



Buddhism and action research: towards an appropriate model of inquiry for the caring professions

Richard Winter

To cite this article: Richard Winter (2003) Buddhism and action research: towards an appropriate model of inquiry for the caring professions, *Educational Action Research*, 11:1, 141-160, DOI: [10.1080/09650790300200208](https://doi.org/10.1080/09650790300200208)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650790300200208>



Published online: 20 Dec 2006.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1041



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

THEORETICAL RESOURCE

Buddhism and Action Research: towards an appropriate model of inquiry for the caring professions

RICHARD WINTER

Anglia Polytechnic University, Cambridge, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT This article traces parallels between the basic principles of action research and some key Buddhist doctrines. The argument is that action research's methodological focus on values, collaboration, dialectics, change and creativity is reinforced and clarified by the Buddhist emphasis on practices such as meditation and on the doctrines of '*metta*', 'harmonious speech', '*kamma*' and the impermanence of all phenomena, including the self. Finally, the issue of validity in social inquiry is addressed: Buddhist 'enlightenment' is grounded in a rationally argued model of human capacity for self-transcendence, whereas action research's model of 'emancipation' is necessarily a 'contested' concept and thus dependent on political optimism.

Introduction: action research

What model of inquiry is appropriate for 'research' in the caring professions, such as nursing and social work?[1] It is increasingly important to pose this question as we see the apparently insoluble problems resulting from the attempt to use a model derived from the logic of natural science. If individuals and settings are unique, how can research be replicable? How can research findings be translated into effective practice? Are randomised controlled trials ever really valid (technically) and, anyway, are they ethical? Are not 'performance criteria' obviously amenable to political manipulation? Perhaps, most importantly of all, how is it that practitioners and patients are largely excluded from defining the purposes of research and the meanings of data, i.e. from the purposes and meanings of their own life-worlds? The list is illustrative, rather than comprehensive, but it serves to reinforce our opening question. How can we conduct inquiry into, for example, nursing, in such a way that it does justice to the subtle and complex qualities of the

nurse/patient relationship, of patients' experience of their illness and their treatment, of nurses' professional judgements in their dealings with their patients and their colleagues? How can we include in our methods and our data the emotional and spiritual dimensions of illness, well-being and care, which are no less 'real', no less part of 'the evidence', for being impossible to measure with any currently available scientific techniques or research 'tools'? How can we 'inquire' in such a way that it actually, directly, immediately enhances nursing practice?

There is, indeed, an alternative model of inquiry that aims to address exactly the questions posed above and which goes under the general heading of 'action research'. It has a long tradition in community work and education (see Collier, 1945; Lewin, 1946; Cory, 1953), and is now beginning to be influential in health and social care settings (Hart & Bond, 1995; Winter & Munn-Giddings, 2001). Action research is a specific form of inquiry appropriate for working with people to help them learn about their situation in order to change it. Its methods for developing knowledge and achieving validity and generalisability are those of diplomatic and caring communication between equals. Its knowledge claims are based on what has been successfully shared and acted upon. Its validity claims are based on what has been agreed by participants to be a 'trustworthy' (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) change for the better. Its generalisability claims are based on what underlying pattern of events and meanings from a specific situation others can translate into their own situations, and thereby learn from. Rationales for action research draw on a variety of Western intellectual traditions, such as Marxism (Fals-Borda & Rahman, 1991), critical social theory (Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Winter, 1989; Winter & Munn-Giddings, 2001), post-modernism (Stringer, 1996), phenomenology (Titchen, 1993), organisational relationships theory (Whyte, 1991), 'reflective practice' (Schön, 1987; Elliott, 1991), and the literature on developing service-user-controlled inquiry (Oliver, 1996; Beresford, 2001).

However, the purpose of this paper is not to explore how the problems of positivist social science can be addressed through the principles of action research. Its purpose is to suggest how our understanding of inquiry in the caring professions based on action research principles can helpfully be illuminated and informed by analogies, and parallels with the complex synthesis of philosophy, psychology, ethics and moral practice represented by Buddhism. The following sections take some key concepts in the methodology of action research, and attempt to add both precision and depth through a comparison with some Buddhist themes and doctrines.

The Importance of Values: care and collaboration

The defining characteristic of action research is that it involves practitioners and service users in attempts to create new understanding through negotiating and implementing improvements in the quality of social practices. This has important consequences. First, the ethic of action

research is not that of scientific detachment, but of responsible engagement. The practical worth of the inquiry process is not simply a matter of subsequently 'implementing the findings'; rather, every phase of the work is in itself intended to enhance professional values (justice, rationality, care, autonomy, etc.) 'Good action research is informed by the values practitioners want to realise in their practice' (Elliott, 1995, p. 10). This means that the relationships of the inquiry process must enact and model the values of the organisation, where the inquiry is taking place. At the very least, all aspects of an action research inquiry – the relationships within which 'data' is sought, offered and analysed, and the relationships within which changes in practice are planned and monitored – must enact the 'caring relationship' embodied in the aims of the professional or organisational setting. In nursing, for example, according to Titchen (2000) the relationships between those involved in the nurse–patient relationship and in inquiries into nursing must all exemplify 'critical companionship' – a form of dialogue combining mutual respect, support, acceptance and challenge.

More generally, this means, also, that the inquiry process must model human values such as 'co-operation' (Heron, 1996, 1998), 'participation' (Reason, 1994) and 'collaboration' (Carr & Kemmis, 1986, pp. 199-200; Winter, 1989, chapter 4). Action research requires this form of relationship for a very practical reason: the inquiry process is going to require participants to take part in a change process, and this is unlikely to occur unless everyone feels that the process is one to which they have fully and autonomously committed themselves, rather than one which has been imposed upon them. (One of the purposes of action research is to close the gap between theory and practice, to rectify a situation in which so much 'research' remains ignored on library shelves.) However, action research also insists on 'empowering' 'democratic', collaborative/co-operative relationships for moral and political reasons, i.e. to overcome a widespread sense of alienation, fragmentation and powerlessness (Reason, 1994, chapter 1). Only within a set of relationships which are experienced as 'empowering', where there is a genuine sense of trust, mutual respect, equality and autonomy, will the inquiry be able to draw on all individuals' inherent creative potential (Heron, 1996). It is in this universal human capacity for emotional transformation (Dadds, 1995, pp. 121-122), for 'critical subjectivity' (Heron, 1998), for 'innovative thinking' (Hart, 1996) that action research locates the possibility for developing new and valuable knowledge. Indeed, both Reason and Heron go even further, and identify this person-centred, experiential, creatively co-operative aspect of action research as having an inherently spiritual dimension, i.e. an essential link with those aspects of human consciousness which transcend ego-awareness and instrumental rationality (Reason, 1995, pp. 50, 53; Heron, 1998, pp. 1-3).

These arguments from within the action research tradition can be related to Buddhist ideas at a number of points. To begin with, one of the most immediately distinctive features of Buddhism was that it rejected the caste divisions of contemporary Brahmin culture. Whereas Brahminism

emphasised that wisdom and understanding were restricted to the Brahmin caste, and that the lower caste *suddas* were forbidden to hear the Vedic scriptures, the Buddhist teaching was intended for all people, since all (regardless of status, gender and experience) have the 'ability' to understand (Payutto, 1995, pp. 38-43). Thus, for example, there is the story of the Sakyan princes, who presented themselves to the Buddha in order to be ordained as his followers along with their barber of long standing, Upali, requesting that in order to humble their pride, Upali should be ordained first – a request to which the Buddha readily assented (Nanamoli, 1995, p. 83). Returning to a research context, one might deduce from this that it is dangerously proud to assume in advance that we know who will contribute wisdom to our work, i.e. that we can rigidly divide participants into lower caste 'research subjects' (who can only contribute the data of their mundane opinions or experiences) and the 'Brahmin researchers' (who decide on theoretical meanings).

One of the key dimensions of action research is the attempt to establish collaborative, co-operative patterns of communication, in order to heal the distorted or inadequate communication processes that so often limit the effectiveness of professional situations and roles. On this topic, the principle of 'harmonious speech' (a sub-section of the Buddhist 'Eight-fold Path') is instructive:

At the fourth and the deepest level ... right speech promotes concord or harmony. 'Concord' in this context does not mean just intellectual agreement: it is not just sharing the same ideas ... It really means what we may describe as mutual helpfulness leading to mutual self-transcendence. (Sangarakshita, 1996, p. 83)

This statement has obvious parallels with Titchen's statement on the need for 'critical companionship' in nursing, mentioned earlier. Writers on action research regularly invoke, as the basis for collaborative relationships, Habermas's 'ideal speech situation', in which all conflictual, power-based roles are suspended and only the power of the better argument prevails (see Carr & Kemmis, 1986, pp. 142-144). Nevertheless, one might respond to all this by saying, 'This is all very fine, as an ideal, but how do we put it into practice? How do we learn to converse "harmoniously" and in a climate of "mutual helpfulness" when we live so much of our lives in settings where competition and conflict are normal and good arguments are frequently ignored?'

Buddhism can offer practical answers here, since its basis is not just a system of theoretical principles, but also a system of value-based practices in which the aim is quite directly to change one's behaviour. One of the central Buddhist practices is, of course, meditation and one of the most important meditation practices is based on the principle of *metta*, usually translated as 'loving-kindness', but having much in common with the idea of generosity and the Christian usage of 'love'. In the meditation to develop *metta* the aim is to develop positive feelings, of 'wishing well' first towards

ourselves, then towards a close friend, then towards someone we are aware of, but do not know well and then towards someone for whom we have some sense of hostility. The next step is to focus these positive feelings simultaneously and equally towards ourselves and the three people we have identified, and finally towards all people in general. (The practice is described in, for example, Sumedho et al, 1990, pp. 61-63; Proto, 1991, pp. 89-91; Kamalashila, 1996, pp. 25-32.)

The value and effectiveness of meditation practice is widely attested. For example, Chuaprapaisilp and her colleagues report the successful use of meditation by nurses in alleviating the physical and spiritual suffering of leukaemia patients during chemotherapy (Chuaprapaisilp et al, 1999). So there are good reasons for thinking that it would also be worthwhile exploring how it might be included within an inquiry process, to guide participants towards 'harmonious speech'. Even from the brief outline above, it is clear that a lot of practical wisdom is implicit in the sequence of stages, e.g. the idea that you can't feel positive towards others unless you are feeling positive about yourself, and the importance of practising one's ability for imaginative empathy on a stranger before tackling the problem of explicitly hostile feelings. But there are further useful details to be noted. *Metta* is the first of a set of four so-called 'sublime states of mind' (see Nyanatiloka, 1970, p. 37) and in some ways the other three can be seen as an analysis of its key elements. The first is *karuna* – a sense of compassion for the general suffering and pain that (inevitably) underlies human beings' words and actions, our own and others. This reminds us that we can avoid responding harshly to others' insensitive or abrasive behaviour, but can instead interpret it as merely careless or, as Buddhists would say, 'unskillful', and thus choose to 'overlook' it. The second is *mudita* – an empathetic joyful pleasure in others' achievements, which reminds us how easy it is to resent others' success ('Why did everyone agree with X's interpretation of the data and ignore my suggestions?') and respond competitively, which prevents the discussion building constructively on everyone's contribution. Finally, there is *uppekha* – a state of 'equanimity' in which joy and compassion are combined, and transcended in a generalised understanding of both the difficulties and the potentialities of the human condition (see Kamalashila, 1996, pp. 201-204).

Another helpful set of ideas concerning how one might seek a skilful approach to co-operative working may be derived from Vajradaka's suggestions as to the sequence of attitudes one should try to cultivate in preparation for meditation (Vajradaka, 1997). His sequence is as follows:

- curiosity;
- contentment;
- confidence;
- enthusiasm;
- kindness.

Like many Buddhist lists this seems to encapsulate neatly a lot of practical wisdom. The first two (combined) suggest that we need to start by cultivating a balance between alertness to new possibilities and an absence of egotistical assertiveness. The implication is that it is this rather complex state of mind that is needed to form a secure basis for confidence, perhaps because an awareness of a desire for egotistical assertion can make us feel nervous about possible disappointment or failure. Our sense of confidence then enables us to feel enthusiasm about the value and probable success of our enterprise (in the context of our present argument, our inquiry process). This, in turn, leads to feelings of kindness towards the others with whom we are working, as part of our confidence in their capacities, which brings us back to the previous discussion on *metta*.

Dialectics: difference, change and creativity

The source of the potential creativity of collaborative inquiry lies in the differences between individuals. This is why the need for skilful communication is so crucial, as indicated in the previous section and why action research is frequently said to be founded on a 'dialectical' process – the reflective, developmental dialogue between participants with different experiences, interests and perspectives (Carr & Kemmis, 1986, pp. 33-34, p. 179; Winter, 1989, chapter 4; Reason, 1994, pp. 30-31). However, dialectics is not just a matter of learning through dialogue: it is a general theory (with a long tradition going back through Hegel and Marx to Heraclitus) about the nature of the social world and how we understand it. Its relevance for the conduct of action research may be summarised as three basic propositions (see Fisk, 1979; Israel, 1979; Winter & Munn-Giddings, 2001, pp. 213-215, 248). First, all phenomena are changing, so unless we understand the way in which they are changing, we won't understand them in a way which reveals the possibilities for the changes in practice with which action research is concerned. Secondly, all phenomena (people, situations, ideas, feelings, organisations, etc.) are connected with one another in a dynamic (change-generating) system or network of mutual influences, so it is always important to consider the broader context of the specific situation on which we are focusing. Thirdly, all phenomena are changing because they are complex, made up of contradictory elements and, therefore, cannot be understood as unities, so we must analyse our data in a way that reveals its contradictions, and thus enables us to construct new interpretations and formulate new practical strategies. (In order to clarify the link with Buddhist concepts, this last point will be discussed in the next section, under 'reflexivity'.)

Whereas conventional Western social science seeks to gather data at a single point in time in order to present an analytical description of a current state of affairs, action research actively seeks change as its main resource for learning. In this respect it follows Buddhism, within which

'impermanence' (*annicata*) is the first and most fundamental characteristic of existence:

Impermanence is a basic feature of all conditioned phenomena, be they material or mental, coarse or subtle, one's own or external: 'All formations are impermanent' ... 'Things never persist in the same way, but ... are vanishing and dissolving from moment to moment'. (Nyanatiloka, 1970, p. 14)

Although, at a commonsense level, we all know perfectly well that our physical bodies, our states of mind, our social relationships, etc., are subject to change, in everyday life we focus on the permanence and fixity of things (e.g. we experience people as individual 'personalities', who have 'beliefs' and hold 'opinions'). Social science follows this familiar perception in identifying, for example, structures, concepts, disease syndromes and specific cause-effect relationships. From both perspectives, a radical emphasis on impermanence would seem an unreal abstraction, an unhelpful distraction from what is important. For Buddhism, in contrast, to forget impermanence is to be in a state of delusion and to focus rigorously upon it is to regain insight into reality (Kamalashila, 1996, pp. 92-93); it is 'a natural law that gives human beings hope', reminding us that 'It is possible ... for people to alter their circumstances, to bring about improvements in the world' (Payutto, 1995, p. 66).

The principle of *annicata* thus suggests that action research is quite right to embrace change as a source of understanding and implies some quite helpful practical suggestions. As we engage in inquiry, we can expect to feel a strong desire to keep certain things fixed (the focus of the topic, perhaps, our theories or our initial interpretative framework), and we can feel confident that letting go of these fixed points is a step in the right direction (improving our understanding), rather than in the wrong direction (losing focus, 'getting in a mess'). One might add that it is obviously easier to be aware that other people need to embrace the principle of impermanence and let go of their favourite ideas as the inquiry progresses than to remember that we ourselves need to do so! The quotation from Nyanatiloka also reminds us change is occurring at every moment (in a discussion, in our thinking, in our actions), so that every moment is an opportunity for innovation, development and learning. In general terms, the implication is that 'reflection' needs to be a process of 'deconstructing' the 'fixed formations' of our spontaneous experience.

Buddhism also provides direct support for the second dialectical principle – the interconnectedness of phenomena – in the law of 'conditioned co-production' or 'dependent origination' (*paticcasammuppada*):

All things are inter-related and inter-dependent; all things exist in relation to each other; all things exist dependent on determinants ... The fact that all things appear in their diverse forms of growth and decline shows their true nature to be one of a continuum or

process ... The form of a continuum arises because the various determinants are inter-related. (Payutto, 1994, p. 14)

The underlying pattern of the whole of existence, therefore, is one which links together into a unified process physical events, social events, sensations, feelings, psychological and spiritual states of mind, and ethical requirements. This means that explanation must consist in explicating patterns of inter-relatedness between a multiplicity of phenomena, rather than seeking a single cause for a single phenomenon, since that would be to return once more to the assumption of fixed and permanent formations (Payutto, 1995, p. 91). However, the inclusion of the spiritual and ethical dimension is of particular importance, since it reminds us that for Buddhism understanding is inseparable from spiritual evolution and ethical action, that *paticcasammuppada* is a process of freeing ourselves from the burden of determinism that is created when we see the world in terms of fixed identities and single causes (Cooper, 1996, pp. 156-157). This poses a profound methodological challenge, since it suggests that effective inquiry and adequate understanding must involve recognising that our analysis of data must trace the links between physical events, social relationships, organisational structures, psychological states of mind, and moral values in order to formulate wise and compassionate action.

This may sound like rather a tall order, but it is clear that the practical points discussed in the earlier section on *metta* are relevant here and the doctrine of *paticcasammuppada* itself also provides us with further guidance, in the form of the law of *kamma*. This states that every action has causes that could be traced backwards in time and outwards to an infinity of personal, social and environmental influences. Similarly, every action has effects that are never ending:

Whatever we do, with our body, speech, or mind, will have a corresponding result. Each action, even the smallest, is pregnant with its consequences ... As the Buddha said, 'do not overlook negative actions merely because they are small; however small a spark may be, it can burn down a haystack ... Do not overlook tiny good actions, thinking they are of no benefit; even tiny drops of water in the end will fill a huge vessel.' Karma does not decay or ever become inoperative. (Sogyal Rinpoche, 1992, p. 92)

Moral actions thus make up a universal system of causes and effects. This has two important consequences. First, since every action is the outcome of a multitude of past influences, individuals are never entirely responsible for the situations in which they find themselves. (This places a limit on the extent to which we need to accept feelings of guilt when we find ourselves involved in painful situations). Secondly, since every action will create an eternal multitude of future effects, individuals must always take responsibility for trying to make those effects as beneficial as possible. (This means that we can never simply hide behind the alibi 'There is nothing I can do: I am constrained by forces, events or social structures beyond my

control'; Payutto, 1995, p. 146). Thus, at the heart of action must always be an acceptance of an ethical responsibility for consequences. What we do will always, in the end, 'make a difference' – it will, even if only in a small way, make a situation better or worse; even if its immediate impact is on how people feel about what is taking place, that also will eventually have an impact on future events.

As a way of thinking about an inquiry process, all this contrasts strongly with the Western 'scientific' attitude of seeking pure, objective, value-free knowledge. The law of *kamma* may be seen as insisting that we need to analyse the processes of research (collecting and analysing data, discussing development strategies) in a way that helps us to anticipate the effects of our behaviour, to understand the significance of our feelings and to appreciate our moral responsibilities. It also focuses on the creative potential within each moment of the work, and in this respect supports and extends the emphasis within action research on interpreting the dialectical structure of human action as both reflective and creative, i.e. as *praxis*:

Praxis ... is informed action which, by reflection on its character and consequences, reflexively changes the 'knowledge-base' which informs it [so that] the fundamental character of the social setting is reconstructed ... It has its roots in the commitment of the practitioner to wise and prudent action ... It is action which is considered and consciously theorised, and which may reflexively inform and transform the theory which informed it. (Carr & Kemmis, 1986, p. 33, p. 190)

Reflexivity: deconstructing the self and mindfulness

This quotation from Carr & Kemmis reminds us of the importance of 'critical reflection' in action research and also of the question of how do we try to ensure that 'reflection' is indeed 'critical' and creative, rather than merely an elaboration of the familiar. One answer to this has already been mentioned: the dialectical principle that phenomena are made up of contradictory elements, even though they present themselves as apparently unified. Thus, we can reflect on data by seeking the contradictions it conceals. For example, an interaction within a 'care' process may contain authoritarian elements that conflict with the principle of 'respect'. Another approach to the problem of reflection is provided by the principle of 'reflexivity'. Reflexivity is that aspect of the process of making a judgement about reality (interpreting an event, a piece of data, someone's state of mind, etc.) that is dependent on ('bent-back-into') our previous thoughts and experiences. A judgement such as, 'This patient is feeling anxious' may look, at first sight, as though it is a simple statement about an objective state of affairs, but when we remind ourselves that it is 'reflexive', we remember that it is constructed by means of our prior assumptions concerning the 'usual' symptoms of 'anxiety' and our own experience of how we are when we feel (as we say) 'anxious'. The

significance of the principle of reflexivity is that, although most of our statements have a reflexive quality, we ignore this most of the time and treat our statements as being about external facts (see Winter & Munn-Giddings, 2001, p. 247). During an inquiry process, it is particularly important that we engage in the particular type of reflection that entails noticing the reflexivity of our judgements, because it enables a discussion involving differing points of view to move forward in a more creative way than if people are all defending their own view as being 'the fact of the matter'.

Buddhist concepts can throw further light on the nature of reflection, and on the need for and the possibility of 'reflexivity', both in terms of theory and practical method. First, there is the doctrine of 'not-self' (*anatta*), which may be thought of as a direct consequence of the principle of impermanence noted above. 'There is no separate Ego-identity ... in reality there exists only [the] continually self-consuming process of arriving and passing bodily and mental phenomena' (Nyanatiloka, 1970, p. 13). Payutto elaborates:

Human life consists of a current of numerous corporeal and mental phenomena that exist in accordance with interdependent causes and conditions. When people are unaware of this truth they cling to the feelings, thoughts, desires, habits, views, beliefs, and impressions that arise at each moment and take this to be the self, even though this self is continuously changing. (Payutto, 1995, p. 268)

In other words, the self of whom we are conscious in each moment is but another impermanent phenomenon that is always changing in response to the ceaseless flow of natural events. Whereas our spontaneous tendency will be to 'cling' (*tanha*) to our idea of our fixed self and to the responses and opinions of which our self seems to consist, the doctrine of *anatta* is that in order to understand the nature of reality we must 'let go of' this fixed self. To grasp the importance of *anatta* helps inquiry to be developmental, because it reminds us that our work must be a change process in which we ourselves change. We will always feel tempted to hold on to opinions and ideas that are part of our current sense of our selves, and attempt to focus our work so that it reinforces our sense of 'expertise'. However, we can see that the process of inquiry, if it is to result in creative insight or innovative development, requires us to let go of who we were and what we knew when we started. Again, this is where a practical contribution might be sought through the practice of meditation, as a process of stopping the flow of familiar thoughts and feelings in order to create a state of quiet concentration (*samadhi*), which allows unexpected thoughts and feelings to arise.

In order to 'reflect' creatively, then, we need a general shift in our consciousness (of ourselves, of others, of the nature of thoughts, feelings, professional practices, etc.) through developing 'mindfulness' (*sati*) (see Chuaprapaisilp, 1997, p. 332). In the context of *anatta*, this means developing an intense and continuous awareness of the illusory quality of all

fixed identities, of how all the ideas, perceptions and feelings in our consciousness are in a continuous flux of arising and dissolving in response to a multitude of influences, some momentary, some long-term (Nyanatiloka, 1970, pp. 165-167). In this way, those taking part in an inquiry (exchanging interpretations of data, for example) may avoid arid personal confrontation and achieve the 'mutual transcendence', which we might take as the ultimate aim of all inquiry (see earlier quotation from Sangharakshita on 'harmonious speech').

Emancipatory Critique and Enlightenment

Some writers on action research see the process as merely a form of collaborative professional problem-solving (see Hart & Bond, 1995, pp. 40-43), but others would hope that action research can (and should) be more than this. For example, the twin methods of dialectics and reflexive analysis may be thought of as having what Carr & Kemmis call an 'emancipatory' aim – liberating us, through the process of 'critique', from the structures of our existing assumptions and habitual practices ('ideology'), insofar as these are perpetuating 'irrationality, injustice, alienation and unfulfilment' (Carr & Kemmis, 1986, p. 204). However, whereas natural science offers at least the possibility of consensus on the definition of its terms, this is rarely the case in investigations of human experiences, where even apparently 'obvious' concepts such as 'illness', 'well-being', 'family', 'community', 'management', 'support', 'treatment' and 'care' are the focus of differing cultural, political and ethical values (see Beresford, 2001). So, returning to Carr & Kemmis's list (above), different individuals will have alternative interpretations of 'rationality' and 'justice'; and claims to experience lack of self-fulfilment or 'alienation' (a sense that external factors prevent one from feeling committed to one's actions) may meet a counter-claim that this is just a matter of individual emotion or political choice. From this perspective, 'emancipation' is, within action research, a 'contested concept': the agreements negotiated within the collaborative process may be seen merely as temporary pragmatic political or interpersonal compromises. The nature of their validity is therefore always open to question.

Let us, then, see how Buddhism might throw light on the issue of validity in social inquiry. We have already seen that Buddhism offers a powerful intellectual framework for describing the process of 'critique', within which all fixed, separate and permanent entities, including our own 'self' with its thoughts and feelings, are treated as unreal, as constructed 'illusions'. In this way, Buddhism may seem to be, apart from anything else, reminding us of the practical significance of modern theories in biology, radical ecology and sub-molecular physics in conceptualising the nature of mental events (see Capra, 1996; Cooper, 1996).

However, Buddhism is not just a descriptive theory of reality, but also a system of practical guidance, in which intellectual insight is inseparable from emotional and spiritual progress. The purpose of Buddhist thinking

and practice is to seek 'Enlightenment', usually analysed into 10 'Perfections': Liberality, Morality, Renunciation, Wisdom, Energy, Patience\Forbearance, Truthfulness, Resolution, 'Loving Kindness' and Equanimity. A further list of seven 'Factors of Enlightenment' overlaps somewhat with the 10 Perfections, but adds, importantly: Mindfulness, Investigation of Mental Events and Concentration (Nyanatiloka, 1970, p. 125, p. 35). It is clear, then, that within Buddhism rigorous intellectual analysis also involves rigorous self-awareness, emotional self-discipline and an ethic of generosity towards others. Whereas Western social science seeks increased understanding by generalising from empirical observation, Buddhism is concerned with a much more complex process. It emphasises that understanding other people must begin from a state of mind in which we feel kindly towards them. Above all, it entails moving from a state of unwitting delusion (which means that our minds and feelings are determined by factors beyond our understanding) to a state of 'freedom', in which we are mentally and emotionally in tune with the real nature of phenomena, including ourselves.

However, we may ask, what is this 'real nature of things'? Are these various Buddhist propositions part of an authoritarian body of 'religious' doctrine, which we are simply asked to accept? If so, one might feel that this is not compatible with what we would take to be the essentially open and critical spirit of inquiry. There are two ways of providing a reassuring answer to this question. First, there is the emphasis within Buddhism that doctrines should never be accepted merely because they have been delivered by an authority, but only when one has ascertained their effectiveness for oneself in contributing to the qualities comprising enlightenment (Sangharakshita, 1993, p. 79). Similarly, Payutto emphasises the importance of each person making up their own mind through a process of what he describes as 'critical reflection' on how principles are to be applied on different occasions (Payutto, 1995, p. 227). Secondly, although Buddhism, unlike most recent Western philosophy, does indeed suggest that human beings can gain access to an 'ultimate' reality, this is not the realm of a separate Divine Creator Being, but a level of awareness within each of us as individuals:

In Buddhism it is always, clearly, even categorically stated that ... archetypal forms [i.e. The Buddha and other Fully Enlightened Beings] are ultimately phenomena of one's own True Mind, or projections from one's own unconscious, and that they are to be integrated. (Sangharakshita, 1996, p. 43)

In Tibetan Buddhism this is referred to as our 'Buddha nature' (*rigpa*) – 'the innermost essence of mind, [usually] enveloped and obscured by the mental scurry of our thoughts and emotions [but capable of offering us occasional glimpses of] a primordial, pure pristine awareness ... the knowledge of knowledge itself' (Sogyal Rinpoche, 1992, p. 47).

In other words, the validity of Insight and Enlightenment within Buddhism is not externally derived, but rests on a 'faith' (*sraddha*) in human

capacity for recognising courage, wisdom, compassion and other forms of fine ethical and spiritual action, based on our own conscience or 'self-respect' (*hri*) and our awareness of the 'wise opinion of others' (*apatrapya*) (Sangharakshita, 1998, p. 119, pp. 125-127). At this level, Buddhism can support and enhance the humanistic optimism underlying action research, creating a model of inquiry that is clearly based on our deepest and most comprehensive awareness of human nature and human understanding. At its best, the process of action research generates a sense of the developmental creativity, and imaginative compassion inherent in relationships of inquiry and professional 'care'. To this, Buddhism adds, first, a faith and an ideal – a basis for understanding 'that the transcendental is there beyond one's mundane experience of the world, and that one is trying to work towards that' (Sangharakshita, 1998, p. 137) and, secondly, a methodology – an account of the possibility of (and practical methods for) self-transcendence on the part of the individual and mutual transcendence in human interaction. In this way, Buddhism simultaneously re-defines the scope of social practices and offers practical guidance for re-defining the processes and relationships of inquiry.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks go to my colleague Dr Arphorn Chuaprapaisilp of the School of Nursing, Prince of Songkla University, Thailand, who suggested and initiated our joint work on the analogies between Action Research and Buddhism. This article is the outcome of several years of dialogue and friendship. Particular thanks go to Vajrananda and Ratnavyuha (Western Buddhist Order, Cambridge), Angie Titchen (Royal College of Nursing, Oxford) and Susan Hart (Cambridge University School of Education), for helpful comments in response to an earlier draft. General thanks also to my fellow members of the Men's Study Group at the Cambridge Centre of the Friends of the Western Buddhist Order, led by Vajrananda, for their rigour and supportiveness in helping to clarify the ideas presented here.

Correspondence

Richard Winter, School of Community Health and Social Studies, Anglia Polytechnic University, East Road, Cambridge CB1 1PT, United Kingdom (r.j.winter@apu.ac.uk).

Note

- [1] This article is based on a paper originally presented at the Conference 'Traditions, Evidence, and Innovations in Nursing', March 2002, Phuket, Thailand. Its primary focus is therefore on nursing. A slightly different set of emphases might be required to explore more specifically the links between Buddhism and action research in an educational setting.

References

- Beresford, P. (2001) Social Work and Social Care: the struggle for knowledge, *Educational Action Research*, 9, pp. 343-353.
- Capra, F. (1996) *The Web of Life: a new synthesis of mind and matter*. London: Harper Collins.
- Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. (1986) *Becoming Critical: education, knowledge and action research*. Lewes: Falmer.
- Chuaprapaisilp, A. (1997) Thai Buddhist Philosophy and the Action Research Process, *Educational Action Research*, 5, pp. 331-336.
- Chuaprapaisilp, A., Chailangka, P. & Tripakong, S. (1999) Using Meditation and Mindfulness to Help Adult Leukemic Patients Cope with Chemotherapy, paper presented at the International Nurses Council Centennial Conference, London, 27 June–1 July.
- Collier, J. (1945) The US Indian Administration as a Laboratory for Ethnic Relations, *Social Research*, 12, pp 266-303.
- Cooper, R. (1996) *The Evolving Mind: Buddhism, biology & consciousness*. Birmingham: Windhorse.
- Cory, S. (1953) *Action Research to Improve School Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dadds, M. (1995) *Passionate Inquiry and School Development: a story about teacher action research*. London: Falmer.
- Elliott, J. (1991) *Action Research for Educational Change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Elliott, J. (1995) What is Good Action Research? – Some Criteria, *Action Researcher*, 2, pp. 10-11.
- Fals-Borda, O. & Rahman, M. (Eds) (1991) *Action and Knowledge: breaking the monopoly with participatory action-research*. New York: Apex.
- Fisk, M. (1979) Dialectic and Ontology, in J. Mepham & D. Ruben (Eds) *Issues in Marxist Philosophy, Vol. 1: dialectics and method*. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Hart, E. & Bond, M. (1995) *Action Research for Health and Social Care*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Hart, S. (1996) *Beyond Special Needs: enhancing children's learning through innovative thinking*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Heron, J. (1996) *Co-operative Inquiry: research into the human condition*. London: Sage.
- Heron, J. (1998) *Sacred Science*. Ross-on-Wye: PCCS Books.
- Israel, J. (1979) *The Language of Dialectics and the Dialectics of Language*. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Kamalashila (1996) *Meditation: the Buddhist way of tranquillity and insight*. Birmingham: Windhorse.
- Lewin, K. (1946) Action Research and Minority Problems, *Journal of Social Issues*, No. 2, pp. 34-46.
- Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverley Hills: Sage.

- Nanamoli (1992) *The Life of the Buddha According to the Pali Canon*, 3rd edn. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.
- Nyanatiloka (1970) *Buddhist Dictionary: manual of Buddhist terms and doctrines*, 3rd edn, revised by Nyanaponika. Taipei: Buddha Educational Foundation.
- Oliver, M. (1996) *Understanding Disability: from theory to practice*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Payutto, P. (1994) *Dependent Origination: the Buddhist law of conditionality*, transl. B. Evans. Bangkok: Buddhadhamma Foundation.
- Payutto, P. (1995) *Buddhadhamma*, transl. G. Olson. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Proto, L. (1991) *Meditation for Everybody*. London: Penguin.
- Reason, P. (1994) *Participation in Human Inquiry*. London: Sage.
- Sangharakshita (1993) *A Survey of Buddhism*, 7th edn. Birmingham: Windhorse.
- Sangharakshita (1996) *A Guide to the Buddhist Path*, 2nd edn. Birmingham: Windhorse.
- Sangharakshita (1998) *Know Your Mind: the psychological dimension of ethics in Buddhism*. Birmingham: Windhorse.
- Schön, D. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sogyal Rinpoche (1992) *The Tibetan Book of Living and Dying*. London: Rider (Random House).
- Stringer, E. (1996) *Action Research: a handbook for practitioners*. London: Sage.
- Sumedho, Santacitto, Anando & Sucitto (1990) *Peace and Kindness*. Hemel Hempstead: Amaravati.
- Titchen, A. (Ed.) (1993) *Changing Nursing Practice through Action Research*. Oxford: National Institute for Nursing.
- Titchen, A. (2000) Critical Companionship: a conceptual framework for facilitating expertise. In J. Higgs & A. Titchen (Eds) *Practice, Knowledge and Expertise in the Health Professions*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Vajradaka (1997) Quality Control. In *Dharmalife – Buddhism for Today*, No. 6. Birmingham: Windhorse.
- Whyte, W.F. (1991) *Participatory Action Research*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Winter, R. (1989) *Learning from Experience: principles and practice in action research*. Lewes: Falmer.
- Winter, R. & Munn-Giddings, C. (2001) *A Handbook for Action Research in Health and Social Care*. London: Routledge.

Theory and Practice in Action Research

some international perspectives

Edited by CHRISTOPHER DAY, JOHN ELLIOTT,
BRIDGET SOMEKH & RICHARD WINTER

This book contains 16 articles from across the professions and from different countries which explore and examine the nature, purposes, processes and outcomes of action research, its importance to professional growth and the challenges of collaboration and change. Written by practitioners from schools and universities, health and social services, it provides a comprehensive yet focused critical appraisal which we believe is essential reading by all for whom lifelong learning is a key component of being and sustaining themselves as professionals.

Part 1. Conceptualisations of Action Research Introduction; **Susan Noffke** Action Research: towards the next generation; **Richard Winter** Managers, Spectators and Citizens: where does 'theory' come from in action research? **Colin Biott** Latency in Action Research: changing perspectives on occupational and researcher identities; **Maggie MacLure** Postmodernism: a postscript
Part 2. Praxis and Partnership in Action Research Introduction; **Christine O'Hanlon** Reflection and Action in Research: is there a moral responsibility to act? **Jean-Claude Couture** Dracula as Action Researcher; **Kath Green** Defining the Field of Literature in Action Research: a personal approach; **Bridget Somekh** Inhabiting Each Other's Castles: towards knowledge and mutual growth through collaboration
Part 3. Action Research for Change Introduction; **Melanie Walker** Subaltern Professionals: acting in pursuit of social justice; **Victor Valla** Popular Education and Knowledge: popular surveillance of health and education services in Brazilian metropolitan areas; **Peter Posch** Changes in the Culture of Teaching and Learning and Implications for Action Research; **Arphorn Chuaprapaisilip** Thai Buddhist Philosophy and the Action Research Process
Part 4. Action Research in Practice Settings Introduction; **Belinda Watts & Shirley Jones** Inter-professional Practice and Action Research: commonalities and parallels; **Carol Munn-Giddings** 'A Different Way of Knowing': social care values, practitioner research and action research; **Pete Strauss** No Easy Answers: the dilemmas and challenges of teacher research; **Angie Titchen & Alison Binnie** A Unified Action Research Strategy in Nursing

2002 paperback 244 pages \$38.00 (£24.00) ISBN 1 873927 44 4

SYMPOSIUM BOOKS

PO Box 65, Wallingford, Oxford OX10 0YG, United Kingdom

orders@symposium-books.co.uk www.symposium-books.co.uk

The Collaborative Action Research Network

CARN is committed to supporting and improving the quality of professional practice, achieved through systematic, critical and creative inquiry into the goals, processes and contexts of professional work. The quality of our work in the professions depends upon our willingness to ask questions of ourselves and others, and to explore challenging ideas and practices, including the values that underpin them. CARN was founded in 1976 to follow up the development work of the Ford Teaching Project in UK primary and secondary schools. Since that time it has grown to become a national and international network drawing its members from a variety of educational, health, social care, commercial, and public services organisations.

CARN SETS OUT TO PROMOTE RECOGNITION

That professional development requires critical inquiry into, past, current and future practice; That practitioners themselves should be actively and creatively involved in defining and developing professional practice; That all relevant communities (including service-users, students, clients, etc.) need to be involved in developing the provision of services; That individual professional development needs to be seen in the context of institutional practices and structures; That action research provides a powerful means of developing worthwhile professional and institutional practice.

SUPPORT

For professional staff carrying out action research, individually and in collaboration with others, in their place of work; For employers/managers wishing to set up action research activities as part of development planning; For professional development through action research as a life-long focus throughout all phases of professional careers; For collaboration and dialogue between those concerned, to develop research-based professional practice, and practice-based research, i.e. Between professional practitioners and their clients, e.g. students, service-users Between professionals and peers in the same and other professions Between professionals and colleagues at all levels in their organisations Between professional workers and community members.

NETWORKING

Through sharing accounts of action research, in the Newsletter, on the CARN website, in the journal *Educational Action Research*, and through other CARN publications; Through attentive personal encouragement and critical feedback; Through engaging with CARN colleagues at steering group meetings, regional events and at the CARN annual conference.

For membership details please contact the Secretary

Lucila Recart, School of Education and Professional Development, University of East Anglia, Norwich NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom (l.recart@uea.ac.uk).

REINTERPRETING EVIDENCE- BASED PRACTICE: *A NARRATIVE APPROACH*

A Collaborative Action Research Network Conference
Sponsored by the South Thames Medical and Dental
Education Centre

*Thursday October 5th, 2000 at
Senate House, University of London
"CONFERENCE NARRATIVES"*

Edited by Members of the
Collaborative Action Research Network

This report of the conference (approx. 90 pages) contains the full text of the keynote lectures by Helen Simons and Trisha Greenhalgh on the role of narrative in professional practice, including specific studies of education and medicine, and detailed summaries of all the workshop discussion groups.

Cost £8.30 (£7.30 to CARN members)
Obtainable from
Lucila Recart, CARN Secretary,
CARE, University of East Anglia,
Norwich NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom.
Please make cheques payable to 'CARN'

Theory and Practice in Action Research

some international perspectives

Edited by CHRISTOPHER DAY, JOHN ELLIOTT,
BRIDGET SOMEKH & RICHARD WINTER

This book contains 16 articles from across the professions and from different countries which explore and examine the nature, purposes, processes and outcomes of action research, its importance to professional growth and the challenges of collaboration and change. Written by practitioners from schools and universities, health and social services, it provides a comprehensive yet focused critical appraisal which we believe is essential reading by all for whom lifelong learning is a key component of being and sustaining themselves as professionals.

Part 1. Conceptualisations of Action Research Introduction;
Susan Noffke Action Research: towards the next generation;
Richard Winter Managers, Spectators and Citizens: where does 'theory' come from in action research? **Colin Biott** Latency in Action Research: changing perspectives on occupational and researcher identities; **Maggie MacLure** Postmodernism: a postscript
Part 2. Praxis and Partnership in Action Research Introduction;
Christine O'Hanlon Reflection and Action in Research: is there a moral responsibility to act? **Jean-Claude Couture** Dracula as Action Researcher; **Kath Green** Defining the Field of Literature in Action Research: a personal approach; **Bridget Somekh** Inhabiting Each Other's Castles: towards knowledge and mutual growth through collaboration
Part 3. Action Research for Change Introduction;
Melanie Walker Subaltern Professionals: acting in pursuit of social justice; **Victor Valla** Popular Education and Knowledge: popular surveillance of health and education services in Brazilian metropolitan areas; **Peter Posch** Changes in the Culture of Teaching and Learning and Implications for Action Research; **Arphorn Chuaprapaisilip** Thai Buddhist Philosophy and the Action Research Process
Part 4. Action Research in Practice Settings Introduction; **Belinda Watts & Shirley Jones** Inter-professional Practice and Action Research: commonalities and parallels; **Carol Munn-Giddings** 'A Different Way of Knowing': social care values, practitioner research and action research; **Pete Strauss** No Easy Answers: the dilemmas and challenges of teacher research; **Angie Titchen & Alison Binnie** A Unified Action Research Strategy in Nursing

2002 paperback 244 pages \$38.00 (£24.00) ISBN 1 873927 44 4

SYMPOSIUM BOOKS

PO Box 65, Wallingford, Oxford OX10 0YG, United Kingdom

orders@symposium-books.co.uk www.symposium-books.co.uk