], [23].

In this study, the dialogue meetings were used as a

democratic arena for collaboration and reflection among the researchers and the practitioners in order to contribute to bridging the gap between theory and practice. The dialogue meetings were also supposed to lead to an increased understanding of their mutual work context and professional knowledge, and were also supposed to contribute to better use of methods in the coming testbed.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Methodological approach

The overall aim of the project “eTeam for welfare technology – organization, implementation and use of welfare technology in municipality health care” is to support Swedish municipalities when welfare technology should be implemented and used. Our research approach in the project is participatory action research, in order to contribute to practical problems in real situations [8], [24]-[26]. In participatory action research in organizations, close collaboration between the researchers and practitioners are important. The close collaboration stimulates learning among the parties. Dialogue meetings with researchers and practitioners are seen as a method in our participative action research, that could stimulate reflection and learning about methods that could be used when welfare technology is implemented. A difference between dialogue meetings and reflection meetings [12] (described in Section IV), is the fact that the reflection meetings supported learning and reflection processes for the practitioners in the County Academy project group, while the dialogue meetings will support learning and reflection processes among the researchers and the practitioners in the project group. Participatory action research is often grounded in strong ethics, such as emancipatory values [23]. Democratic values are applied to our dialogue meetings, thus collaboration and reflection between all participants, both practitioners and researchers, without any power relation [25]. The researchers participate in the meetings in the same way as the practitioners, in a democratic peer relationship, and they are supposed to learn from each other [27]. Within action research more and more emphasis has been put on authentic participation of all participants in a project, and full integration of action and reflection. In this way the knowledge developed in the inquiry process is directly relevant to the issues being studied. Thus, participatory action research is conducted by, with and for people, rather than research on people.

B. Activities in the Participatory Action Research

Two dialogue meetings were held in the collaboration project with the practitioners. The researchers participated as complete participants in the dialogue meetings [28]. Documents and reports written by the researchers were distributed to the participants of the dialogue meetings before the meetings were held. The dialogue meetings were recorded, transcribed and analyzed by the researchers.

We used mixed methods in our action research approach. Mixed methods may allow a team to discuss, reflect and

discuss with each other, using different perspectives [29]. The methods used in our project are dialogue meetings, focus groups and participant observations.

Focus groups [30] were used as a relevant research method in order to gather knowledge about the participants' experiences and thoughts from participating interviews, observations/shadowing and/or workshops held by the practitioners. During the focus groups, the researchers' roles were participant-as-observers [30].

Three focus group meetings were held in May 2019 with assistant nurses and unit managers from the Care Administration who had previously participated in interviews, observations and/or workshops held by the practitioners in the pre-study. They were asked by the practitioners or their managers if they wanted to participate in the focus groups that the researchers were going to create. The discussions in the focus groups should focus on their experiences from participating in the interviews, observations and/or workshops.

Before the focus groups met, the participants were informed both orally and in a written document (approved by the Ethical Review Authority in Sweden), and they had to sign a consent form where they ensured that they wanted to participate in the focus group. The consent forms were then archived.

Each focus group consisted of homogenous professions such as assistant nurses or unit managers, and each focus group had two to four participants (either assistant nurses or unit managers), and two researchers. The participants were ensured that their responses would be anonymous. Therefore, no nurse could participate in the focus groups, as the practitioners had only interviewed one nurse.

During the focus group meetings, the participants discussed their experiences before, during and after the interviews, observations and/or workshops. The participants seemed to be interested in participating in the discussions with their colleagues during the focus group meetings, but the unit managers seemed to be more accustomed to discussing their experiences compared with the assistant nurses. The discussions during all focus group meetings were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed (using content analysis) by the researchers. A report with the results and analysis were distributed to the participants of the second dialogue meeting in advance. During the dialogue meeting the report was discussed. The results and analysis of the dialogue meeting are described in the next section.

The researchers also made participant observations of two workshops (as part of the participatory action research), held by the practitioners with personnel participating in their pre-study. During the observations the researchers' roles were participant-as-observers [31]. The results of the participant observations were also reported to the practitioners in the report.

IV. THE COLLABORATION AND REFLECTIONS AMONG THE RESEARCHERS AND PRACTITIONERS

A. The Dialogue Meetings

Soon after the first contacts between the researchers and the

practitioners, a dialogue meeting was scheduled. Before the first meeting, the researchers sent a proposal of the collaboration study to the practitioners to be discussed at the meeting. In the proposal, the researchers described an ambition to develop mutual learning processes between the researchers and the practitioners, focusing on the experiences from the insight study. The researchers suggested that it would be relevant to use focus groups in order to study the experiences of the personnel that had participated in the interviews, observations/shadowing and workshops in the insight study. The researchers also suggested that it could be relevant to use participative observations of the workshops in the insight study.

The dialogue meetings were recorded, transcribed and analyzed and the results were reported to the practitioners before the next meeting, in order to promote reflections during the next dialogue meeting.

The first dialogue meeting between the researchers and practitioners was held in March 2019 in the municipal building. The aim of the meeting was to discuss and plan the collaboration study. During the meeting the practitioners described their pre-study in detail, and the collaboration study was discussed. The proposal of the study was adopted, and it was decided to hold a new dialogue meeting after the researchers had conducted their focus group meetings. One of the researchers had already made participative observations from the two workshops that were held in January and earlier in March and reported back to the practitioners.

After the focus groups and observations were done, the researchers wrote a preliminary report with the results to be discussed at the second dialogue meeting. During the second dialogue meeting (which was held in June 2019), the researchers and the practitioners together discussed and reflected upon the results in the report. The discussion was recorded and transcribed and the main points of the discussion are presented this article in Chapter IV. The final report of the collaboration study also contained these main aspects of the discussion. The practitioners used that report as an enclosure to their application for research funding for the future test bed.

B. Selection of Respondents

The selection of respondents for an interview or observation can affect the result. If only respondents that are easy to ask are chosen (convenient selection), there is a risk that they are biased in some way, e.g. only respondents who are positive or respondents with the same experiences. In the beginning of the insight study, temporary employees were not supposed to be observed, but after a while they were nevertheless included, and their views of the work became a very relevant part of the results, as a complement to the views of the other employees.

C. Information before Interview/Observation/Workshop

It was seen as very important that prospective participants relevant in interviews/focus groups/observations/workshops, receive relevant information about the aim and implications of their participation. Relevant information in advance can reduce anxiety and potentially contribute to more positive

attitudes to participating, according to the focus groups. Some of the assistant nurses that were observed, had not been personally informed about their participation, but only read it in their digital calendars. Perhaps they were not completely comfortable to participate, but participated anyway, in order to show that they did their job well. The discussions at the dialogue meeting concluded that it was important that the prospective participants were personally asked well in advance about their participation, and most preferably by the practitioners instead of the managers of the participants.

D. Interviews and Focus Groups

The practitioners interviewed assistant nurses both working at the testbed department and at other departments, in order to compare their work situations. The assistant nurses that worked at the testbed have had more contact with the practitioners in discussions about the testbed, and they seemed to be more accustomed to interview situations compared to the assistant nurses from the other departments. The researchers had the same experiences from the discussions in the focus groups. The practitioners stressed that it is not common to involve all personnel, e.g. assistant nurses, which would be affected by a change. Focus groups can be an alternative to interviews if the respondents are not used to being interviewed, in order to create a safer environment for the participants. If the respondents already know some of the other participants, that also helps to create a safer environment.

The practitioners reported that some of their interviews took more time than planned, perhaps because they already knew each other. The discussions became long and open and came to focus on complicated aspects of the work, but were difficult to end, which could be due to the fact that the practitioners were untrained in the beginning. The documentations from the interviews contributed to a better understanding of how they could improve their interview techniques.

The practitioners mentioned a cultural aspect that could have affected the interviews and focus groups of the assistant nurses; they did not really trust that their work situations would improve as a result of changes in the work. Many previous changes have instead led to a work situation with fewer personnel which resulted in increased work load for the remaining personnel. The assistant nurses also mean that they have little ability to improve their work situations, which could potentially contribute to a lack of interest to participate in interviews of focus groups.

The managers stressed that they have less time today, compared to before, and that they are more stressed; aspects which could contribute to stopping proposals from the employees to improve their work situations, with arguments such as, e.g. lack of money.

E. Observations

The observation studies that the practitioner made were not supposed to be pure participant observations, but the practitioners mentioned that it was difficult to judge whether they should assist a client who needed help, or just observe. In

many such cases they could not refrain from assisting. It was also difficult to know what to document during the observations.

It is more common in research studies that the researchers do not know the people that they are going to observe, which could make it easier for the observer to behave in a more “neutral” or passive way. It is important that both the practitioners and the researchers inform the people they are going to study, about their roles and what they will focus during their observations, and how the results will be used. Some roles for the researchers in research studies are e.g. complete participant, participant-as-observer, observer-as-participant or complete observer [30]. The personnel that were observed by the practitioners were aware that the focus of the observations was on how they worked, without evaluating their performance of the work. The observed personnel seemed to be more relaxed when the observers took a more active part in their work. They also wanted to describe their perspective on the work, e.g. aspects of the work that need to be improved. According to the observations of the practitioners, observations of personnel are a very good way of paying attention to them and contribute to their engagement in their work.

In order to document observations in a relevant manner, important aspects to focus on could be identified in advance and used as a template for the documentation protocol. Interviews and videos could also be used as a complement to observations [31]. The practitioners took notes and photos with their mobile phones as their documentation. They also reflected on the fact that it would have been easier to observe if they had chosen fewer focus aspects to focus on.

The practitioners suggested that it would have been relevant with a follow-up discussion with the personnel directly after the observations, in order to address questions and aspects for which there was not enough time to discuss during the observation. The observers did, however, visit the personnel some while after the observations, in order to ask some follow-up questions and discussed possible improvements in work routines. When the observers visited the personnel after another two weeks, the personnel seemed to have reflected on the improvement suggestions and were more willing to change their work routines.

F. Follow-up of Interviews and Observations

As a follow-up from the results of the interviews and observations, the practitioners made a compilation of different focus areas (also with quotes). The focus areas were written on post-it notes that were displayed on big screens in the test bed department, and were also discussed with the personnel in a meeting.

The results from the interviews and observations were also presented (using a Power Point presentation) and discussed with the personnel on a work meeting.

G. Other Methods for Change Work in Organization

The practitioners meant that the assistant nurses could also make observations as part of changing work. The researchers

suggested that a template could be developed for such observations, and discussed in focus groups before used. Conducting their own observations could contribute to making the assistant nurses feel more included in the change work.

The practitioners have also started to make personas of e.g. assistant nurses, clients’ relatives and managers, to be used in work change processes, in order to get a relevant picture of the different groups. Such personas could be discussed in, e.g., workshops with the personnel.

H. Participation in Work Change Processes

Participation in work change processes seemed to be very important for anchoring new routines among the personnel. Some experiences from the pre-study were that the personnel became more positive to the changes and more interested in proposing changes if they participated in interviews, observations and discussions. They seemed to have a need to first express some negative aspects of their work today and then propose constructive changes that could help to improve the situation. Their proposals contributed to an understanding that there are more alternatives to change than just reduce the number of personnel.

The practitioners organized visits to exhibitions of welfare technology for the pre-study participants, which affected their interest in the coming changes. The practitioners also organized workshops where the personnel participated in making prototypes for a planning system, which also contributed to their positive attitudes.

I. Conclusions from the Pre-Study

The main conclusion from the pre-study is that there is a large need for digital structures and planning support in the organization the personnel mainly receive information about, e.g., planning of the work, via personnel information. This leads to a lot of additional work, e.g., introducing temporary personnel to the work. A large part of the personnel communication between the assistant nurses and the nurses could also be facilitated with a better planning system. A better support and planning system could contribute to a better work situation for the personnel, e.g., with less stress. It could also contribute to better information to the clients. Most municipalities in Sweden seem to have a lack of structure and planning support in their care organizations

V. CONCLUSIONS

The dialogue meetings served as an arena for collaboration, analysis and reflection. The arena encouraged processes of learning and reflection among the researchers and the practitioners, based on their perspectives on the collaborative work when the testbed should be implemented. Dialogue meetings are thus an arena for practitioners to understand themselves and their work better. The dialogue meetings also served as an arena for bridging the gap between theory and practice. The dialogues during the meetings were democratic; there were no formal chairs of the meetings and the knowledge and understanding of both the researchers and practitioners were seen as important. The researchers and

practitioners participated in the dialogues in an equal way.

Hammarén [4] means that reading and writing could be methods that trigger reflection. For each of the dialogue meetings there was a written document as the basis for the discussions and reflections. A written proposal of the collaboration study was sent to the practitioners before the first meeting, and a written report with results from the focus groups that the researchers had made, were sent to the practitioners before the second seminars. These documents seemed to have facilitated the discussion and reflection during the dialogue seminars.

During the seminars, the researchers discussed and reflected more upon the use of traditionally research methods in an organizational context and the practitioners discussed and reflected more upon whether they could improve their use of the methods in order to have a more efficient change process in their organization. Knowledge was socially constructed and created in local situations.

Dialogue meetings could be relevant for reflective learning among researchers and practitioners in different organizational contexts, as a method to promote bridging the gap between practice and research in a democratic way, create trans-professional collaboration and reflection and to contribute to work change processes and sense-making.

REFERENCES

- [1] Argyris, C. & Schön, D.A. *Organizational Learning II: Theory, Method and Practice*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1964.
- [2] Senge, P.M. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*, NY: Doubleday Currency, 1990.
- [3] Høyrup, S. Reflection as a core process of organizational learning. In *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 16 (8), pp. 442-454, 2014.
- [4] Hammarén, A. *Writing: A Method for Reflection*. Utbildningsförlaget, 1995.
- [5] Göransson, B. & Hammarén, M. "The methodology of the Dialogue seminar" in Göransson, B., Hammarén, M. & Ennals, R. (eds.) *Dialogue, Skill & Tacit Knowledge*. West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 47-66, 2006.
- [6] Ellström, P-E. "Lärande och innovation i organisationer". In Backlund, T. et al. (eds.) *Lärdilemman i arbetslivet*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 2001.
- [7] Svensson L. & Åberg, C. *E-learning och arbetsplatslärande – en revolution av vuxenutbildningar*. Stockholm: Bilda förlag, 2001.
- [8] Rapoport, R., N. "Three dilemmas in Action Research", *Human Relations*, 23 (4), p. 499, 1970.
- [9] Bray, J. N., Joyce, L., Smith, L., L. & Yorks, L. *Collaborative inquiry in practice*. London: Sage Publications, 2000.
- [10] Dewey, J. *Demokrati och utbildning*. Göteborg: Daidalos, 1999.
- [11] Schön, D. *The Reflective Practitioner. How Professionals Think in Action*, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1983.
- [12] Grundén, K. "Reflection meetings as a method for learning and evaluation" in Remenyi, D (ed.) *Proceedings of the 11th European Conference on Information Technology Evaluation (ECITE2004)*, 2004.
- [13] Lave, J. & Wenger, E. *Situated learning: Legitimate Peripheral participation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 1991.
- [14] Henfridsson, O. *IT-adaption as sense making: Inventing New Meaning for Technology in Organizations*. Doctoral thesis. Umeå: Research reports in informatics: RR-99.01. Umeå University, Departments of Informatics, 1999.
- [15] Thiry, M. "Sensemaking in value management practice", *International Journal of Project Management*, 19, pp. 71-77, 2001.
- [16] Weick, K. E. *Sensemaking in organizations* (Vol. 3). Sage, 1995.
- [17] Boud, D., Cressy, P. & Docherty, P. *Productive Reflection at Work. Learning for changing organizations*. Routledge, London, 2006.
- [18] Erikson, K. & Holmer, J. *Studiecirklar som stöd för förändring i arbetslivet*, report No. 9, University of Gothenburg, Institution for Pedagogik, 1991.
- [19] Perby, M-L. *Konsten att förvalta yrkeskunnande*. Gidlunds, 1995.
- [20] Högdin, S., & Kjellman, C. "Research circles: A method for the development of knowledge and the creation of change in practice". *Academic Journal*, 19, pp. 24-37, 2014.
- [21] Evetts, J. (2006) "Introduction: Trust and Professionalism: Challenges and Occupational Changes", *Current Sociology*, 54 (4), pp. 515-531, 2006.
- [22] Chen, H-L., Fan, H-L. & Tsai, C-C). "The role of community trust and altruism in knowledge sharing: An investigation of a virtual community of teacher professionals", *Educational Technology & Society*, 17 (3), pp. 168-179, 2014.
- [23] Hashim, K.F. & Tan, F.B. "The mediating role of trust and commitment on members' continuous knowledge sharing intention: A commitment-trust theory perspective", *International Journal of Information Management*, 35, pp. 145-151, 2009.
- [24] Wood, L. & Govender, B., "You learn from going through the process": the perceptions of South African school leaders about action research", *Action Research*, 11 (2), pp. 176-193, 2013.
- [25] Reason, P. & McArdle, K). "Brief Notes on the Theory and Practice of Action Research", In S. Becker & A. Bryman (Eds.) *Understanding Research Methods for Social Policy and Practice*. 2004, London: The Polity Press.
- [26] Reason, P. & Bradbury, H. *The Sage Handbook of action research: Participative Inquiry and Practice*, (2nd ed.) 2007. London, Sage.
- [27] Ghaye, T., Melander-Wikman, A., Kisare, M., Chambers, P., Bergmark, U., Kostenius, C. & Lillyman, S. "Participatory and appreciative action and reflection (PAAR) –democratizing reflective practices". *Reflective practice*, 9 (4), pp. 361-397, 2008.
- [28] Waddington, D. "Participant observation", Cassell, C. & Symon, G. (eds.) *Essential Guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research*, 2004 Chapter 13
- [29] Sendall, M. C., McCosker, L. K., Brodie, A., Hill, M. & Crane, P. "Participatory action research, mixed methods, and research teams: learning from philosophically juxtaposed methodologies for optimal research outcomes". *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 18 (1), pp. 1-6, 2018.
- [30] Wibeck, V. *Fokusgrupper. Om fokuserade gruppintervjuer som undersökningsmetod*. Lund, Studentlitteratur, 2000.
- [31] Waddington, D. "Participant observation". In Cassell, C. & Symon, G., (eds.) *Essential guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 154-165, 2004.