Scaling up the International Impact of Action Research: SAS Phase 3

By: Jacques M. Chevalier and Daniel J. Buckles
Report Type: Final Technical Report
Date: November 1, 2011

Institution: Carleton University, 25 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6
Contact Information of Researcher/Research Team members: Jacques M. Chevalier, Daniel J. Buckles
Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6

Abstract:

The project was the third and final phase of funding from IDRC to Carleton University in support of participatory action research in the field of international development. While Phases I and II of the SAS2 initiative generated a "proof of concept" for a new approach to participatory action research, the current phase focused on publishing and dissemination through trained instructors. It sought to make a strategic contribution by publishing for a university audience new and innovative tools, software, theoretical insights and case studies, and by building capacities in developing countries to teach and practice participatory action research. The basic rationale underlying the project strategy was that scholarly research, advanced teaching materials and trained instructors were needed to bridge the gap between university teaching and the actual practice of participatory action research. Researchers who are sympathetic to participatory methods and philosophy often lack theoretically informed, fully participatory and flexible tools, examples and skills to inquire into complex settings involving multiple stakeholders and knowledge systems. The final phase contributed to scaling up the

international impact of participatory action research by bringing international credibility and profile, scientific rigor and conceptual clarity to better connect the academic world and development research. Project outputs include several scholarly publications and numerous capacity building activities reaching more than 1,000 researchers, and firmly established SAS2 teaching and training resources in Bangladesh, Nepal, India, Bolivia, Peru, Chile, Honduras and Canada. In addition, SAS2 tools and methods were introduced in a meaningful way to research and development communities in Bhutan, France, West Africa and North Africa. Importantly, the scholarly publications emerging from the project are poised to set a new standard for action research and teaching in the Canadian and International university environments. As such, they represent a significant effort to address central issues in the creation and mobilization of knowledge for development and research theory and methods in the social sciences.

Keywords: Participatory Action Research, Research Methods, Social Analysis, Stakeholder Analysis, Community-based Research

Table of Contents

The Research Problem

A central problem in the development research community is the widespread difficulty researchers who are sympathetic to participatory methods and philosophy face when trying to walk the proverbial talk. They often lack the flexible and practical means to inquire into situations that do not lend themselves to easy solutions designed by experts alone. This is particularly crippling in complex settings involving many stakeholders and knowledge systems where both careful reasoning and dialogue across boundaries are urgently needed.

Academic training in research methods reinforces this problem through the conventional division that separates theoretical insights on social history from tools and techniques for assessing and discussing issues that actually matter to people. This apparently harmless split between 'theory' and 'small-m methods' is perhaps the least obvious and yet one of the greatest barriers to rethinking the practical means and skills needed to reconnect knowledge making in the academic world with ongoing community life and real problem solving. This is particularly urgent in the social sciences, a field that places too much emphasis on students applying general theoretical reasoning to social issues, at considerable cost to teamwork and collaborative problem solving. Little attention is given to developing the skills required to facilitate careful reasoning and dialogue across social divides. University learning in the engineering professions and the hard sciences has a different problem: students learn to apply exact knowledge to problems stripped of their social aspects. Graduates in both fields end up applying narrow sets of theoretical concepts or strictly technical frameworks to each and every new situation they encounter.

The seventy-year long history of Participatory Action Research (PAR) and French psychosociology dating back to the pioneering work of Kurt Lewin and the Tavistock Institute has much to offer researchers actively seeking ways to better connect the academic world, community life and the social construction of knowledge and human history. The ongoing evolution of PAR has had a lasting legacy in fields ranging from community development to education, public engagement, and organizational life approached experimentally or psychosociologically (using the insights of psychoanalysis). All formulations of PAR have in common the idea that research must be done 'with' people and not 'on' or 'for' people. Inquiry of this kind makes sense of the world through efforts to transform it, as opposed to simply observing and studying human behavior and people's views about reality, in the hope that meaningful change will happen somewhere down the long and winding road.

Despite the strengths of this tradition, PAR is still not widely taught at universities. Part of the reason is that PAR is considered light theoretically and substantively. The tendency for PAR, especially in the field of community and international development, to focus on quick-and-easy techniques and toolboxes and to ignore theory in the social sciences, has created the perception that it has little to contribute to science per se. The view is that it fails to engage

seriously with theories of knowledge and society, and consequently is of little relevance in the university teaching environment. These gaps have been recognized in various critical reviews of the PAR experience (Hickey and Mohan, 2004; Cooke and Kothari, 2001). They suggest that to be taken seriously in the university environment, PAR must scale up research practice beyond the narrow set of qualitative (focus group, interview, story telling) and quantitative (survey) methods commonly used in the field, and pay more attention to the theoretical foundations of engaged research.

Objectives

The current project phase set out to correct this view of PAR. It sought to scale up the international impact of PAR by bringing rigor and participation to research practice, and providing scope for engaging students and faculty in discussions of why theory is both useful and necessary to grounded research. In the end, theory matters and makes a difference in the methods chosen and the way research is conducted. As Lewin put it, there's nothing more useful than a good theory, including a theory of knowledge production. More generally, the project sought to show how to walk the talk of engaged research — people engaged in dialogue and the exercise of critical reason towards effective social change in community life, the workplace, civil society and educational institutions.

With this challenge in mind, Phase III of the SAS2 initiative conducted and brought together research on the theoretical and methodological foundations of PAR and developed a collection of rigorous, practical and theoretically informed research tools and case studies. It also extended the reach of the results of previous phases of the intiative into various institutional settings by supporting the development of independent capacities in the South to undertake and provide training in SAS2 inspired participatory action research and to do research on specific topics relevant to national priorities. By publishing new and innovative methods and concepts and building capacities in developing countries to teach and practice participatory action research the project sought to scale up its contribution to the development and practice of participatory action research in the field of international development.

Specifically, the objectives of the project were to:

1. Produce a comprehensive and collaborative scholarly book on the international contributions of SAS2 to the theory and practice of action research;

2. Consolidate regional SAS2 capacities by providing ongoing coaching and advanced training for leading SAS2 instructors in the South;

3. Support action research in the Global South and Global North by linking SAS2 instructors to the needs of specific research communities and projects;

4. Collect, document, systematize and publish in the SAS2 Community Digital Library the knowledge and experience of international researchers using SAS2 concepts and tools.

Methods and Activities

Project implementation drew primarily on the time of a two-person research team at Carleton University, dedicating a full-time equivalent of 1.0 persons. Project partners were also engaged on a voluntary basis and through small contracts to meet specific capacity building objectives. Despite these modest human resources, the project completed a wide range of activities on four continents, in line with the project objectives. While these objectives did not change over the life of the project, the methods and activities for achieving them did evolve.

Publications

Plans to produce a single comprehensive and collaborative scholarly book on the theory and practice of participatory action research (Objective 1) and populate the SAS2 Community Digital Library (Objective 4) evolved over the life of the project in light of new thinking about audience needs, as well as a better understanding of the needs of our partners and the constraints they face. Unlike the previous phase of the project, the current project did not have the financial resources and set of formal obligations needed to systematically engage multiple partners in a collaborative writing and publication process. Partners had no formal obligations to provide Carleton University with results from their work or to report according to project timelines. This made it difficult for Carleton to coordinate the writing and publication process, and brought into question the feasibility of producing a single, comprehensive and collaborative publication reflecting the contributions of multiple partners. It should be noted as well that our partners' publication goals were primarily tied to their substantive research and project development areas, and not to scholarly publication per se. Writing experience, capacities and interests varied considerably within the community of practice.

Discussions with partners and reflection on this dilemma resulted in an alternative publication and information sharing strategy better suited to the goals of the project and the interests and needs of our different partners and audiences. First, we reviewed the lessons learned from field practice and use of the tools generated by the previous phase of the project. This involved meetings and discussions with project partners, the evaluation of past training materials and activities, and a critical assessment of the various audiences for our work. We also learned from an independent project with a Canadian indigenous peoples organization (COTA, the Cree Outfitters and Tourism Association). COTA commissioned us to

produce a small tool-kit for First Nations community-based tourism development officers (*COTA Toolkit*, Jacques M. Chevalier et al., published by SAS2 Dialogue and COTA). This activity helped us rethink the style, format and approach to presenting SAS2 tools to practitioners and trainees. The lessons from these various activities indicated that more attention to the design and presentation of the tools would help enormously with training activities and independent learning by field-level and university-based practitioners. We concluded that it would be best to produce the materials needed for training as a complete handbook for trainers and practitioners, and to ensure that trainers and practitioners have access to these materials on the internet and access to local language versions of the training materials.

As a result of these deliberations we created a comprehensive and integrated collection of tools called "A Handbook for Participatory Action Research, Planning and Evaluation". The publication complements the publications created under the previous phase of the project by adding some 50 tools not previously published. New tools focused on key evaluation questions were added as well, in response to a growing interest in bridging gaps in traditonal evaluation methodologies. The handbook also greatly improves the instructions and guidelines for selecting and scaling tools to meet the needs of action research. Throughout it uses an innovative design and clear language to enhance usability. The final product, now available in English, French and Spanish is, we believe, a vital resource for practitioners, instructors and university teachers. It has, in fact, become a key resource in the strategy to build capacities among our partners to teach and practice participatory action research (see below). The full text of the handbook is available in print and on the project website, placing it firmly in the public domain. In addition, Nepali, Bengali and Marathi language collections of SAS2 tools were created by partners drawing on these materials, published on their own websites and on the project website.

Despite project attention to the publication of tools, our original plan to produce a scholarly book remained valid. Mainstreaming high quality participatory action research and training in higher learning institutions is an important challenge, and scholarly publications a key strategy for doing so. They are needed to bring international credibility and profile, scientific rigor and conceptual clarity to participatory action research, and to successfully bridge the divide between development-oriented theory, university teaching and actual practice. Project methods in support of scholarly publication objectives moved in two directions. First, we continued to work on a comprehensive book combining theory, methods and case studies, as well as a novel review of the history of participatory action research that lays out the key contributions of SAS2. The book draws extensively on our own work and collaborative applications with our southern partners. This book, now an advanced manuscript, is intended to be a modular textbook on participatory action research methods, theory and practice — a strongly recommended

textbook on the reading list of commonly taught optional undergraduate and postgraduate courses and training programs in applied and participatory research, field research and qualitative methods. The book offers novel concepts and practical tools to "walk the talk" of engaged research that is both rigorous and matters to people. It is designed for researchers, teachers, students, facilitators, consultants and analysts (NGO and public sector) interested in learning how to support participatory action research, planning and evaluation that is methodical and engages key stakeholders in the creation of knowledge and decision making. While the concepts and tools can be applied to many sectors and settings, the illustrations will resonate particularly well within the fields of community development, organizational development and public engagement in both the Global South and the North. Much of the material for this book, adding up to about 140,000 words (330 pages), is already written. We are currently in the final process of negotiating a publication agreement with an international publisher (Routledge UK). Our expectation is that the book will be published by the spring of 2012, within the extended project schedule (May, 2012). It will also become part of the IDRC Books web publication process, thereby being linked to the IDRC Digital Library.

One of the key contributions of SAS2 to the practice of participatory action research is that it not only provides a first rate set of rigorous and novel participatory tools but also shows how to select, scale and combine tools in a coherent research process that is action oriented. This is key to going beyond the "tool box" approach to methods common in the field, and to addressing the question of what tools to use when, why and how. To make this point, we decided to give more attention to the production and publication of a detailed case study of a long-term research process designed and implemented with partners in India using SAS2 tools and concepts. The resulting book-length publication brings together original research on two development themes: the land and housing rights of India's tribal populations, and methods for engaging marginalized people in action research. Using rigorous and novel methods adapted from different disciplines and theoretical perspectives, the research examines the land and housing struggles of the Katkari, a former 'Criminal Tribe' and 'Primitive Tribal Group' fighting eviction from rural hamlets in Maharashtra. The account is designed to help readers learn about participatory action research progressively and with a strong narrative grounded in real-life development problems and efforts to resolve them. As such, it provides an strategic complement to the short case studies included in the general SAS2 publication. It also makes an important scholarly contribution to development studies and Indian anthropology, thereby enhancing the academic credibility and profile of the SAS2 approach to participatory action research. The book will be published by Cambridge University Press India and is expected to be in print within the extended project schedule (May, 2012).

After extensive consultation with partners we determined that there was a critical mass of SAS2 research and commitment to publications among practitioners in Honduras associated with

several national universities. Consequently, we made adjustments to the funding for partner honoraria to accommodate the production of a scholarly collection of case studies from Honduras, to be published by Zamorano in Spanish. This includes findings from more than 20 projects dealing with watershed management, coastal management and the role of women in small agricultural enterprises, undertaken by faculty and students. The book is expected to go to print before the extended project period.

Some individual project partners have pursued independent publication strategies for studies where SAS2 methods played a key role. For example, several colleagues in Nepal published reports on climate change issues, both in English and in Nepali. In Bolivia partners published on water management challenges, community forestry and efforts to reform the education institutions in Bolivia. A doctoral dissertation on community forestry initiatives in Bolivia written by Jorge Tellez for the University of Cordoba (Spain) and supervised by Jacques Chevalier won a prestigious prize from the University Comunidad de Madrid for excellence in research on international development in the field of Engineering. A doctoral disseration on ecotourism among indigenous communities in the circumpolar region was also completed during the project period, and benefited directly from supervision by Chevalier. More modest reports and articles on studies produced by various partners using SAS2 methods have also been published in Peru and Bangladesh. If of sufficient quality, these documents will be included in the SAS2 Community Digital Library hosted by IDRC for the SAS2 Community of Practice.

Capacity Building Activities

The capacity building activities of the project carried out since November 2008 involved more than 1065 participants in 22 countries (Table 1). They were of two types. On the one hand, the principal investigators at Carleton provided ongoing coaching and advanced training for leading SAS2 practitioners in the South, with a view to consolidating regional capacities to teach and practice participatory action research (Objective 2). This often involved joint planning and co-facilitation of the SAS2 Introductory Workshop with individuals in the South on track to becoming Certified Instructors. At the request of IDRC, Carleton University occasionally also provided introductory training and research design support directly in the South, in settings where southern instructors were not available. On the other hand, leading SAS2 practitioners in the South independently provided introductory and advanced training for specific research communities and projects with whom they interacted, with a view to consolidating their training profile and supporting action research on specific topics in various settings (Objective 3). In all cases, organizations hosting the training events provided significant in-kind contributions, including convening, logistical support, and participant travel and per diems. Trainer fees and travel were covered by the project. This method provided our partners with an opportunity to offer training to partners

at a subsidized rate but without the project taking full responsibility for costs. Our thinking was that cost-sharing would provide a means to make a transition from the active supply of training to a demand-driven approach fully funded by organizations and individuals receiving the training. The project experience suggests that the willingness and capacity to pay for training varies from context to context, although demand for training has remained high and donors are willing to independently fund training events for their partners.

The project developed and promoted among SAS2 instructors a sound and novel method for capacity-building. Most training events were organized around multistakeholder groups with concrete projects in common, grounding practice and learning in the information gaps and plans of existing or proposed projects. This enhanced the extent to which people could learn-by-doing in contexts that are meaningful and immediately useful to participants. Training often resulted in real-life assessments, project and proposal development, and concrete decision-making regarding future plans and research activities. The Handbook helped trainers cover all basic features of the SAS^2 approach to participatory action research while at the same time leaving scope for adaption to the needs of particular groups. The capacity-building approach also emphasized follow-up and ongoing coaching in the design and facilitation of real-life SAS^2 diagnostic assessments and collaborative projects among practitioners. This helped ensure that training was followed whenever possible by practice that was fully integrated into ongoing plans and projects of participating organizations. Workshop reports from the training activities directly funded by the project are consolidated in Annex I (CD-ROM only).

Nepal

During the life of the project Carleton University provided advanced training for 6 organizations in Nepal that have been active in the initiative for several years. These included members of LIBIRD, Forest Action, the Institute of Forestry, USC-Nepal, FORWARD, and the DFID funded Livelihood Forestry Program (LFP). Two LIBIRD staff (Bikash Paudyal and Pitamber Shrestha) also participated in advanced training in India provided by Carleton. The training resulted in certifications for 6 Nepali instructors, and involved more than 30 participants. The reach of these instructors to other researchers in Nepal is significant.

LIBIRD, an established research NGO with a strong reputation and track record in development research, has been a key partner since the early days of the SAS2 intiative. During the life of the current project, LIBIRD provided and continues to provide regular and ongoing SAS2 training for new staff and staff of its immediate partners. It has integrated SAS2 methods into virtually all its institutional projects. SAS2 methods have played a key role in LIBIRD's contributions to the National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA) for climate change, various external evaluations it has undertaken on behalf of clients, and work on Community Biodiversity Management in Nepal funded by the Government of Nepal. LIBIRD has also

integrated SAS2 methods into the activities of a regional programme on Community Biodiversity Management supported by The Development Fund (Norway). The programme seeks to strengthen the capacity of farming communities in South Asia to conserve, utilize and benefit from their genetic resources through appropriate technical support, institutional mechanism and policy interventions. The programme has adopted SAS2 as its main methodology, with LIBIRD providing SAS2 training to programme partners in India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Tibet-China. LIBIRD also contributed to the development of a SAS2-based curriculum for collaborative inquiry at the Institute of Forestry in Nepal and in the Department of Sociology in Tribhuwan University (TU), Central Campus, Kritipur, Kathmandu. In support of this work LIBIRD developed Nepali language SAS2 training materials available on the project website.

In addition to consolidating SAS2 within LIBIRD, the project also extended the reach of participatory action research in a number of other Nepali organizations. During the reporting period, Bimal Regmi, the most senior and experienced of the SAS2 Instructors, shifted from LIBIRD to DFID, where he was responsible for climate change programming. Mr. Regmi has been actively training DFID and partners in Nepal in the use of SAS2 methods, and using SAS2 tools in a range of projects. He is currently doing a PhD at Flinders University in Australia, and has incorporated SAS2 tools into his dissertation work, still in progress. Neeraj Chapagain, a SAS2 Instructor with the DFID funded Livelihood Forestry Program (LFP), has trained over one hundred and fifty individuals in community-based organizations in eastern Nepal in the use of SAS2 methods for community-based research. He has also been active as a researcher and published two articles on forestry issues where SAS2 was the main methodology. He is currently setting up an independent consulting firm in Nepal with 6 partners to do evaluation and monitoring of development projects in Nepal, with SAS2 tools and methods forming a central pillar among the services offered by the firm. During the life of the project Forest Action developed a course in development studies in association with the College of Development Studies at the Purwanchal University in Nepal that incorporated various elements from the SAS2 training program. Maniram Banjane, a SAS2 Certified Practitioner with Forest Action, is currently doing his PhD at a University in Australia and is incorporating SAS2 methods into his research. Apar Paudyal of Forest Action has continued to provide the organization with assess to SAS2 training and support to research projects of the organization, primarily in the area of climate change research. A detailed study using these tools was written by Mr. Paudyal and Mr. Regmi in Nepali, and published by DFID. These initiatives are those we are aware of in Nepal, and do not take into account what is likely considerable more use of SAS2 tools in research and development projects of other individuals and organizations in Nepal that received training in SAS2 either from Carleton or close partners.

India

The project was active in eastern, western and southern India, with three organizations and their partners. During the project period Carleton provided advanced and introductory training on two occasions. The first event involved 5 organizations working on climate change research and sustainable agriculture programs. These included Development Research, Communication and Services Centre (DRCSC), Technology Resource Communication and Services Center, Living Farm, RDA, and the Tangore Society for Rural Development. The second event involved 5 different organizations based in Southern India coordinated by The Green Foundation. Both occasions provided opportunities for Carleton to coach and train trainers. As a result, six advanced practitioners in India are now recognized as Instructors.

DRCSC, the host of one of the training events, independently provided a series of SAS2 training events to members of a sustainable agriculture network in eastern India and a national climate change network. This is in addition to ongoing training in SAS2 for its own staff and for members of its Board of Trustees. To support this work, DRCSC produced a Bangla version of key SAS2 resources, posted to the project website and integrated in their own website. DRCSC has also integrated SAS2 into a wide variety of institutional endeavors, including project planning, project assessment and community-based research. It is currently using a specific set of participatory action research tools, including SAS2, to support research on understanding climate change and documenting adaptation strategies in eastern India. This work has been supported actively by Debjeet Saranji, the head of Living Farms. He has become a specialist in the use of SAS2 methods in the context of climate change research and disaster relief programming, and active as a trainer not only in India but in other countries of the region as well. He plans to participate in a training session in February, 2012 in the Philippines, in support of the work of the Asia division of a Roman Catholic relief agency focused on disaster relief.

In western India, Carleton provided ongoing coaching to members of the Academy of Development Science (ADS) and SOBTI, two organizations that have been longstanding partners in the SAS2 initiative. Coaching by Carleton on two separate occasions focused on advanced applications of SAS2 tools in research and ways to adapt SAS2 training to community-based and grassroots organizations. ADS has actively provided basic training in participatory action research using SAS2 tools to dozens of grassroots organizations in India. This includes groups working on food security issues funded by The German Catholic Church aid agency MISEROR as well as groups working on climate change research funded by IIED. SAS2 training has also been integrated by ADS into the mentorship program of the New Education Group (NEG) involving Master level students. During the reporting period ADS provided several rounds of training support to the work of YUVA, a large NGO doing research

on the potters of Mumbai, with funding from the Ecosystems Approaches to Human Health program initiative at IDRC. These activities are in addition to the active use of SAS2 tools in ongoing institutional work by ADS and SOBTI on housing issues funded by Habitat for Humanity, food security programs and land rights initiatives involving Adivasi people. In support of these activities ADS developed a Marathi language set of SAS2 training materials, now posted to the project site.

Bangladesh

In Bangladesh, Carleton delivered an intensive SAS2 workshop and coaching in support of an UBINIG project funded by the Research on International Tobacco Control (RITC) at IDRC. The project, which seeks to engage tobacco farmers in the development of alternatives to tobacco cultivation, has made extensive use of SAS2 methods for over three years, with ongoing support and coaching provided by Carleton. The results of this work form a major chapter in the scholarly book of the project, and are likely to be integrated into a new IDRC publication on tobacco control research.

UBINIG has also actively integrated SAS2 methods into virtually all of its programs on agricultural research and extension, including work with farmers, fishers and weavers. During the reporting period, UBINIG developed and offered courses in SAS2 methods for four different audiences in Bangladesh: development agencies, Dhaka University students, farmer leaders and professional journalists active in the national media. These courses created ongoing demand for SAS2 training in Bangladesh among organizations and with support from various donors. UBINIG continues to offer the course independently.

Bhutan

In Bhutan, Carleton co-designed a monitoring and evaluation framework with the Evaluation Unit of the Ministry of Education, in consultation with teachers and other stakeholders. The purpose of the framework was to generate information on the extent to which schools in Bhutan are successfully integrating the principles of Gross National Happiness into their activities and school improvement plans. This work was in the broader context of IDRC support to the Canadian organization GPI Atlantic and its Educating for GNH project.

The training and co-design support provided by Carleton contributed new and relevant elements to a School Self Assessment Tool now used by all schools in the country. The tool makes use of "The Socratic Wheel" to assess current and desired levels of achievement in five areas: leadership and management practice, physical ambiance of the school, psycho-social ambiance of the school, curriculum, co-curriculum, student assessment, and school-community relationships. This allows schools to assess progress and set improvement goals for specified periods of time relevant to the broader objectives of Educating for GNH. Carleton

continues to correspond with the Evaluation Unit in Bhutan, and has integrated a short case study on the work into the scholarly book.

North Africa

During the project period Carleton facilitated three significant training events in Africa, one in Senegal, one in Nigeria and another in Morocco. All events have led to follow up work with SAS by participants. A five day workshop on participatory action research methods organized in Sengal COPAGEN (Coalition pour la protection du patrimoine génétique africain) in collaboration with USC-Canada focused on peasant seed selection, preservation and promotion ("Détermination d'une méthodologie de recherche participative sur la valorisation des semences paysannes"). In addition to the host organizations, the event involved partners of IDRC and SWISS-AID from several West African countries. It generated considerable interest in the SAS2 approach to participatory action-research in the area of seed management and was followed by a five-day SAS2 workshop in Canada attended by the head of COPAGEN (Ibrahim Ouéderago) and Modibo Goita, coordinator of USC in Mali. USC-Canada also became active in the use of SAS2 in its programs in West Africa as a result of this training initiative, and later helped to launch a new initiative on the use of SAS2 approaches in evaluation (see below).

Carleton University provided a 4 day SAS2 Introductory Workshop for several North African partners supported by the Rural Poverty and Environment initiative at IDRC. The workshop took place in Settat, Morocco, and was attended by two IDRC officers (M. Owaygen, L. ElFattal) and 6 research teams from Algeria, Morocco and Lebanon representing different projects: INRA's Management of Collective Rangelands in Rhamna-Morocco, CREAD's Sustainable Development of the Algerian Steppe, and ICARDA's Strengthening Social and Gender Analysis in ENRM in MENA involving four other teams. In the words of Lamia ElFattal, "The course was very positively received because... it 'speaks' social science in a language (and logic and rigor) that is usually understood by natural scientists. It structures the associated perceived messiness of social science and helps in the words of SAS 'make sense of the real life complexity'. The great part of Carleton's support is that it was delivered in both English and French -- it is practical, and can be tailored to a specific need" (Email report, November 16, 2009).

Following this training process, the independent consultant Maria Fernandez was hired by ICARDA to provide ongoing support in SAS2 training for the national teams involved in the Morocco training. This work focused on tools for gender analysis, and was funded by the IDRC SAGA program. In depth training and facilitation support was given to professors and students at the National Agricultural Institute of Meknes in Berber High Atlas communities. Their work has focused on understanding the role of gender in the organization, management and marketing of medicinal and aromatic plants. Dr. Fernandez provided ongoing support,

and is co-authoring three publications on the work. Discussions are also underway with Aden Aw-Hassan of ICARDA regarding the possible development of a comprehensive assessment of partner experience with SAS2 tools in North Africa, including IDRC partners in Lebanon, Syria, Morocco and Algeria.

In Nigeria project support took the form of advanced SAS2 training for facilitators, delivered in Canada by Carleton at the request of the consulting firm Marbek and CUSO-VSO. These organizations engaged Carleton in the design of a training process later delivered by Dr. Fernandez and another consultant (Ricardo Ramirez) for a large network of CIDA partners in climate change research in Nigeria. The training was delivered by consultants that have consequently become active proponents and practitioners in their own practice with a wide range of international development organizations.

Bolivia, Peru and Colombia

During the project period, David Mercado of the NGO EMPRENDE facilitated numerous SAS2 training events in different parts of Bolivia. These involved government agencies (El Servicio Nacional de Riego – SENARI; Centro de Informacion en Energias Renovables - CINER), universities (Universidad Mayor de San Simon, Sucre; Universidad Mayor San Simon, Cochabamba) and NGOs (Centro de Servicios Agropecuarios Technicos Chuquisaca - CESATCH). This was in addition to many applications of SAS2 tools to issues ranging from water management to institutional change within the university system. Another SAS2 practitioner active in Bolivia is Carmen Ramirez, an independent consultant and academic working with indigenous populations near Sucre involved in the production of brazil nuts. These studies have helped inform the selection of cases used in project publications and uploaded to the project Repository. CEBEM, an active SAS2 partner during the previous phase, also continues to use and promote the use of SAS2 tools and concepts in Bolivia through its website.

SAS2 training and research was extended to Peru during the project period through the work of Jenny Menacho, a member of the Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Peru. With the assistance of David Mercado of Bolivia, Ms. Menacho developed a SAS2 research and training process with the Peruvian Ministry of Education and the National Electoral Office. This activity sought to review and provide guidance to some 800 Centros de Educación Básica Alternativa (CEBA) across the country engaged in the development and delivery of teacher training on elections and democratic processes in Peru. Ms. Menacho has also been actively teaching SAS2 methods in the context of distance learning courses she offers at the Pontificia University. In 2011 she joined forces with Dr. Maria Fernandez (see above) to offer an intensive SAS2 training process for the Municipalidad Metropolitana de Lima in support of their 5 year strategic plan on risk management associated with climate change. Some 35 leaders from three districts in Lima participated over several sessions, resulting in enhanced

capacities to undertake community consultations on the topic and make specific plans to address climate change challenges.

Mr. Mercado and Ms. Menacho, with direct assistance from Daniel Buckles of Carleton, also collaborated on the delivery of a SAS2 Workshop to members of RIMISP (Centro Latinoamericano para el Dessarrollo Rural) immediately following a major conference of the network. Some 35 people participated from a wide range of institutions dealing with environment and natural resource management issues. This was followed up later by Carleton with a refresher course for RIMISP staff at their headquarters in Santiago de Chile. As discussed below, various members of the RIMISP network in South and Central America have integrated SAS2 tools and approaches into their research plans and activities.

Chile and Argentina

In Chile, Dr. Carlos Tapia organized four workshops with universities in different parts of the country and on a wide range of themes. The Universidad de la Frontera in central Chile, the Universidad de Chile in Santiago de Chile, la Universidad de la Serna and the Universidad Catolica del Norte hosted these events. The training provided a solid introduction to SAS2 methods for faculty in various departments including the Centro de Investigaciones de la Inclusión Digital y la Sociedad del Conocimiento (CIISOC), the Faculty of Sociology (FACSO), the Community Ecology Centre and others. A fifth workshop delivered by Dr. Tapia engaged more than 15 faculty members at the Universidad de San Luis and the Universidad de San Juan, in San Luis, Argentina. These events laid the groundwork for ongoing university training in SAS2 in Chile and Argentina, and support to related participatory methods used by a large number of faculty members. Dr. Tapia also worked as a consultant on a variety of projects requiring specialized community-based research and facilitation support for government agencies, typically involving SAS2 tools. The most significant of these was a major study on behalf of the Instituto de Fomento Pesquero into the process of consultation and decision-making used in the fishing sector in Chile. SAS2 training was integral to the work with the Institute and the Fisheries Ministry.

Honduras

In Honduras, Dr. Laura Suazo and Dr. Raul Zelaya, both of Zamorano University, organized a series of SAS2 workshops to engage directors, donors and field staff of NGOs throughout the country. The training events were followed by ongoing coaching support through Zamorano and FOPRIDEH, a national umbrella organization for NGOs. This work was in addition to ongoing teaching of SAS2 tools and methods at Zamorano by Drs Suazo and Zelaya, and teaching by other SAS2 instructors based at the National Agricultural University. Members of these two universities have thoroughly integrated the SAS2 approach into the university curriculum, and supervised many undergraduate theses using these methods. A major

collection of studies from this work made possible because of the training process is being published in Honduras.

Canada and Europe

The project as defined in the project proposal is only part of what makes up the SAS2 initiative. In addition to the specific project objectives, methods and activities reported above, Carleton University team members contribute in other ways to the broader goal of scaling up participation action research. Following is a partial list of these additional and independently funded training and facilitation activities aimed at testing, improving, disseminating and building capacities in action-oriented research in Canada:

- Three rounds of SAS2 training for community health professionals in Saskatchewan, involving more than 60 Public and Primary health workers. A province-wide network of community health facilitators is beginning to take shape.

- Training for 10 First Nations land management agents in Keewaywin, Ontario, hosted by the Keewaytinook Okimakanak Research Institute.

- Training for 70 school counselors and 10 school board directors in Quebec.

- Three rounds of SAS2 training for consultants and staff of international development organizations in the Ottawa-Toronto-Montreal region, involving more than 40 participants.

- Co-design and facilitation of assessments on various topics for CIDA and its partners based in the Ottawa region.

- Co-design and facilitation of a comprehensive evaluation framework for the United Way of Canada.

- Co-design and facilitation of collaborative inquiry, planning and evaluation for the Trent Centre for Community Based Education (two events).

- Co-design and facilitation of strategic planning exercises for AQOCI (Association québécoise des organismes de coopération internationale) (two events).

- Co-design and facilitation of a strategic planning and mediation exercise on the development of tourism in northern Québec, for the Projet ACCORD Baie-James (Ministère du Tourisme et Ministère du Développement économique, de l'Innovation et de l'Exportation, Québec), in Oujé-Bougoumou.

- Design and facilitation of a problem solving and strategic planning exercise for the Gatineau Park (National Capital Commission).

- Co-design of a major PAR project on "Les conduites collectives et individuelles face aux risques dans le BTP (Bâtiments et Travaux Publics)", led by the Groupe de recherche en SHS, École Centrale de Paris.

- Co-design of a SAS2 approach to M&E for OXFAM Canada (Ottawa) and the Canadian Food Grains Bank (Winnipeg), funded by the Canadian Council for International Co-operation (CCIC).

- Several rounds of SAS2 training for Ottawa Family Services and the Catholic Immigration Services Ottawa.

- Several SAS2 presentations to Canadian CSOs working in the field of development, including Interculture (Ottawa), OXFAM International (in Montréal), and the North-South Institute.

- Several SAS2 presentations to university-based PAR researchers in France (École Centrale de Paris and CEDREA) and to school counselors and university researchers (Université Louvain-la-Neuve) in Belgium.

- Co-supervising Sylvie Blangy's doctoral dissertation on aboriginal tourism in Circumpolar countries, defended in 2010 at Montpellier University, France.

- Co-designing research on reserve land and economic development among First Nations in Canada, led by Paul Fauteux, Senior Advisor at Lands and Economic Development, INAC.

- Co-design and facilitation of research on aging and disabilities by the Canadian Centre on Disabilities Studies, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

- Support to a network of Canadian International NGOs supported by IDRC and coordinated by Canada World Youth, focused on bridging gaps in the methods of Results-based Management.

- Training in PAR for staff of the Trillium Foundation.

Project Outputs

The main project outputs are project publications, a new website, and training events involving more than 1065 participants in 22 countries. Indirect outputs include research using SAS2 methods by people and institutions that received training both in Canada and in the global South.

Publications

- Jacques M. Chevalier and Daniel J. Buckles, 2011. "A Handbook for Participatory Action Research, Planning and Evaluation". In print, and published to the project website www.participatoryactionresearch.net

- Jacques M. Chevalier and Daniel J. Buckles, (under review). Engaged Research: Methods, Theory and Cases. Forthcoming, Routledge UK (Earthscan).

- Daniel J. Buckles, Rajeev Khedkar, and Bansi Ghevde, (under review). Homeless: Katkari Struggles for Land and Identity. Forthcoming, Cambridge University Press India.

Website

The Phase II website was revised during the early stages of the current project to improve searchability and to accommodate multiple language sections in a common site (English, Spanish, French, Nepali, Bengali, Marthi). Each language section was under the supervision of a partner in the corresponding region. Little use was made of this functionality, however, and after consultation with partners we redirected the local language materials to be posted directly to partner websites. The site was then redesigned to provide easier access to project outputs and general guidance on participatory action research, planning and evaluation. Consideration was also given to ensuring the sustainability of the site following project closure by shifting full responsibility for the site from Carleton University to the authors. The site was also populated with an updated version of the interative software "Social Analysis CLIP", making use of current webbased application technology. This software helps users create profiles of the stakeholders involved in a core problem and now has full functionality in English, French and Spanish. The site maintains a link to the SAS2 Community of Practice Repository hosted by IDRC.

Training

The following table lists the capacity building activities directly support by the project during the reporting period. Many other training activities were organized directly and independently by partners in the initiative.

Table 1: Capacity Building Activities of Phase III (November 1, 2008 – October 31, 2011).

Lead Trainer	Location and date	Type of training	Participating institutions	Partici-pants	Profile
Carleton	Dakar, Senegal, March 2-6, 2009	Co-design and facilitation	USC, IDRC, COPAGEN, INADES-Formation, SWISS-AID	22	Farmers, NGOs, scientists, donor
Carleton	Pune, India,	Co-design and	ADS, SOBTI	5	NGO,

Lead Trainer	Location and date	Type of training	Participating institutions	Partici-pants	Profile
	April 25 – May 2, 2009	facilitation			Community members
Carleton	Kolkatta, India, May 2-6, 2009	Community Research	DRCSC, Technology Resource Communication and Services Center, Living Farm, RDA, Tangore Society for Rural Development	15	NGO
Carleton	Tangail, Bangladesh, May 7-11, 2009	Co-design and facilitation	UBINIG, Nayakrishi Andolon	25	NGO, Community members
Carleton	Pokhara, Nepal May 12-15, 2009	Advanced research	LIBIRD, USC-Nepal, FORWARD, LFP, Forest Action	29	NGO, Community members, University
Carleton	Ottawa, Canada, Aug 29- Sept. 2, 2009	Advanced research	COPAGEN, USC, INADES-formation, IDRC, Ottawa U.	7	NGO, University, donor
Carleton	Settat, Morocco, November 2-5, 2009	Basic action research	INRA, CREAD, ICARDA, IDRC	24	NGO, University, donor
Carleton	Pune, India, Feb 2-10, 2010	Co-design and facilitation	ADS, SOBTI	5	NGO
Carleton	Bangalore, India, Feb 11-13, 2010	Advanced community research	LIBIRD, DRCSC, Living Farms, The Green Foundation	19	NGO
UBINIG	Dhaka, Bangladesh, December, 2009 – January, 2010	Farmer-Based research	UBINIG, Nayakrishi, University of Bangladesh	45	NGO, Farmer Organization, University students
Carleton	Bogota, Colombia, March 19-21, 2010	Community Research	RIMISP and 21 other institutions	38	NGO, University, Government
LIBIRD	Pokhara, Nepal, December, 2010	Advanced Research methods	LIBIRD staff and partners	60+	NGO, University, Government
LFP	Bhojpur District, Nepal, May 7 – 9, 2009	Community research	Samuhik Abhiyan Animators, Supervisors, Programme Officers, Board Members	16	NGO
LFP	Dhankuta, Nepal, 21-24 November, 2009	Community research	District Forest Officers, Programme Coordinators and Programme Officers	20+	Government, NGO
LFP and DFID	Kathmandu, Nepal, Feb 10-13, 2010	Climate change research	LFP Senior Management, DFID	20+	Government, NGO
DRCSC	Kolkata, India,	Farmer-based	14 partner organizations	18	NGO

Lead Trainer	Location and date	Type of training	Participating institutions	Partici-pants	Profile
	April 15-17, 2010	research			
DRCSC	Kolkata, India, April 20-24, 2010	Co-design and facilitation	DRCSC Senior Management and Board of Trustees	21	NGO
DRCSC	Kolkata, India September, 2010	Facilitation	DRCSC Senior Management	10	NGO
ADS	Various locations in India, ongoing	Introductory and co-design	Using Diversity Network, Climate Change Network, NEG, YUVA, various grassroots organizations	100 +	NGO
CESSO	San Juan, Argentina, May 26-28, 2010	Mining industry assessment	University de San Luis and University of San Juan	22	University
UBINIG	Dhaka, Bangladesh, March 25, 2011	Problem-solving	Pathshala Study Circle, Prabartana	29	NGO, Small business staff, Students
UBINIG	Tangail, Bangladesh, April 19-21, 2010	Priority setting	Women's Alliance against Tobacco, Nayakrishi	38	NGO, Farmer Organizations
UBINIG/Action Aid	Jhenaidah, Bangladesh, March 15, 2011	Exploring problems	Khulna district media organizations	19	Journalists
Carleton	Thimphu, Bhutan, February 16-19, 2010	Evaluation design	Ministry of Education	25	Government, educators
EMPRENDE	Cochabamba, Bolivia, 24-26 February, 2010	Strategic planning	Escuela Universitaria de Pos Grado, Universidad Mayor de San Simon	16	University faculty
EMPRENDE	La Paz, Bolivia, 14, 18, 19 February, 2011	Organizationde velop-ment	Servicio Nacional de Riego, GTZ	18	Government
EMPRENDE	Sucre, Bolivia, September 8-10, 2011	Curriculum develop-ment	Centro de Servicios Agropecuarios Tecnicos, Universidad San Fransisco	30	University, Government
CESSO	Santiago, Chile, May 10-12, 2010	Methods develop-ment	Faculty of Sociology, University of Chile	36	University
CESSO/Carleton	Valparaiso, Chile, August 25-26, 2011	Planning and Evaluation	Instituto Fomento Pesquera, SUBPESCA	18	Government
Carleton/CESSO	Santiago, Chile, August 29, 2011	Methods develop-ment	RIMISP	14	NGO, University
CESSO	Coquimbo, Chile, December 20-21, 2010	Planning, organizationca pacity building, fisheries develop-ment	Universidad de La Serena	24	University faculty, researchers

Lead Trainer	Location and date	Type of training	Participating institutions	Partici-pants	Profile
CESSO	Antofagasta, Chile, October 4-5, 2010	Fisheries management	Universidad Catolica del Norte	30	University, Government
Zamorano	Tegucigalpa, Honduras, June 23, 2010	Executive training	20 organizations in NGO and government	23	NGO, Government
Zamorano	Tegucigalpa, Honduras, July 26-28, 2010	Methods develop-ment	14 organizations in NGO and university	26	NGO, University
Zamorano	Tegucigalpa, Honduras, August 23-25, 2011	Advanced methods	13 organizations in NGO and university	21	University, NGO
DRCSC	East India, Periodic, 2010-11	Organizationpl anning, community research	DRCSC and network partners	various	NGO
ADS	West India, Periodic, 2010-11	Community-based research on agriculture	ADS and Using Diversity network	various	NGO
ICARDA/Ferna ndez	Menkes, Morocco, 5 events in 2010-11	Gender training using SAS2	National Agriculture Institute	25	University
LIBIRD/LFP	Nepal, 4-5 events	Climate change methods	LIBIRD, Forest Action, LFP	30	NGO, University
Carleton	Goose Bay, Canada, July 19-21, 2010	Community research	NunatuKavut Community Council, Torngat Secretariat, Memorial University	15	University, NGO
EMPRENDE	Asuncion, Paraguay, May 12-13, 2011	Strategic Planning	Union de Comunidades de la Nacion Yshir	12	Indigenous Organization
Universidad Catolica, EMPRENDE	Lima, Peru, May 28-30, 2010	Planning and community consultation	GIEE, COPAE, Oficina Nacional de Procesos Electorales, Lima Metropolitana	60	Government
Universidad Catolica	Lima, Peru, August 13-14, 2011	Climate change research and planning	Municipalidad Metropolitana de Lima	35	Government
Total				1065 + participa nts	

Project Outcomes

The project outcomes emerged from publication activities, capacity building and the research undertaken by the people involved. It is too early to say what will result from publication of the comprehensive scholarly book and detailed case study from India, although we are confident

that these will raise the profile and credibility of participatory action research in both the development and academic environments. They are unique and high caliber products, likely to fill strategic gaps in what is currently available. Time, and the citation index, will tell. Our expectation remains that the publications will make a strategic contribution to training in higher learning institutions and development organizations that are actively seeking ways to better connect the academic world and community life.

More immediately, we can conclude that the publication of the Handbook on Participatory Action Research, Planning and Evaluation, and the project website, has inspired and supported the work of several thousand people who are sympathetic to participatory methods and philosophy and are eager to further develop the flexible and practical means to inquire into complex situations. The Handbook, for example, has been distributed in hard copy to over 400 people during various training events, and is actively used as a training tool by SAS2 Instructors on all continents. Many supportive comments on the user-friendly character of the Handbook suggest that it meets the need for practical yet rigorous and engaging tools to support dialogue and research in a wide range of settings and topics, from health to environment, education, organizational capacity building and conflict management. The website has also reached far beyond the immediate network of practitioners and people engaged directly in training events. The website has more than 3,000 subscribers, and we regularly receive queries for training and additional information from a range of practitioners and scholars around the world.

The capacity building activities of the project have succeeded in developing solid training capacities in a number of Latin American and Asian countries as well as in Canada and Europe. There are a significant number of Instructors in these regions actively engaged in using SAS2 in their own institutions and providing access to training in participatory action research methods for a large and increasing number of national research and development communities. Interaction with university-based researchers has been very strong in Latin America, while in Asia partners have focused primarily on NGOs and Government agencies. This has included direct South-South mentoring among instructors within each region (India-Nepal-Bangladesh as well as between Bolivia and Peru). In addition, SAS2 methods have been introduced in a meaningful way to research communities in both West and Northern Africa, and continue to be supported independently by consultants and organizations active in these regions. These individuals and institutions are able to deliver a solid body of well-tested concepts and tools that appeal to development agencies, academic institutions, and government agencies interested in "walking the talk" of participatory action research.

The training also supported the development of numerous case studies in a wide range of settings that have in turn supported decision-making and actions by the people involved. Examples from Nepal, India, Bangladesh, Honduras, Bolivian and Canada are included in the

comprehensive book, in the project repository and in other publications and reports produced by partners in various regions. These suggest that SAS² diagnostics have empowered people by building better understanding of their situations so they can plan and make decisions regarding community or organizational actions. This extends as well to institutional decision-making involving multiple stakeholders and projects of various scales and duration. Project partners indicate that the use of SAS² has made significant direct contributions to the development and evolution of specific projects and programs at the community, research and development levels. For example, Félix Modrego of RIMISP in Chile has noted that "the SAS2 methodology has helped us focus the research we do with people and communities through a different lens, facilitating understanding and action in complex settings with diverse interests. In this sense, it has helped us develop our capacities to interpret social phenomenon from the point of view of the local actors, helping us reduce the bias that often affects the relationship between researchers and subject of study." [email correspondence, October 5, 2011. Our translation].

More generally, the project contributed to the development and consolidation of new research skills and behaviours among researchers in the south and in Canada. Partners and other participants in training processes are now better equipped to do research that is people- and evidence-based, and that is grounded in plans and proposals of immediate interest to those involved. This has called for a fundamental change in development practice, where co-learning, research and negotiating with the stakeholders is the norm.

Overall Assessment and Recommendations

The project has, in our view, made a strategic contribution to the development of concepts and tools to walk the proverbial talk of participation, collaborative inquiry, and social engagement. It addresses several critical gaps, including new methods to engage multiple stakeholders in the analysis of complex social situations, to mobilize and delve into culture and local knowledge systems, and to build closer links between *action, research, and training* (ART) activities. The initiative generated both the conceptual foundations and practical guidelines to support continuous planning where research and action takes stock of new information, evolving cicrcumstances, and changing stakeholder priorities and perspectives. Throughout the project, collaborating researchers have strengthened the skills they needed to carry out and train people in participatory action research while also generating new knowledge relevant to understanding and changing the circumstances of the vulnerable communities they work with. Positive shifts in research approaches and capacities are now embedded in a number of institutions, and are likely to have a multiplier effect for some time to come. International publication of key outputs also ensures that the research findings

remain fully in the public domain, and begin to influence perceptions of participatory action research in the university environment. Given these results it is our view that the project has contributed considerable value for the level of time and resources invested by the research team and by IDRC.

The emphasis throughout the project on achieving objectives through partnerships was key. The theoretical commentaries and detailed methods developed through the project would be of little consequence if they had not been tested rigourously and frequently in a wide variety of field settings around the world. This was made possible by the active engagement of the Canadian research team with collaborators in Asia, Latin America, Africa, North America and Europe. Typically with no or very limited project funding, these individuals and institutions contributed in various ways and at various times to enrich what we now offer. Key collaborators were the Academy of Development Sciences and DRCSC (India), LIBIRD (Nepal), UBINIG (Bangladesh), UNA and Zamorano (Honduras), CEBEM and EMPRENDE (Bolivia), CESSO (Chile), Efficience International, the Collectif des Savoirs Apprenants and South House Exchange (Canada). In more recent years many other individuals and organizations have provided examples and contributed new insights into the ongoing development of the SAS2 Dialogue approach to participatory action research, planning and evaluation. We gratefully acknowledge the enthusiasm and creative contributions of the committed practitioners at these organizations. Their own feedback to us is that they also valued and realized many intangible benefits from a partnership with a Canadian institution and researchers. In particular, the relationship with Canadians seems to have helped them position participatory action research as a credible and leading edge approach to development research. Evidence suggests that the relationship has also helped some of the partners leverage funding from other donors and secure long term commitments to the research approach within their organizations. For these reasons, we applaud the willingness of the Canadian Partnerships Branch at IDRC to enable Canadian academics to engage as equals with developing country partners.

Other lessons may be of general value to IDRC, especially where methods development and capacity building are central goals. First, it is now evident that acquiring the skillful means of participatory action research is a steep learning curve, steeper perhaps than is the case for conventional research methodologies where judgement and experience may place a less prominent role. Important qualities in the participatory action research process are not easily conveyed or acquired, including the attitude of inventiveness and the exercise of judgement and attention to local language, concepts and ways of doing things. While the modular structure of SAS^2 lends itself to incremental learning, being true to the spirit of knowledge creation and mobilization in complex, multi-stakeholder settings is a significant challenge.

This learning process is ongoing, even for the Canadian researchers at the centre of the initiative.

Second, systematic documentation of research results is a persistent problem for researchers dedicated to participatory action research and applied development interventions. Writing and publication, even when defined explicitly as key objectives, are easily displaced by the urgent tasks of doing and planning future actions. Many practical research activities undertaken by partners and partners-of-partners over the life of the project simply remain unwritten, only partially documented or even unknown to us. This is indicative of a creative and lively research community, but problematic in terms of process documentation. While we have encouraged all SAS2 practitioners to create written products that are both *timely and useful in* the context of ongoing plans, much of what was meaningful in their research is lived experience. We can conclude that the telling of the action research process necessarily unfolds along two parallel tracks, one embedded in the day-to-day planning, evaluation and research of stakeholders in real-life settings, and the other in the writing and future uses of examples, case histories, and process documentation. The first track is not dependent on the second, as a matter of principle and practice. A central feature of a SAS2 research process is that every interaction with stakeholders is designed so that the people involved arrive at their own conclusions and make decisions that are relevant and immediately useful to their own change process. Results are immediately shared, with or without documentation. And like music in the air, the actual research results are immediately transformed into new actions and new questions for further inquiry.

Despite these challenges, there is clear evidence of contributions to development made by research undertaken by partners using SAS2 methods. While it is beyond the scope of this report to describe any in detail (see project publications), one example is provided here to illustrate their concrete and practical nature: research and a forthcoming book on the enclosure and eviction of the Katkari, a former 'Criminal Tribe' and so-called 'Primitive Tribal Group'. Rising land prices due to the economic boom in the Mumbai Metropolitan Region had prompted legal landholders to sell and attempt to forcibly evict the Katkari, even though they had lived there for generations. The SAS2 research process tried to change the situation of the Katkari by engaging them in the analysis and interpretation of the constraints they face and ways to overcome them. Over a period of several years an action-inquiry with the Katkari sought to secure a village site for 212 hamlets in three *talukas* at risk of enclosure and eviction. While fragile and uneven from hamlet to hamlet, several meaningful and significant results eventually emerged.

Overall, Katkari hamlets in the area are now more secure than they were when enclosures and evictions went unnoticed and unchallenged. Landholders are more cautious, due to the

tangible risk of prosecution under the Prevention of Atrocities Act and the resolve of an organized and informed Katkari community. Evictions have slowed, a significant result considering the stakes at play and the vulnerability of the Katkari. Formal claims to a hamlet involving private lands and in some cases common grazing areas and Temple lands have been registered by Katkari in more than 40 communities. These are waiting in the appropriate government offices for action to be triggered at the policy level. In addition, 52 collective claims submitted by hamlets on Forest Lands held by the Forest Department resulted in land grants to approximately 1000 Katkari families. In late 2010 the Forest Department approved individual house plots (*gharthan*) of 1 *guntha* each for all registered households in these hamlets. This gives these families secure tenure over the land under their houses -- an inalienable base, a home, from which to pursue a livelihood and hope of a better future.

Claims of transformation and human emancipation can also be made. It is encouraging, indeed inspiring, for the research team to know that many Katkari in many hamlets where we worked are much more aware of their rights than they were, and less fearful of the powers that be. Importantly, they are active in making demands for village rights and acquiring Caste Certificates that recognize their status as Adivasi. Various Katkari hamlets have come forward to physically remove fencing from around their hamlets and make it publically known that the land is theirs. Furthermore, over a thousand Caste Certificates have been acquired by Katkari in recent years. These documents are critical to Katkari affirmation of their identity as an Adivasi people, and demands for political representations, access to education and special development funds available to Scheduled Tribes and Primitive Tribal Groups in particular. These changes can be fully attributed to the greater confidence of the Katkari. The inquiry process helped to create these conditions, based on peoples' own understanding of their situation, their rights and the opportunities available to exercise these rights. This development outcome exemplifies the spirit of empowerment that are part and parcel of authentic dialogue and collaborative inquiry.