

---

# *From Margins to Center? The Development and Purpose of Participatory Research*

BUDD L. HALL

---

This article documents the development of the libratory stream of participatory research as experienced through the activities and connections of one of the key figures in the early development and dissemination of these ideas. It traces the developments in Tanzania in the early 1970s, through the establishment of the original Participatory Research Network to the elaboration of theoretical and political debates. It highlights the formulation and elaboration of participatory research as a contribution to social change in a variety of settings. It includes discussions of the feminist advance, the question of voice and the relationship of power to knowledge in transformative practice. It contains an extensive and historically valuable bibliography.

## **Introduction**

In August of 1970, I began working at the Institute of Adult Education of the University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, as a Research Fellow. I was fresh out of Graduate School in African Studies and Comparative Education from the University of California at Los Angeles. I was also fresh out of the turmoil of the late 1960s where we occupied campus buildings and threw bricks through the windows of the Bank of America offices. I came to Tanzania, which was in the full throes of experimentation and creativity as it sought ways for such a poor country to use the only weapons it had, its people, to move forward against a world, which even still has not shared its wealth with the many.

“Participatory research” were the words that evolved in the Tanzanian context of the early 1970s for a practice that attempted to put the less powerful at the center of the knowledge creation process; to move people and their daily

---

Budd L. Hall is affiliated with the Ontario Institute For Studies in Education. Address for correspondence: Centre for Community and Global Transformation Learning, Ontario Institute For Studies in Education, 252 Bloor St., W., Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1V6.

lived experiences of struggle and survival from the margins of epistemology to the center.

I was fortunate to be associated with the first elaborations of participatory research as a concept as it developed in Tanzania and have remained strongly connected to its dissemination and development. Along with Dian Marino and Ted Jackson, I was the cofounder of the original Participatory Research Project of the Toronto, Canada headquartered International Council for Adult Education in 1977. The PR Project evolved into the Participatory Research Group, the North American node of the International Participatory Research Network. Importantly the coordination office for the International Participatory Research Network was set up in New Delhi, India in an intentional effort to counterbalance the United States, Canada or Europe as the more usual locations for international head offices. Participatory research has benefited from a history of quite rare, early international conceptual collaboration through its international networks and series of meetings in Venezuela, Peru, Slovenia, Nicaragua, India, Canada, the United States, Mexico, Tanzania and elsewhere. It is a concept that has come first from the needs and concerns of activists and researchers in poor countries of the world or poor parts of richer countries. It has benefited from an interdisciplinary development drawing its theoretical strength from adult education, sociology, political economy, community psychology, community development, feminist studies, critical psychology, organizational development and more. It was well known in adult education community-based settings long before it entered the university and is practised in community health settings and community economic development settings far more in the mid-1990s than in universities.

This article, based on my files and records from the original Participatory Research Group, is the story of what a number of us felt was a new way of doing research brought about by unique changes in the world in the 1960s and 1970s. Later on as some of us, based in either Canada or the United States, began to use these approaches in our own settings, we found many earlier sources of experience and process. In fact the question of whose knowledge counts has been with us always. In the United States for example the practices evolved in the Agricultural Extension Services or the mass-based organizing models associated with Saul Alinsky have influenced many researcher/activists who are now comfortable working within the framework of participatory research. For a fuller account of participatory research developments in North America, I suggest the 1993 collection edited by Park, Brydon-Miller, Hall and Jackson.

Participatory research has been expressed most generally as a process that combines three activities: research, education and action (Hall, 1981). Participatory research is a social action process that is biased in favor of dominated, exploited, poor or otherwise ignored women and men and groups. It sees no contradiction between goals of collective empowerment and the deepening of social knowledge. The concern with power and democracy and their interactions are central to participatory research. Attention to gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, physical and mental abilities, and other social factors are critical.

With the early support of the International Council for Adult Education, which initiated a global network in participatory research in 1977 and widespread interest over the years, the concept has been elaborated and developed much further. Fals Borda, initially referred to a similar process, which he and his colleagues in Colombia in the mid-1970s and elsewhere in Latin America had been engaged in as “action research” (Fals Borda and Rahman, 1991). When Vio Grossi, now of Chile, but earlier working in Venezuela organized a vigorous and dynamic Latin American network under the label “participatory research.” Fals Borda and Vio Grossi joined forces and Fals Borda modified his label to “participatory action research.” Both the “participatory action research” of Fals Borda and “participatory research,” which I and others have used refer to the same general process. In 1991, William Foote Whyte published a book titled, *Participatory Action Research*, which is based upon a very different tradition (Whyte, 1991). Surprisingly, the Whyte book has been written totally without reference to the extensive international literature in participatory research, a portion of which is reflected in this article. Indeed its title uses the identical words that Fals Borda has used without reference to Fals Borda’s work. The working definition used by Whyte and others in his book is drawn largely from earlier organizational development literature, and portrays a depoliticized process of collaborative labor-management reflection. Power and its relationship to knowledge in such a process is not central. The fact that a book such as Whyte’s could be produced without reference to other works using a similar title could perhaps be understood in earlier days when researchers were more isolated in the United States or when disciplines were more distinct. But in this case numerous American sociologists such as Peter Park, John Gaventa, and Don Comstock who are referenced in this article and others had begun to publish using the concept of participatory research many years earlier. Peter Park, for example, was far from an obscure scholar having played a significant leadership role in the International Sociological Association since the late 1970s.

In contrast writers from the liberatory tradition of participatory research have framed their work explicitly within contexts of power and transformation. Participatory research: joins people together for radical social change (Maguire, 1987:29); enables oppressed groups to acquire leverage for action (Fals Borda and Rahman, 1991:4); presents people as researchers in pursuit of answers to questions of daily struggle and survival (Tandon, 1988:7); breaks down the distinction between the researchers and the researched (Gaventa, 1988:19); acts as a flow-through mechanism between indigenous and western science (Colorado, 1988:63); and returns to the people the legitimacy of the knowledge they are capable of producing (Fals Borda and Rahman, 1991:15).

### **The Origins of Participatory Research**

It is important to recognize that, while the term “participatory research” may be new, the concerns being expressed have a history and continuity in social science. Many of the ideas that are finding new opportunities for expression can

be traced as far back as the early field work of Frederick Engels investigating conditions in the early factories of Manchester in England in the mid-nineteenth century. Marx's use of the structured interview—L'Enquete Ouvriere—with French factory workers is another sometimes forgotten antecedent (Marx, 1971). By the late 1950s and early 1960s, the dominant international research paradigm was a version of the North American and European model based on empiricism and positivism and characterized by an attention to instrument construction and rigor defined by statistical precision and replicability. Through the elaborate mechanisms of colonial and postcolonial relations, international scholarships, cultural exchanges, and training of researchers in Europe and North America, this dominant paradigm was extended to the dependent and poor nations. Research methods, through an illusion of objectivity and scientific credibility, become one more manifestation of cultural dependency. Practical experience in what was becoming known as participatory research occurred in the work of the Tanzanian Bureau of Research Allocation and Land Use Planning. Here, Marja-Liisa Swantz and teams of students and village workers were involved in the questions of youth and employment in the coast region and later in studies of socioeconomic causes of malnutrition in central Kilimanjaro. A fuller description of the early Tanzanian experience can be found in *Participatory Research: An Emerging Alternative Methodology in Social Science Research*, which contains the papers of the first international seminar held in Tanzania in 1979 (Kassam and Mustapha, 1982). A visit by Paulo Freire to Tanzania in 1971 was a stimulus to many social scientists who might not otherwise have been as impressed by the already developing experiences of many local adult educators or community development workers. His talk to the Institute of Adult Education on research methods was transcribed and became one of his first writings in English on the subject of alternative research methodologies (Freire, 1982).

What happened in Tanzania in a small way, had already begun in Latin America in the early 1960s. Stimulated in part by the success of the Cuban revolution, Latin American social scientists began exploring more committed forms of research. One of the most useful roles of Paulo Freire has been to bring some of the current ideas of Latin American social scientists to the attention of persons in other parts of the world. His work on thematic investigation, first in Brazil and later in Chile, was an expression of this search. Others such as Beltran and Gerace Larufa, have explored alternatives through concepts of horizontal communication (Beltran 1976, Gerace Larufa 1973). Fals Borda (1980) and others in Colombia have been engaged in *investigation y accion*, while the D'arcy de Oliveira's have made people aware of the value of militant observation (D'Arcy de Oliveira and D'arcy de Oliveira, 1975).

### **Not the Third World Alone**

While the specific term "participatory research" developed in the south, consciousness was growing in Europe and North America. Critiques of positivistic research paradigms began to surface in the 1970s. The Frankfurt School was

rediscovered through the work of Habermas and Adorno. the International Sociological Association with encouragement by Peter Park of the United States and Ulf Himmelstrand of Sweden began to put action-oriented sociology on the agenda of many academic meetings. In Switzerland, researchers in curriculum development adapted methodologies from political research to their needs. In Canada, Stinson developed methods of evaluation along action research lines for community development (Stinson, 1979). In the Netherlands, de Vries explored research alternatives as an adult educator. Brown, of the United States, brought participatory research to the world of organizational development (Brown and Kaplan, 1981). The National Institute for Adult Education in the United Kingdom pioneered participatory research through its evaluation of the United Kingdom adult literacy campaign (Holmes, 1976). In Italy, Paulo Orefice and colleagues at the University of Naples applied the methodology in the context of growing political decentralization (Orefice, 1981). In the United States, the Highlander Center in Tennessee has used participatory research for many years to deal with issues of land ownership and use (Horton, 1981) and environmental deterioration. In Canada, the Toronto-based Participatory Research Group worked with a wide variety of groups including First Nations peoples (Jackson, 1980; Jackson et al, 1982), adult educators (Cassara, 1985), immigrant women (Barndt, 1981), health workers (Hall, 1982). The 1991 bibliography on participatory research by the Center for Community Education and Action provides the best perspective on the use and geographic spread of the approach (CCEA, 1991). One of the newest books on participatory research reviews the North American experiences during the 1980s (Park, Brydon-Miller, Hall and Jackson, 1993).

### **Historical Materialism, and Critical Theory**

Vio Grossi wrote in 1981 that,

... some ... understood that participatory research was implicitly rejecting ... historical materialism. We were accused of integration and reformism. Participatory research is not, and has never intended to be, a new ideological and scientific holistic system, an alternative to historical materialism. On the contrary, it attempts to start the research from the concrete and specific reality, incorporating the people's viewpoints, in order to contribute to a type of social transformation that eliminates poverty, dependence and exploitation. This assertion requires a further analysis of its components. Historical materialism has been stated as a method for investigating reality with the intent of revealing the main tendencies of changes in order to orient action (Vio Grossi, 1981).

As Gramsci has said,

The starting-point of critical elaboration is the consciousness of what one really is, and in "knowing thyself" as a product of the historical process to date which has deposited in you an infinity of traces, without leaving an inventory (Gramsci, et al. 1971, p. 326).

Additional Gramscian notions of hegemony and counterhegemony, civil society, organic intellectuals and historic blocs have been helpful to participatory researchers seeking additional theoretical reference points, but the earliest theoretical exchanges focused on debates between pragmatic or historical materialist epistemological frameworks (Kassam and Mustapha, 1982). The majority of participatory research writers found themselves agreeing that class, power, ideology and other social structural elements were critical to understanding change and hence drew upon historical materialist sources. In the mid-1980s and particularly in North America, contributions have linked participatory research to the critical theory streams of Horkheimer, Adorno and Habermas (Comstok and Fox, 1993; Park, 1993). Additional linkages are made between the concepts of "critical pedagogy" particularly as both Giroux of the United States and Simon of Canada have begun to move the focus of their work beyond schooling and into cultural politics and the notions of "border" pedagogies.

We wish to stress that the basis for a critical pedagogy cannot be developed merely around the inclusion of particular forms of knowledge that have been suppressed or ignored by the dominant culture, nor can it only center on providing students with more empowering interpretations of the social and material world. Such a pedagogy must be attentive to ways in which students make both affective and semantic investments as part of their attempts to regulate and give meaning to their lives (Giroux and Simon, 1992).

The project of Sullivan of Canada to construct a liberatory critical psychology represents a breakthrough in a discipline known mostly for its individualistic control-driven ethos (Sullivan, 1990).

### **The Question of Methods**

The literature on participatory research has always been vague on the question of methods. This is so because for participatory research, the most important factors are the origins of the issues, the roles that those concerned with the issue play in the process, the emergence of the process in the context of the moment, the potential for mobilizing and collective learning, the links to action, the understanding of how power relationships work and the potential for communications with other experiencing similar discrimination, oppression or violence. In addition participatory research is based on the epistemological assumption that knowledge is constructed socially and therefore that research approaches which allow for social, group or collective analysis of life experiences of power and knowledge are most appropriate.

This means that for participatory research there are no methodological orthodoxies, no cookbook approaches to follow. The principle is that both issues and ways of working should flow from those involved and their context. In practice a creative and very wide variety of approaches have been used. All approaches have been selected because of their potential for drawing out knowledge and analysis in a social or collective way (Participatory Research Network, 1982).

They include: community meetings, video documentaries, community drama, camps for the landless in India, use of drawings and murals, photo-novels, sharing of oral histories, community surveys, story telling, shared testimonies and many more. Even questionnaires have been used at times as a first step in a group-controlled process of reflection. Barndt and the Jesuit Centre for Faith and Social Justice in Canada have developed an approach to social movement research called, "Naming The Moment," which offers a method for determining the political space available to them for action. Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA) reviewed the methods and results used by ten different grass roots groups in India (PRIA 1985). The Society for the Promotion of Education and Research (SPEAR) of Belize, Central America produced a participatory research training guide (SPEAR, 1990). Fals Borda discusses many methodological issues on a videotape produced by the University of Calgary (Fals Borda, 1989).

## Issues and Debates

### *The Feminist Advance*

Feminist critiques of research have contributed to the understanding and practice of participatory research. Both feminist approaches and participatory research are concerned with knowledge creation in ways that empower those engaged rather than maintaining the status quo. Both feminist research and participatory research seek to shift the center from which knowledge is generated. Spender has described the field of women's studies:

Its multi-disciplinary nature challenges the arrangements of knowledge into academic disciplines; its methodology breaks down many of the traditional distinctions between theoretical and empirical and between objective and subjective. It is in the process of redefining knowledge, knowledge gathering and making . . . (Spender, 1978).

In addition, Callaway has demonstrated that women have been largely excluded from producing the dominant forms of knowledge and that the social sciences have been not only a science of male society but also a male science of society (Callaway, 1981). Spender urged women "to learn to create our own knowledge." It is crucially important, she states,

. . . that women begin to create our own means of producing and validating knowledge which is consistent with our own personal experience. We need to formulate our own yardsticks, for we are doomed to deviancy if we persist in measuring ourselves against the male standard. This is our area of learning, with learning used in a widely encompassing, highly charged, political and revolutionary sense (Spender, 1978).

The growing awareness globally about environmental and ecological deterioration has reinforced many of the claims and aspirations for participatory research. Shiva of India for example has noted that the scientific revolution of Newton and Bacon was a male, Eurocentric, white science that by its invention immediately created non-science or ignorance among people or in places that did

not share in this particular way of knowing. Western science rendered invisible ancient, feminine, proearth ways of knowing (Shiva, 1989).

Maguire, has bridged feminist research approaches and participatory research in her 1987 book, which points out what she has called the "Androcentric filter" in participatory research writing (Maguire, 1987). Maguire has pointed out the distinct silence around gender and women in the participatory research discourse. She notes that women's ways of seeing were not mentioned until 1981 and that in the general discourse women have been excluded.

Maguire puts forward a number of specific guidelines for feminist participatory research:

1. The critique is both of positivist and androcentric research paradigms;
2. gender needs to be a central piece of the issues agenda;
3. integrative feminism, which recognizes diversity should be central to theoretical discussions on participatory research;
4. the role of gender needs to be taken into account in all phases of participatory research;
5. feminist participatory research would give explicit attention to how women and men as groups benefit from a project;
6. attention to gender language use is critical;
7. gender, culture, race and class all figure into questions about the research team;
8. gender should be a factor in considering evaluation; and
9. patriarchy is a system to be dismantled along with other systems of domination and oppression (Maguire, 1987: 105-108).

Smith has suggested that feminist sociology, like participatory research must, "begin where we are" with real, concrete people with actual lives if it is to do more than reproduce patriarchal patterns of relations (Smith, 1979). Oral history, which is a particular approach to feminist research, has been used in participatory research as well.

### *The Question of Voice*

Participatory research fundamentally is about who has the right to speak, to analyze and to act. It is about rural black women in southern cooperatives in the United States speaking for themselves in obtaining loans for planting. It is about shanty town mothers in Bombay speaking for themselves. It is about citizens of Turkish descent in Germany looking at and articulating their own needs in the face of neo-Nazi revival. It is about women in Thailand's hill country protecting forests. It is about indigenous people of the First Nations of North America researching land rights. It is about people who do not read and write taking control of literacy programs. It is a process that supports the voices from the margins in speaking, analyzing, building alliances and taking action. As Lorde's (1984) poem, "Litany for Survival" says:

and when we speak we are afraid  
our words will not be heard

nor welcomed  
but when we are silent  
we are still afraid  
So it is better to speak  
remembering  
we were never meant to survive

A critical theorist and an Afro-American woman, bell hooks, has said, "It is our responsibility collectively and individually to distinguish between mere speaking that is about self-aggrandizement, exploitation of the exotic 'other,' and that coming to voice which is a gesture of resistance, an affirmation of struggle" (hooks, 1988).

Participatory research argues for the articulation of points of view by the dominated or subordinated, whether from gender, race, ethnicity or other structures of subordination. Participatory research posits that an individual's position in structures of subordination shapes the ability to see the whole. Reflecting on growing up black in the United States, hooks said:

Living as we did—on the edge—we developed a particular way of seeing reality. We looked both from the outside in and from the inside out. We focused our attention on the center as well as on the margin. We understood both. This mode of seeing reminded us of the existence of a whole universe, a main body made up of both margin and center. Our survival depended on an ongoing private acknowledgment that we were a necessary, vital part of that whole.

This sense of wholeness, impressed upon our consciousness by the structure of our daily lives, provided us an oppositional world view—a mode of seeing unknown to most of our oppressors, that sustained us, sided us in our struggle to transcend poverty and despair, strengthened our sense of self and our solidarity (hooks, 1984:ix).

### *A Question of Power*

Emerging from the discussions, debates and activities of participatory research is the central question of power. Participatory research is intended to contribute to processes of shifting power or democratizing a variety of contexts. Power can be expressed in several ways: A exercises power over B when A affects B in a manner contrary to B's interests; in other words A gets B to do what he or she does not want to do. But A also exercises power by influencing, shaping, or determining B's very wants, by controlling the agenda through a complex interplay of social control (Gaventa, 1981).

Vio Grossi (1981) has written of participatory research as initiating a process of disindoctrination that allows people to detach themselves from the myths imposed on them by the power structure and that have prevented them from seeing their own oppression or from seeing possibilities for breaking free. Transformative action can be seen as the strategic goal to be reached in the medium or long term. A participatory research process carried out in conjunction with

popular groups (and under their control) is designed to facilitate the analysis of stages towards that goal.

Knowledge containing transformative power has been sometimes referred to as popular knowledge. Fals Borda outlines the process of power shifts in his paper on Science and the Common People (Fals Borda, 1980). The process of this new paradigm involves: 1. returning information to the people in the language and cultural form in which it originated; 2. establishing control of the work by the popular and base movements; 3. popularizing research techniques; 4. integrating the information as the base of the organic intellectual; 5. maintaining a conscious effort in the action/reflection rhythm of work; 6. recognizing science as part of the everyday lives of all people; and 7. learning to listen. Gaventa sees popular knowledge as limiting the ability to those in power to determine the wants of others, thus in effect, transferring power to those groups engaged in the production of popular knowledge (Gaventa, 1981). Most researcher activists agree that it would be an error to assume that naive or "unrooted" use of participatory research results in strengthening the power of the powerless. Without the embedding of the participatory research in the lives of the less powerful, power can easily accrue to those already in dominant positions.

### *Cooptation and the Role of the University*

What is the role of the academy in participatory research? What has the academy done with participatory research? What is the status of the knowledge generated in a participatory research process? Participatory research originated as a challenge to positivist research paradigms as carried out largely by university-based researchers. The position has been that the center of knowledge generations needed to be in what dominant society described as the margins; in the communities, with women, with people of color and so forth. Experience has shown that it is very difficult to achieve this kind of process from a university base hence the need for alternative structures such as community-based networks or centers. But how can this be reconciled with the fact that so many of those who publish are university based?

If the research process is genuinely and organically situated in a community, workplace or group that is experiencing domination than there is no need to be afraid that the knowledge that is being generated will be used for purposes that the community or group does not need or wish for. The difficulty arises because there are different uses of knowledge in the academy from those in community or workplace situations. According to the discourse of participatory research, knowledge generated, whether of localized application or larger theoretical value is linked in some ways with shifts of power or structural changes. But intentions do not always produce desired results, and those who have been working along these lines for a number of years share these assumptions. It is necessary to hope for a fuller understanding of the context and conditions of both work and life.

Knowledge within the academy serves a variety of purposes. It is a commodity by which academics do far more than exchange ideas; it is the very means of exchange for the academic political economy. Tenure, promotion, peer recognition, research grants, and countless smaller codes of privilege are accorded through the adding up of articles, books, papers in "refereed" journals and conferences. Academics in the market place of knowledge know that they must identify or become identified with streams of ideas that offer the possibility of publishing and dialogue within appropriate and recognized settings. Collaborative research or at least collaborative publishing is informally discouraged because of the difficulty in attributing authorship. Collaborative research with persons who are not academics by the standards of the academy is not common. And while academics in fact gain financially through accumulated publications of appropriate knowledge, community collaborators seldom benefit from such collaboration in financial terms. As can be seen academics are under economic, job survival or advancement pressures to produce in appropriate ways. And it is this structural pressure that plays havoc with academic engagement in the participatory research process. It is not possible that in spite of personal history, in spite of ideological commitment, in spite of deep personal links with social movements or transformative processes that the structural location of the academy as the preferred location for the organizing of knowledge will distort a participatory research process?

Does this mean that there is no role for university-based folks to be engaged in participatory research processes? Arguments exist on both sides of this question. Universities or similarly accredited researchers are clearly not *required* to animate a participatory research process. Participatory research is a tool, which social movements, activists, trade unionists, women on welfare, the homeless or any similar groups use as part of a variety of strategies and methods for the conduct of their work. If they wish to invite a university-based group to become involved they need to set up the conditions at the start and maintain control of the process if they wish to benefit as much as possible. Countless groups make use of processes that resemble participatory research everyday without naming it or certainly without asking for outside validation of the knowledge that is produced.

Participatory research deserves to be taught in universities, and is increasingly being taught. The academic community deserves to discuss and challenge and be challenged by these and other ideas that raise questions of the role of knowledge and power. Adult educators, community workers, social workers, primary health care personnel, solidarity cooperators, cooperative movement workers, multicultural workers, teachers and countless others who begin working after a university education deserve to study, read and experience the ideas that make up participatory research.

Academics also do not cease to become members of the community by going to work in a university. There are countless community issues whether related to toxic dumping, homelessness, high drop out levels in local schools or unfair

taxation policies, which engage us all as citizens. Academics have some skills which can contribute to community action along with the skills of others in the community.

The concern with cooptation is not limited to the academy, but runs through the professional circles of those involved in international development. Rahnema, a former senior Iranian official, advisor on nongovernmental activities for the UNDP, and currently a visiting university professor has criticized participatory action research as, "The Last Temptation of Saint Development" (Rahnema, 1990). He says that in its most generalized form, the call for participation is naive and by now accepted by all international agencies. He suggests that participatory research can at best only change external factors effecting people's lives and not touch the deeper conditioning that causes people to do what they do, "It serves no one to make a new fetish out of participation, only because non participatory development has failed in every way" (Rahnema, 1990).

## Moving Ahead

To live anywhere in the world in the 1990s is to live on the edge. The comfortable armchair view, which many of us living in rich countries or in the rich parts of poorer countries of struggles at a distance, is ending. Global economic structures have moved economic decision making for those parts of the economy linked to the global marketplace to places not even most national governments can reach. Painful indicators of social collapse are present in all of our North America cities and barely hidden in many of our rural communities in the forms of homelessness, street begging, increases in violence against women and young black men. Ecologists and cultural historians speak of our times as the turning point between either a technozoic era which would continue a path towards destruction of human and other life forms and an ecozoic era which would allow us to move into new forms of relationships with each other and our earth. What Berry, Swimme and other scientists now tell us is that the death now of over half of the life forms of the cenozoic era into which we were all born signals the transition from our cenozoic era into a new time (Berry, 1990). We have a capacity to move forward to a new era if we are able to do so. Knowledge from those parts of our communities, which are engaged in survival and transformative action will be critical to our ability to move towards a more just and ecologically sustainable world. Participatory research, if it can continue to respond to those who are every day renaming their own world, may be a modest contribution to our ability to listen, to act and to survive.

## References

- Barndt, Deborah. 1981. *Just Getting There: Creating Visual Tools for Collective Analysis in Freirean Education Programmes for Migrant Women in Canada*. Toronto, Canada: Participatory Research Group.
- Barndt, Deborah. 1989. *Naming the Moment: Political Analysis for Action—A Manual for Community Groups*. Toronto, Canada: Moment Project.
- Beltran, Luis R. 1976. Alien Premises, Objects and Methods in Latin American Communication Research. *Communications Research*, 3:107-34.
- Berry, Thomas. 1988. *The Dream of the Earth*. San Francisco: Sierra Books.

- Brown, L. David and Robert E. Kaplan. 1981. "Participatory Research in a Factory," in *Human Inquiry: A Source Book for New Paradigm Research*, ed. Peter Reason and John Rowan. London: Wiley.
- Callaway, Helen. 1981. "Women's Perspectives: Research as Re-vision," in *Human Inquiry: A Source Book of New Paradigm Research*, ed. Peter Reason and John Rowan. London: Wiley.
- Cassara, Beverly. 1985. *Participatory Research: Group Self-directed Learning for Social Transformation*. University of Georgia: Adult Education.
- Center for Community Education and Action. 1991. *Participatory Research: An Annotated Bibliography*. Amherst: CCEA and Center for International Education.
- Colorado, Pamela. 1988. "Bridging Native and Western Science." *Convergence* 21(3/4).
- Comstock, Don and Robert Fox. 1993. Citizen's Action at North Bonneville Dam. In Park et al. (eds.). *Voices for Change: Participatory Research in North America*. Westport: Greenwood.
- D'arcy de Oliveira, Rosiska and Michael D'arcy de Oliveira. 1975. *The Militant Observer: A Sociological Alternative*. Geneva: Institut d'Action Culturelle.
- Fals Borda, Orlando. 1980. *Science and the Common People*. Yugoslavia: International Forum on Participatory Research.
- Fals Borda, Orlando. 1989. *Knowledge for the People* (video) Calgary, Alberta: University of Calgary Media.
- Fals Borda, Orlando and M. Anisur Rahman. 1991. *Action and Knowledge: Breaking the Monopoly with Participatory Action-Research*. New York: Apex.
- Freire, Paulo. 1982. "Creating Alternative Research Methods: Learning to Do It by Doing It." In *Creating Knowledge: A Monopoly: Participatory Research in Development*. Hall et al. (eds.) Toronto, Canada and New Delhi: International Council on Adult Education, pp. 29-40.
- Gaventa, John. 1981. *Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Gaventa, John. 1988. Participatory Research in North America. *Convergence* 21(2/3):9-28.
- Gerace Larufa, Francisco. 1973. *Comunicacion Horizontal*. Lima: Libreria Studium.
- Giroux, Henry and Roger Simon. 1992. "Popular Culture as a Pedagogy of Pleasure and Meaning: Decolonizing the Body." In Giroux, Henry, *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Gramsci, Antonio (Hoare, Quinten and Gerrard Nowell-Smith. eds. and trans.) 1971. *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hall, Budd, 1979. "Knowledge as a Commodity and Participatory Research." *Prospects* 9(4).
- Hall, Budd, 1981. "Participatory Research, Popular Knowledge and Power." *Convergence* 14(3).
- Hall, Budd, Arthur Gillette and Tandon Rajesh. 1982. *Creating Knowledge: A Monopoly?* New Delhi: PRIA.
- Holmes, John. 1976. "Thoughts on Research Methodology." *Studies in Adult Education* 8:149-63.
- hooks, bell. 1984. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Boston: South End.
- hooks, bell. 1988. *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist Thinking Black*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- Horton, William D. 1981. *On the Potential of Participatory Research: An Evaluation of a Regional Experiment*. Paper prepared for annual meeting of the Society for Study of Social Problems, Toronto, Canada, 21-24 August 1982.
- Jackson, Edward T. 1980. *Environmental Assessment in Big Trout Lake, Canada*. Paper for International Forum on Participatory Research. Yugoslavia.
- Jackson, Edward T., Don McCaskill and Budd Hall. 1982. "Learning for Self-determination: Community-based Options for Native Training and Research," special issue of *Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 2(1).
- Kassum, Yusuf and Kemal Mustapha. 1982. *Participatory Research: An Emerging Alternative Methodology in Social Science Research*. Toronto, Canada: ICAE.
- Lourde, Audre. 1984. *Sister Outsider*. Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.
- Maguire, Patricia. 1987. *Doing Participatory Research: A Feminist Approach*. Amherst: Center for International Education, University of Massachusetts.
- Marx, Karl. 1971. *Collected Works of Engels and Marx*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Orefice, Paolo. 1981. Cultural Self-awareness of Local Community: An Experience in the South of Italy. *Convergence* 14:56-64.
- Park, Peter. 1993. "What is Participatory Research?" In Park et al. (eds.), *Voices for Change: Participatory Research in North America*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Park, Peter, Mary Brydon-Miller, Budd Hall and Edward T. Jackson, (eds.). 1993. *Voices for Change: Participatory Research in North America*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Participatory Research Network. 1982. *An Introduction to Participatory Research*. New Delhi: ICAE.
- PRIA. 1985. *Knowledge and Social Change: An Inquiry Into Participatory Research in India*. New Delhi: PRIA.
- Rahnema, M. 1990. "Participatory Action Research: The 'Last Temptation' of Saint Development." *Alternatives* 15:199-226.
- Shiva, Vandana. 1989. *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development*. London: Zed Books.
- Smith, Dorothy. 1979. A Sociology for Women. In Sherman, J. and Bock, E., *The Prism of Sex: Essays in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- SPEAR. 1990. *You Better Beltze it! A Participatory Research Training Guide on a Training Workshop in Beltze*. Society for the Promotion of Education and Research and PRG, Toronto, Canada.
- Spender, Dale. 1978. Editorial. *Womens Studies International Quarterly* 1:1-2.

- Stinson, Arthur (ed.) 1979. *Canadians Participate: Annotated Bibliography of Case Studies*. Ottawa, Canada: Centre for Social Welfare Studies.
- Stoecker, Randy and David Beckwith. (1992). Advancing Toledo's Neighbourhood Movement Through Participatory Action Research: Integrating Activist and Academic Approaches. *Clinical Sociology Review* 10:198-213.
- Sullivan, Edmund. 1990. *Critical Psychology and Pedagogy: Interpretation of the Personal World*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Tandon, Rajesh. 1988. Social Transformation and Participatory Research. *Convergence* 21(2/3):5-18.
- Vio Grossi, Francisco. 1981. The Socio-political Implications of Participatory Research. Yugoslavia: International Forum on Participatory Research. *Convergence* 14(3):34-51.
- Whyte, Wm. F. (ed.) 1991. *Participatory Action Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

## SOCIOLOGY

The Journal of the British Sociological Association

Published quarterly in February, May, August and November

Editors: Liz Stanley and David Morgan

Vol. 26 No. 1

February 1992

### CONTENTS

#### ARTICLES

#### CAREERS AND PROFESSIONALISM

JULIA EVETTS. Dimensions of Career: Avoiding Reification in the Analysis of Change

SHARYN L. ROACH ANLEU. The Professionalisation of Social Work? A Case Study of Three Organisational Settings

ALAN ALDRIDGE. Discourse on Women in the Clerical Profession: The Diaconate and Language-Games in the Church of England

STUART CAMPBELL, FRANK BECHHOFFER and DAVID McCRONE. Who Pays the Piper? Ownership and Control in Scottish Based Management Buyouts

BERNADETTE C. HAYES and F. L. JONES. Marriage and Political Partisanship in Australia: Do Wives' Characteristics Make a Difference?

NIGEL G. FIELDING and SUE CONROY. Interviewing Child Victims: Police and Social Work Investigations of Child Sexual Abuse

Plus extensive Book Reviews and Books Received.

### Subscription Rates (1992)

FULL MEMBERS and OVERSEAS MEMBERS of the BSA receive **SOCIOLOGY** as part of their subscription to the Association.

<i>Non-member individuals UK</i> .....	£20.75
<i>Non-member individuals Overseas</i> .....	£25.00
<i>UK institutions</i> .....	£57.00
<i>Overseas institutions</i> .....	£63.00

*Rates include postage*

All subscriptions, enquiries about subscriptions (other than for members) and cheques (*made payable to BSA Publications Ltd*) should be sent to

BSA Publications Ltd,  
351 Station Road,  
Dorridge, Solihull,  
West Midlands B93 8EY, England

Single issues £12.50 each. Back issues available please enquire.

Have you got a copy of the 20 year classified index? An indispensable tool for anyone seeking information on sociology. Institutions £13.00, Individuals £6.50.

Membership Enquiries,  
BSA, Room 701, 7th Floor,  
Columbia House, 69 Aldwych,  
London WC2B 4DX, England