

The Mission of the Scholar in Action Research

Robin McTaggart

The role of the scholar in action research contrasts sharply with the roles of scholars in all other forms of research. There are some commonalities of course, but the crucial difference lies in the commitment of action researchers to bring about change as part of the research act. Fundamental to action research is the idea that the social world can only be understood by trying to change it. Colombian sociology professor and community activist Orlando Fals Borda summarised the evolution of the idea in this way:

In the 1970s it was heretical to preach horizontal relationships in the research adventure, even in professional life. It became clear to me however that sociological investigation should not be autistic but a rite of communion between thinking and acting human beings, the researcher and the researched. The usual formality and prophylaxis of academic institutions had to be discarded and space given to some sort of down-to-earth collectivisation in the search for knowledge. This attitude I called *vivencia*, or life-experience (*Erlebnis*) (Fals Borda, 1997, p. 108).

Welcome to the world of the heretics! I will elaborate this perspective throughout the chapter that is structured around several themes:

- My own career development
- The idea of social practice
- The role of professors in social practice and change
- The theory and practice of participation
- The objectification of experience
- The disciplining of subjectivity and the engagement of affect and feeling
- The disciplining of subjectivity and the enhancement of agency
- The role of professors in research and community life

A career trajectory

About twenty years ago, I became an educational researcher almost accidentally and I am not certain this qualifies me well for the task I am undertaking here. I should begin by expressing my discomfort at the use of the term 'scholar'. To me the term always implies an academic excellence achieved by a minority much smaller than those like me who fell into an academic life. This is not to argue that scholarship is not important, but rather to disavow the elitism that sometimes is attached to academic endeavour. I trust that my account of my interest in action research will show why I make that point, and express a somewhat more egalitarian and communitarian view of the relationship between the academy and other forms of social life.

I have written at some length elsewhere about the concatenation of events that led me into University life (McTaggart, 1996). I studied chemistry and biochemistry at university on a bonded studentship which required me to become a science teacher, an aspiration I had for many years. I taught science for a few years, and influenced by the science curriculum movements of the post-Sputnik era, I became interested in the assessment of student learning. I had also begun to tire of the cumbersome

bureaucracy of the education system. This led to a permanent appointment in a teachers college, which became a college in the new Victorian state college system and in turn and almost immediately that college became a faculty of Deakin University. Within the space of three years I had four different employers without changing desks! Stability eventually prevailed and I worked at Deakin University for over twenty years.

The change from teachers college to the university setting was quite important for several reasons. First, there was a strong impetus in the university for staff to engage in research. Second, the new leaders of the university faculties, including the education faculty, actually knew something about doing research. Third, among some people associated with universities there was considerable snobbery about the supposed inferiority of teachers college staff and this provoked some of us to show we were capable of university careers. I was encouraged to do a Ph.D. and did so with evaluation specialist, Robert Stake at the University of Illinois at the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation. On return to Australia, with a developed interest in democratic evaluation and case study methods, and an already whetted appetite for doing something a little different in the new university, I began my academic career.

In the few years before I left for the United States to study in 1982, Stephen Kemmis had worked with me and other Deakin colleagues to re-interpret curriculum enquiry, educational research methodology, interpretivism, and critical theory with a view to developing the theory and practice of educational action research. Our aim was to develop a comprehensive understanding of the ways in which academic work and academic workers could relate more closely to the exigencies of educational practice. My motives in teacher education up to that point had been to ensure that educators knew what could and could not be achieved by natural scientific methods, and to help teachers to improve quantifiable assessments. I became tired of inducting educators into that discourse, and became less trusting of it as an adequate way of representing student learning, especially for teachers. Kemmis' work was very influential in building a team of people interested in curriculum as a field of study, and in action research informed by critical theory as an approach to studying it. My collaborations with him now range over about twenty years, but the best known examples are on action research approaches and methodology (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1988a, 1988b, 2000).

My own initial route into those ideas was through Joseph Schwab's work in curriculum (Schwab, 1969; Westbury and Wilkof, 1978). I knew a little of Schwab's work because he chaired the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study in its latter days, and I had read with enthusiasm his invigorating views about the representation of science and of the practical arts when I was preparing to become a science teacher. Whilst it is a commonplace in the sociology of knowledge now, for me Schwab made the 'disciplines' seem much more like vulnerable human inventions and teaching much more complex than inducting students into the disciplines' own views of themselves. As a biology teacher and later as a teachers college lecturer, I had wondered why the Lysenko tragedy was featured in Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS) curricula as an example of state interference in science, when high energy physics was sponsored everywhere at the expense of research and other efforts which might ameliorate human suffering. I began to discover that the message systems of schooling went far beyond the stated curriculum. I found that the hidden curriculum similar to familiar Russian dolls — there was always another one underneath. I became curious about curriculum, in

working with people outside schools in order to understand the nature of schooling more clearly.

In my early days of teaching education studies at Deakin, I found the anthropological and ethnographic voyeurism of Jules Henry (1963) and Philip Jackson (1967) and the critique of Ivan Illich (1976) fascinating for a while. These were useful ways of understanding schooling, but they seemed of little help in changing it to address the very issues they had raised. It soon became obvious that the exposé approach to researching schools too easily made victims of those best located and informed to improve education, the teachers. I thought insightful qualitative research was important, but the democratic impulse of 'new wave' evaluation and case study approaches had created for me an irresistible logic. If participants in social situations were to be taken seriously as intelligent observers, interpreters and actors in their social milieu, why couldn't their capacity to do research be recognised too? Why couldn't professors¹ and teachers collaborate on research projects in schools and systems, and work out ways of enhancing and understanding what was happening at the same time? I became committed to the idea, reflexivity in research: why do a study unless all that work has some more or less immediately constructive effect? I knew from the evaluation literature that studies close to people's lives often had quite immediate and sometimes unfortunate effects (McTaggart, 1991c), so reflexivity was reasonably easy to achieve. The issue became how to do research close to people's lives in ways that had more constructive effects than the accidents of evaluation practice. So, my commitment to the idea of action research was affirmed.

What then was to be the role of the university professor? That requires addressing two further questions, which are both logically prior ones.

What really is the purpose of social research? The answer to this question to me now is quite straightforward: the improvement of a social practice. Increasing understanding, creating explanations, and informing practice are in the rhetoric of almost all forms of science, but the direct and more or less immediate enhancement of practice only assumes primacy in the arguments for action research.² Indeed, the effort to change practice as the primary route to understanding is fundamental to key forms of action research. Hence my second question: how do professors change social and education practice? This leads me to an excursus about what action researchers mean by the term 'practice', because it is integral to the way we understand how professors might work.

Practice

Practice can mean quite contained, individualistic technical activities. Of course, activities and practices are never merely technical, some content is always implicit, and understanding practice in broader terms is essential to understanding change and how to learn from deliberate attempts to change things. Accordingly, it is more helpful to use

¹ I use the term 'professor' here in its North American sense to mean a university teacher and researcher. In Australia, the more appropriate term would be 'academic', because in Australia, like the UK, the term professor is used only for senior academics.

² I use the term 'action research' in its general sense here to include for example, action learning, action science process management, and participatory research. The term is used rather sloppily elsewhere to include many kinds of 'applied' research, I do not include that whole spectrum here, and will generally refer to a subset of the field of action research which is best termed 'participatory action research' (McTaggart, 1991a).

the term in ways that ensure that its substantive content is embraced. Social theorist Alasdair MacIntyre defined practice rather globally as:

any coherent and complex form of socially established co-operative activity through which goods internal to that form of activity are realised, in the course of trying to achieve those standards of excellence which are appropriate to, and partially definitive of, that form of activity, with the result that human powers to achieve excellence, and human conceptions of the ends and goods involved, are systematically extended. Tic tac toe is not an example of a practice in this sense, nor is throwing a football with skill; but the game of football is, and so is chess. Brick-laying is not a practice; architecture is. Planting turnips is not a practice; farming is. So are the enquiries of physics, chemistry and biology, and so is the work of the historian, so are painting and music. In the ancient and medieval worlds the creation and sustaining of human communities — of households, cities, nations — is generally taken to be a practice in the sense in which I have defined it. Thus the range of practices is wide: arts, sciences, games, politics, in the Aristotelian sense, the making and sustaining of family life all fall under the concept (MacIntyre 1984, p. 187).

MacIntyre distinguished practices from institutions arguing, for example, that medicine was a practice whereas hospitals were institutions.³ Similarly education is a practice, while schools and universities are the institutions established to sustain them. MacIntyre also acknowledged that institutions were necessary to sustain practices, but that institutional politics sometimes distort or even subvert their purposes:

For no practices can survive any length of time unsustained by institutions ... institutions and practices characteristically form a single causal order in which the ideals and the creativity of the practice are always vulnerable to the acquisitiveness of the institution, in which the co-operative care for common goods of the practice is always vulnerable to the competitiveness of the institution (MacIntyre 1984, p. 194).

I want here to focus on the idea of a practice, rather than its institutional subversion (though such contradictions can be an important focus for action research [Kemmis and McTaggart, 1988a]). In most settings, there are four general sub-categories of a practice, each deserving the prefix of the larger practice, but perhaps with some of its own distinctive language, its own cluster of activities, and with its own power relationships with the other sub-categories of the practice. This is most easily demonstrated with an example from education. The four identifiable sub-categories of educational practice are:

Curriculum practice	(the substantive work of the organisation or system)
Administrative practice	(leadership, policy development and management)
Teacher education practice	(staff training and development, pre-service and in-service)

³Of course, the invention and maintenance of social structures, media and institutions are practices in a sense too.

Educational research practice (any research, evaluation, or appraisal informing practice)

The concepts in parentheses are the generic equivalents for any organisation. It will be obvious that these educational practices also relate closely to four different groups of education professionals: teachers, principals and system administrators), and teacher education professors. However, there is more to it than this simple categorisation suggests, and this will become the nub of what I want to say. Every sub-category of practice is expressed in all forms of work. For example, teachers do administrative work in their classrooms, schools and systems; principals teach students and engage in staff development with teachers; teachers teach each other and learn from each other, taking responsibility for their own staff development; and all participate in knowledge production through both formal and informal research and evaluation. The same may be said of professors of education. Further, practice is manifold; it cannot be partitioned and studied or changed as if these sub-practices were independent of each other. In other words, it is the relationships between these sub-categories that are important. That is, the work of the groups of education professionals are intricately in practice.

All of the sub-categories interact in very profound ways. So much so that change in one sub-category is almost certain to demand change in another. It would be difficult for example to teach democratic practice in classrooms in a school where administrative practices resemble those of the Third Reich. Accordingly, action researchers not only expect to make changes across these categories, they plan to, and also plan to 'collect data' about such changes. I trust now that I am beginning to complicate the role of the professor!

Professors are practitioners too

In action research, practice must be considered at several levels, and 'practitioners' are not merely workers such as teachers or surgeons, all people engaged in the practice are practitioners of something. University professors, for example, are practitioners of teaching, consultancy, scholarship and a selection from the different genre of research. We can obviously extend this notion to consider the social and cultural practices within which 'work' practices in a field such as education or health are constituted.

The literature of innovation (House 1974, 1996; Fullan 1982, 1989; Malen 1994) shows that change falters or is undone unless it is nurtured and practised across the complete spectrum of institutional and systemic activities. We need to think about practice across the spectrum. Only then can we use efforts to change as the wellspring of new knowledge, enhanced practice, and more efficacious ways of organising ourselves and our work. Further, we can see from this argument that action research is essentially participatory because it involves the commitment to change. That is, action research is democratic not because of some starry-eyed view about democracy, but because experience (and the disciplined version of it we call research) show us that it must be so. Informed change is political, just like any other change, and people will not commit to it without engagement in its invention. Keep in mind that the political nature of change is not the only reason that action research is essentially participatory.

In the action research genre, knowledge is not produced with a view to later incorporation into practice as it is in other research. Knowledge production is embodied in the enactment of emerging understanding. That is, the research aspect of participatory action research is not an end in itself, it defers to practice. As Stephen

Kemmis and I have reiterated, the aim of participatory action research is to change individual and collective practices, social structures and social media⁴ which maintain irrationality, injustice and incoherent and unsatisfying forms of existence. It is inherent in the idea of action research that professors must do more than profess, they must participate with others to bring about change, change that is both moral in intent and fundamental to new understanding. This means that professors have much to learn from other participants. Understanding just what professors have to contribute requires further thought about just what it is that the collectives involved in action research are participating in.

Participation in what?

For action researchers, participation is not merely an expression of a democratic principle, important though that is. Nor is participation necessary simply because change is a political process. Participation is the means by which action researchers seek to re-interpret some principles from scientific, political and personal activity in other spheres. Action research is emphatically not about the simple emulation of other forms of scientific practice, it is about reconstructing social scientific, political and personal practices together with the structural and communicative conventions which gave them their historical forms. The aim in action research is to recolonise and extend the meanings of scientific, political and personal practice, not to discard them altogether. Action research aspires to new, more comprehensive and comprehending forms of social science, political life and individual subjectivity.

Participation is necessary in the objectification of experience and the disciplining of subjectivity where subjectivity is taken to embrace two aspects, affect, and agency at the individual and collective levels. All three of these, (i) the objectification of experience, (ii) the disciplining of affect and (iii) the disciplining of agency, are social processes and require thoughtful, reflective human interaction to express desirable moral aspirations. They are also deeply inter-dependent, but can be discussed separately provided this is kept in mind.

Participation and the objectification of experience

The objectification of experience is what we most readily identify with many forms of 'science'. It involves the selection, collection and interpretation of information, and in action research is disciplined by the participation of those involved and affected. In action research, 'objectivity' is not seen as an ideal state guaranteed by procedural rules established by a remote and elite 'scientific community'. Rather, seeking it is considered to be an ongoing socio-political process where the credibility of evidence and the relevance of the theoretics which make it possible to see anything are engaged in situ with participants. The term 'objectification' is used to indicate this social dynamism and the disavowal of positivist tendency at the same time. It also draws attention to the importance of 'data' and the informed use of relevant literatures in action research.

In conventional forms of science, the objectification of experience is thought to be guaranteed by strict adherence to methods which are agreed upon by the scientific community, though in some fields it is rigorous debate about method rather than consensus which seems to be the rule. Knowing the debates and defending a method appropriate to a particular purpose and circumstance can be more important than pursuit of universally accepted rules for the conduct of enquiry. In conventional research, knowledge of the debates and agreed rules of enquiry is the prevail of the academy. In

action research, the role of the professor is providing access to this knowledge (and its uncertainties) to other participants. This is not an imperial role, but a rather facilitating discussion about how these methods might be used to inform people and enhance the public credibility of their findings.

Participation and the disciplining of subjectivity: affect and agency

The disciplining of subjectivity is also necessarily a collective activity.⁴ It also requires a strong capacity for nurture in both of its aspects, the personal affective and the political agential. Discipline and nurture might be seen as quite complementary activities. In the affective aspect of subjectivity, the action research process requires that feelings are made accessible and explored. At the same time they must be examined for deeper causes and meanings, and serious concerns differentiated from the transient and the peripheral. Again this work is not thought to be the prevail of the scientific or professional specialist group therapist or facilitator, but a social process comprehensible to participants. Participants play a supportive role, but the collective has a disciplining function, helping to clarify thinking and provides a context where affect is justified. People come to realise that some feelings are superficial, misdirected, unfair, and over-reactions. Other feelings are focused, strengthened and nurtured as they are revealed, articulated, thought through and reflected upon. This is introspective in part, but its aim is refined action.

It is not clear that professors are any better than anybody else at engaging the affective aspects of their own lives. This role may put quite new demands on them as they review the personal trajectories commitments to detachment, impartiality and objectivity have shaped for them.

Political agency is corollary to heightened understanding and motivation. As affect becomes mobilised and organised and experience is objectified and understood more clearly, both knowledge and feeling become articulated and disciplined by the collective into wise and prudent action. Individual action is informed and planned with the support and wisdom of those directly participating in related action in the same or related context. The collective provides critical support for the development of personal political agency, and critical mass for a commitment to change. Through these interactions, new forms of practical consciousness emerge. In other words, both the action and research aspects of action research require participation. But what should professors do? Here too we have no right to expect any greater wisdom among professors than among other people. In fact, others may be much better skilled in political activity, union members and community activists for example.

In the realms of both affect and agency, the skills, understandings and values of professors nurtured by the prophylaxis and formality of their institutional settings have in all likelihood deskilled them for the roles expected of them in action research. This calls for the redevelopment of their personal and professional repertoires, and of their capacity for participation in community life.

⁴ One way of characterising different forms of science is to recognise that subjectivity is disciplined in different ways. For example, in the natural sciences, subjectivity is disciplined by strict adherence to generally agreed methods of designing experiments to eliminate alternative explanations of cause and effect. In some versions of psychoanalysis which we might term idiographic rather than nomothetic, the subjectivity of the analyst is disciplined not merely by method, but by subjecting oneself to regular analysis.

A role for professors?

Up to this point I have assumed that there is a genuine possibility of an educative process supporting people from a position of disengagement into an increasingly informed and ethically motivated life. In some research discourses, the academy occupies a somewhat privileged place. But if we take seriously two propositions I have advanced, first, that the goal of research is the enhancement of social practice, and second, that understanding the social world requires an effort to change it, privileging professors is at best a little naïve, and at worst dangerously arrogant. People are typically quite expert in their own situations, or at least in engaging and applying their interpretations of those situations, living out their realities. And even if one concedes that professors are reasonably expert at research, they seem no better at politics or the harnessing of emotion than any body else. We might perhaps concede that professors make good teachers, but I see that as highly problematic when their teaching skills are grounded in the deference students must grant them to acquire the credentials of the academy. Teaching a 'public' is not the same as teaching a student prepared to submit to institutional authority to complete a credential. The public intellectual has quite different skills than the institutionalised one, and academics do not have a monopoly on the role I have in mind here.

In cross-cultural settings the role is even more problematic. In the qualitative research literature in particular, debates about the representation of the 'other' have called into question the practice of inscribing meanings on the lives of others. The conventional research purpose of generating 'understanding' has been seriously challenged as a form of exploitation, typically imposing categories, meanings, homogeneity and stereotyping on disadvantaged groups, all of which the people portrayed deny, resent and regard as unhelpful. In cross-cultural situations, especially those where Western researchers work among Indigenous people, these challenges are at their sharpest (McTaggart 1989, 1991b, 1993, 1999). And the challenges are not simply challenges of conscience, they are explicit and completely justified political challenges from Indigenous people themselves. In Australian indigenous communities for example, researchers face a difficult time gaining access unless they commit to the principles of participatory action research (Marika, Ngurruwutthun, and White, 1992). But commitment is one thing. Just what professors should do in such settings remains both hotly contested and poorly understood by people who have not worked there (and by some who have).

In practice, professors' skills, attitudes and understandings may be an impediment to the role I am proposing. Prima donnas, of which the professoriate has at least its fair share, like participation because this is how they are likely to get their own way. The aesthetics of eloquence honed for years in lecture theatres and conference symposia may not be as persuasive in other contexts. Hegemony works in conversations as well as on the world stage. Some people are more articulate, some discourses are more authoritative, some media are more persuasive, some speakers are more elegant, and some audiences more deferent to the authority of all or some of them. In some situations, eloquence leads to rejection. A plethora of behaviours of domination and submission may be brought into play to pervert any commitment to symmetry and reciprocity among people. What counts as an argument, what counts as a feeling and what counts as a politically adept judgment are all potentially subject to deliberate or unintentional distortion. In this way, real concerns and real people are marginalised, and participants simply fade away. This is the reason that we must consider participation as

an ethic: it is about a commitment to the other, not a right to be asserted or assumed primarily for oneself.

Professors do have a role, but it requires some re-invention.

What should professors do?

There is a need for some of the conventional work of the professor. Knowledge of theory and knowledge of other cases can be a useful contribution to specific changes in social practice. Reflective professors can also help to valorise other forms of knowledge by recognising the role of tradition and political persuasion, that is, the less than rational influences in their own knowledge production. Practical, craft, local, traditional, and indigenous knowledges influence practice, and recognising their importance is essential for professors to learn how to make their own knowledge useful and reflexive in the local situation. Professors' skills in the use of argument and evidence are not to be dismissed, and their understanding of the politics of their own, often privileged institutional setting may give people access to resources, if only intellectual ones.

Though legitimation is a two edged sword, professors can lend legitimacy to worthy community projects. Publication can help community projects to create the reputation by which they are comprehended and the taste by which they are enjoyed (a felicitous phrase from evaluation specialist David Jenkins). Nevertheless, caution is required here. Professors working in action research projects must value what happens ahead of what might be publishable. To the extent that publication is nurtured, the goal of the professors should be to lengthen other participants' CVs rather than their own. In particular they must acknowledge that CV length might not correlate, or might even correlate inversely with effectiveness as social agent.

As Orlando Fals Borda has reminded us, there is a need to accept that 'method' is not god, but that immersion in social life, 'vivencia' (McTaggart, 1991a,1992; Fals Borda, 1997), and the struggle for social change is the important course to moral and practical understanding. In other words, little action research will occur unless the social relations that are necessary for close collaborative work are established and sustained. This obviously requires the recognition that others know more about local settings and politics, and also explicit effort to learn about affect in the situation and to validate feeling as a way of making progress towards effective changes in practice. There seems to me to be no guarantee that professors are better than others at disciplining subjectivity in either introspective or agential planes. In other words, professors have a lot to learn in each social setting by barking their shins on the realities of life outside the academy.

Finally, I believe that educational research is, above all, an activity to enhance education. There is a strong tendency towards the commodification of knowledge in education, the 'publish or perish' ideology. This is not a view which excuses lack of publication by education professors, but rather invites the better argument that educational researchers should do many other things as well as publish. Most especially, education professors must make themselves available to other members of the education professions and to parents and students, to support the struggle to sustain educational values in a world increasingly beset by economic and other forms of fundamentalism. Merely knowing about education will not change it. Professors need to insinuate themselves into political life and action research is a way to accomplish this with a disciplined blend of reason, feeling and political savvy.

References

- Fals Borda, O. (1997). Participatory action research in Colombia: Some personal feelings. In R. McTaggart (Ed.) Participatory Action Research: International Contexts and Consequences. (pp. 107-1120. Albany NY: State University of New York Press.
- Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (1989). The new meaning of educational change. London: Cassell.
- Henry, J. (1972). Culture against man. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- House, E. R. (1974). The politics of educational innovation. Berkeley CA: McCutchan.
- House, E. R. (1996). A framework for appraising educational reforms. Educational Researcher, 25 (7), 6-14.
- Illich, I. D. (1976). Deschooling society. Harmondsworth: Penguin. (Originally published New York: Harper and Row; London: Calder and Boyars, 1971
- Jackson, P. W. (1968). Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2000). Participatory action research. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (Eds.), The Handbook of Qualitative Research (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (Eds.). (1988). The action research planner (3rd ed.). Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (Eds.). (1988). The action research reader. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (1984). After virtue: A study of moral theory (2nd ed.). London: Duckworth.
- Malen, B. (1994). The micropolitics of education: Mapping the multiple dimensions of power relations in school politics. Journal of Educational Policy, 9 (5-6), 147-167.
- Marika, R., Ngurruwutthun, D., and White, L. (1992). Always together, Yaka gana: participatory research at Yirrkala as part of the development of Yolngu education. Convergence, 25 (1), 23-39.
- McTaggart, R. (1999). Reflection on the purposes of research, action and scholarship: A case of cross-cultural participatory action research. Systemic Practice and Action Research, 12 (5), 493-513.
- McTaggart, R. (1996). An accidental researcher. In J. A. Mousley, M. Robson and D. Colquhoun (Eds.), Horizons, images and experiences: The research story collection (pp. 24-37). Geelong: Deakin University.
- McTaggart, R. (1993). Dilemmas in cross-cultural action research. In D. Colquhoun and A. Kellehear (Eds.), Health research: Political, ethical and methodological issues (pp. 65-96). London: Chapman and Hall.
- McTaggart, R. (1992, July). Reductionism and action research: Technology versus convivial forms of life. Keynote address to the Second World Congress on Action Learning, University of Queensland, Brisbane. In S. Bruce and A. L. Russell (Eds.), Transforming tomorrow today (pp. 47-61). Brisbane: Action Learning, Action Research and Process Management Association.
- McTaggart, R. (1991a). Principles for participatory action research. Adult Education Quarterly, 41 (3), 168-187.
- McTaggart, R. (1991b). Western institutional impediments to Aboriginal education. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 23 (4), 297-325.
- McTaggart, R. (1991c). When democratic evaluation doesn't seem democratic. Evaluation Practice, 12 (1), 9-22.
- McTaggart, R. (1989). Aboriginalisation involves empowerment and disempowerment. The Aboriginal Child at School, 17 (2), 37-44.

Schwab, J. J. (1969). The practical: A language for curriculum. *The School Review*, 78 (1), 1-23.

Westbury, I., and Wilkof, N. J. (Eds.) (1978). Joseph J. Schwab: Science, Curriculum and Liberal Education. Chicago Il: University of Chicago.

Bionote

Professor Robin McTaggart is Pro-Vice-Chancellor Staff Development and Student Affairs at James Cook University in Townsville, Queensland, Australia and Adjunct Professor in the International Graduate School of Management at the University of South Australia. He has an extensive variety of refereed and other publications on democratic approaches to evaluation, action research and reflective practice and on issues in cross-cultural education.

Before taking up his current position he was Executive Dean of Law and Education (1998) and Executive Dean of Education and Indigenous Studies (1999) at James Cook University. Immediately before moving to North Queensland he was Director of International Programs in the Faculty of Education at Deakin University Geelong Australia and was Head of the School of Administration and Curriculum Studies at Deakin University from 1993-5. He completed his PhD with Professor Robert E. Stake at the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation at the University of Illinois where he was a W. F. Connell Scholar. He has conducted evaluation and research studies of action research by educators, discipline-based arts education, arts programs for disadvantaged youth, instructional computing programs for intellectually disabled adults, coeducation and gender equity in private schooling, AIDS/HIV professional development for rural health workers, Aboriginal education in traditionally-oriented remote communities, scientific literacies and distance education provision in technical and further education. He has conducted participatory action research and evaluation training workshops for private and public sector managers, academics, technical and further education and training professionals, educators, educational consultants, and health professionals in Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore, Thailand and the United States.