Research Collaborations as Social Action: Constructing Meaning and Interrogating Relationship-Building in an Outcomes-Based Approach

Karen Noble, Robyn Henderson & Patrick Alan Danaher

Abstract

In 2009 the Faculty of Education at the University of Southern Queensland began an ambitious agenda to improve both the quality and the quantity of its research outcomes. It encouraged the establishment of small, informal research teams with some financial incentives to support a research agenda. In this chapter, three members of one such team consider their experiences of research collaboration in relation to collective mindfulness, a term that one of the researchers used during a focused conversation. The analysis articulates and then synthesises the authors' understandings and experiences of the term, which is posited as a useful theoretical and practical device for helping research teams to maximise their outcomes and at the same time to contribute positively to relevant social action.

Introduction

Education research has been conceptualised in a variety of ways. These conceptualisations have ranged from bricolage (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004) and promoting human well-being (Hostetler, 2005) to engaging with the discipline's history (Grossman & McDonald, 2008) and its politicised character (Ingram Willis, 2009). As we elaborate below, one particularly fruitful conceptualisation is of education research as social action (see also Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006; Noffke & Somekh, 2009; North, 2006).

Given the situation outlined above, whereby the seven members of the research team have been faced with significant individual and institutional expectations to function effectively as a single entity, our group's focus on education research as social action was potentially risky. This is because moving from the safer realm of theorising to the messier terrain of practical prescriptions and specific strategies – travelling from theory and concepts to practice and actions – might reveal divergent worldviews and disparate values about what practice and actions ought to look like. On the other hand, it is only through recognising and engaging with such differences that our group and the team as a whole can have a solid foundation for continued growth and development.

As we explore in this chapter, the concept of "collective mindfulness" (Jordan, Messner, & Becker, 2009, p. 468) is helpful in harnessing the potentially destructive energy of opposing viewpoints into a positive force that can animate and sustain team members. Instead of operating as a kind of *group think* (Forsyth, 2009; Ohlin, 2007; Solomon, 2010), collective mindfulness seeks and celebrates diversity of thought and action linked to a common purpose and shared and separate goals and interests. Rather than the perspectives of one or a couple of individuals with strong personalities dominating and other standpoints being silenced, it is vital for every team member to contribute actively to the group's existence and in turn to benefit from its expansion.

We acknowledge that collective mindfulness has been associated with business operations and with seeking to predict the reliability of organisational functioning (Elbanna & Amany, 2009; Vogus & Welbourne, 2003; Weick & Sutcliffe, 2007). At the same time, we consider it timely to help to reconceptualise this notion beyond its current

focus on management learning (Jordan, Messner, & Becker, 2009), computer-mediated learning (Curtis, 2009), information systems (Butler & Gray, 2006), and software development (Matook & Kautz, 2008) and to explore its broader applicability to other types of teams and organisations. For example, we see the concept as assisting in understanding less tangible but no less crucial metaphysical dimensions of team and organisational functioning such as the sacred or spiritual, as we highlight below.

Research collaborations as social action and collective mindfulness are taken up in this chapter. The chapter begins with the transcript of one segment of a focused conversation held by the authors in late 2009; then each author in turn unpacks the transcript from a personal perspective; then together we reflect on and synthesise our individual unpackings. We conclude by considering what those unpackings suggest about the ways that we construct meaning and build research relationships in the context of an outcomes-based approach.

The focused conversation segment
All social action is mediated (Scollon, Bhatia, Lee & Vung, 1999) and it is our critically reflective approach to understanding our personal and professional development that informs the approach adopted in this chapter. As we, the three authors of the chapter, came together with the intent of having a focused conversation around perceptions of our successful research collaborations, it was clear that processes of confronting, deconstructing, theorising and thinking otherwise (Noble & Henderson, 2008; Noble, Macfarlane, Kilderry, & Nolan, 2005) were inherent in our approach. Throughout the wider dialogue that constituted that conversation (which space restrictions prevent our canvassing here), each of us shared our experiences of participation in this group, identifying key aspects of the development of the synergies that exist for each of us. It was clear in the process of deconstructing our initial comments that there were various theoretical and conceptual lenses that could be applied to aid deeper understandings and broaden collective as well as individual perspectives. Given the length of the transcript of the conversation, we have decided to focus on only one short segment, with each of us individually analysing this segment for meaning in order to highlight some of the variances before once again sharing our understandings as a collective. We see this as yet another example of social action leading to heightened metacognitive awareness and further demonstration of the process in action as described.

1   But see, that's what I see as collective mindfulness. That's where that moves
2   beyond, because it's being – collectively we're being mindful; we're always
3   looking for opportunities for one another as well as for ourselves. We're always
4   – at the forefront, we've always got, "Okay, well, what's the goal? What other
5   goals might come into it that we can be mindful of to bring back to the
6   collective?" I'm using those words loosely, but that's what it's kind of about. So
7   you're looking for difference. Like you're valuing – it's not that one is good and
8   one is bad or one is more preferable than the other. You're actually saying,
9   "Well, actually sameness is good but difference within the same group is also
10 good and that one isn't worth more than the other; they're actually both equally
11 valuable to creating spaces and opportunities". Because it's create the space to
12 explore and value the likeness but create opportunities to bring in the difference.

13 We each do that by going outside the group and then coming back to the group.
14 You're engaging in different groups and in different ways but, equally, because
15 there is no competition within the group, if you go back to that kind of binary
16 analogy, it is about collective value and because we know the three of us have
17 such a strong sense of self-efficacy as a group and each one of us can publicly
18 defend the position we've taken, the work that we've done, and whether we are
19 one on our own doing that or whether it's as a group we're doing that makes no
20 difference because we know we're speaking with a collective voice. So even
21 though I am representing the group, I know I'm speaking from a collective, not
22 [as] an individual, because we've got that deep sense of understanding.

Karen's unpacking

In undertaking this somewhat introspective inquiry into the synergies that sustain me as a researcher, I have been drawn to several key concepts pertaining to my experiences of social presence as a member of several smaller research groups within this larger, formally recognised and funded research group within the faculty. To unpack some of the complexity and interconnectedness of my understandings of these experiences, I am attracted to the theorisation of the ethic of care and specifically wish to tease out understandings of collective mindfulness (Jordan, Messner, & Becker, 2009, p. 468). Through this lens, implications for the self and other group members may be able to be applied to others' endeavours to build successful research teams in similar contexts.

It quickly became clear to me that the strength of the social relationship being described in the conversation segment transcribed above was very powerful and could almost be described as sacred or spiritual. That is, the perception of interconnectedness with, and care for and of, others sets this relationship apart from the ordinary. As was noted in part of the transcript, "That's where that moves beyond, because it's being – collectively we're being mindful; we're always looking for opportunities for one another as well as for ourselves" (lines 1-3). In explaining this dimension of the relationship, I draw on the field of positive psychology (Bryant & Veroff, 2006; Petersen, 2006; Snyder, 2005), where psychological capital is understood as consisting of several core factors, including hope, efficacy, optimism and resilience. It is clear that through our engagement with one another there is a heightened awareness of the self and one's individual rights, while at the same time recognition that there is also a concomitant responsibility for others. It is clear that as well as having shared goals in research in this context we exchange ideas, plans, innovations and inspiration and collaboratively aspire to ensure that we are each afforded as many opportunities as possible to realise this potential. This is demonstrated through the communication of positive emotions and engagement in citizenry actions for one another.

Taking the notion of care of others a step further in relation to mediated actions (Collins & Murphy, 1997), the theoretical conception of an ethic of care (Flint, Simon Kurumada, Fisher, & Zisook, 2009; Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984) is a useful tool. Going back to the transcript once again, "it is about collective value and because we know the three of us have such a strong sense of self-efficacy as a group and each one of us can publicly defend the position we've taken, the work that we've done, and whether we are one on our own doing that or whether it's as a group we're doing that makes no

difference because we know we're speaking with a collective voice" (lines 16-20). If one is to examine the key tenets of such a commentary, a social justice framework is immediately evident, where a greater awareness of individuality is a product of ongoing interactions between the self and the social environment (in which the other group members feature). That is not to say that the group goals are privileged over those of the individual, but instead that each harmoniously co-exists. Rather than stressing independence and self-reliance, the group's sense of collectivism emphasises the interdependence of individuality and celebrates the diversity and independence of each individual within this 'community'.

There is also no sense of exclusive membership, in that each of us inhabits many other separate social research spaces. Instead one can almost state that what exists is what Steiner (as cited in McDermott, 2009) coined "ethical individualism" or freedom to move in and out of the social space at will, but always to belong. What is apparent is that the establishment of such collective mindfulness occurs at two levels: through direct interactions; and more generally through a careful examination of existing ways of working within this social context. At the latter level, it becomes evident that such critical reflection in-action and on-action as a collective evokes a heightened awareness of the impact of context on interactions and ways of being, knowing, doing, valuing and understanding (Gee, 1996) that each of us values. That is the power of the social dynamic identified here.

Robyn's unpacking
In talking about the research relationships that the three of us have developed over the past couple of years, Karen used the term "collective mindfulness" which comes from the organisational literature (Jordan, Messner, & Becker, 2009, p. 468). Although collective mindfulness involves "a heightened state of involvement or being" (Knight, 2004, p. 10) and is often used in relation to risk management (Sellnow, Ulmer, Seeger, & Littlefield, 2009), I draw on my conceptualisation of the social world to explain my interpretation of the concept. By doing this, I unpack my experiences of how research relationships can work effectively and how I think that those understandings can contribute to furthering the research capacity of our faculty more broadly.

To this discussion I bring my experiences of working in effective research relationships with both of my co-authors. Patrick and I are both passionate about the field of mobilities, and the synergies between our research interests are fairly obvious, from our doctoral work – Patrick's (Danaher, 2001) investigating the marginalisation, resistance and transformation of Australian itinerant show families and mine (Henderson, 2005a) exploring the stories told by itinerant farm workers' children, their parents and their teachers about school literacy learning – through to our current collaborative work about pedagogies for mobile learners (Henderson & Danaher, 2010, in press). With Karen as co-researcher, my experiences are different. We came from very different backgrounds methodologically and theoretically and with expertise in different educational areas – Karen's in early childhood and mine in literacies. However, our common interest in promoting successful learning experiences in teacher education has resulted in multiple collaborative projects around the scholarship of teaching and learning (see for example Henderson & Noble, 2009; Noble & Henderson, 2009, under review).

These projects have enabled us to conduct and publish research successfully on topics that we might never have predicted as research foci.

Despite the differences, these two research collaborations are both successful. And this is where Karen's remark about collective mindfulness becomes significant. When I reflect on the comments that I hear regularly, many of our colleagues cite barriers that prevent them from doing research, including lack of time, heavy workloads, interminable meetings, compliance requirements and so on. Whilst I agree that these are all constraints that make it difficult to find ample time and headspace for research, I would argue that we can do research despite the adversities.

In theorising why I think that the practice of doing research is achievable within such constraints, I draw on Chouliaraki and Fairclough's (1999) ambiguous use of the term "social practice". As I have also discussed elsewhere (Henderson, 2005b), they refer to social practice as an instance of a social action that occurs in a particular place and time, as well as a way of acting that has become relatively permanent or habitual.

Chouliaraki and Fairclough argue that social practices are shaped, constrained and maintained, on the one hand, by the "long-term background conditions for social life" and the "relative permanencies of social structures" (p. 22). In relation to research, university and faculty structures play a significant role in constraining how we *do* that part of our roles as academics. Workload formulae, teaching timetables and accountability requirements are part of the institutional structures that constrain our research endeavours. Yet, on the other hand, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) also highlight the way that social practices are activities of production, with "particular people in particular relationships using particular resources" (p. 23; see also Henderson, 2005b). It is this part of their theorisation that provides the potential for doing research differently. This component of the dialectical relationship between social structures and social events offers possibilities for agency, because agentic action can work against the constraints and become an enabler of "an active process of production" (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 1).

If we return, then, to Karen's discussion of collective mindfulness, it is possible to consider the effect of a team of people working together (rather than individuals working alone) against the constraints. And, talking as one of the three co-authors of this chapter, this is the *power* that *our* collaborative research relationships have been able to demonstrate. There are times when the pressures of academic life seem so all-encompassing that I feel, as an individual researcher, that the constraints have won. However, it is when I am at that point that my co-researchers always manage to ensure that the impossible becomes the possible. In my opinion, this is the power of collaboration and the power of collective mindfulness.

As Karen said, collective mindfulness is evident when we look "for opportunities for one another as well as for ourselves" (line 3), because "there is no competition within the group" (line 15). While we acknowledge that from an external perspective team members compete for inevitably scarce resources, and also that the process of forming teams was competitive (with not all team bids being successful), collective mindfulness relies on a "deep sense of understanding" (line 22) that what is good for the group is also good for the individual – and vice versa. To go back to the theorisation that I discussed earlier, this way of working is founded in social relations, with individuals being able to work collectively as well as individually. In line with Harvey's (1996) ideas about the

elements or 'moments' of social practice, it appears that collaborative social relations and shared understandings about research beliefs, values and desires help us to mediate the "seeming slipperiness" (p. 58) of that dialectical relationship and to ameliorate the effects of institutional structures and constraints.

I suspect that it is this notion of collaboration – that working for the group does not mean that resources for the individual are even scarcer – that some of our colleagues simply do not understand. In Karen's words, the approach allows us to "create the space to explore and value the likeness but [also] create opportunities to bring in the difference" (lines 11-12). Through working together as a group, we have not lost our individual identities as researchers but instead we have expanded and transformed what we are able to do both individually and collectively. This way of working requires acceptance that we can rely on our fellow researchers just as we can rely on ourselves and that collective interest rather than self-interest is a good basis for decision-making.

Patrick's unpacking
This interplay between collective interest and self-interest is where I begin my unpacking of Karen's discussion of collective mindfulness (Jordan, Messner, & Becker, 2009, p. 468). In particular, I consider some of the implications of both this interplay and this concept for framing possible interactions between us as researchers and other participants in our separate and shared research projects. Such interactions are of considerable interest to all the authors of this chapter and all the members of the broader research team, not least because they are the logical concomitant of both the social action with which this chapter is concerned and the research collaborations that lie at the heart of this book. Researcher–research participant interactions are also implicated in the ethic of care theorised by Karen and in the social practices elaborated by Robyn. Furthermore, these interactions are potentially examples of collective mindfulness at work, demonstrating how such mindfulness can be cultivated as well as the hopefully positive impact of that cultivation on the different groups of stakeholders in research.

More specifically, collective mindfulness, researcher–research participant interactions and the interplay between collective interest and self-interest are encapsulated and synthesised in the crucial question "cui bono?" – in whose interests and for whose benefit is education research designed, conducted and published (Coombes & Danaher, 2001; Coombes, Danaher, & Danaher, 2004). Other colleagues and I (Anteliz, Danaher, & Danaher, 2001; see also Anteliz, Danaher, & Danaher, 2004) have argued, in relation to the area of scholarship that I share with Robyn, that it is vital to recognise that both researchers and research participants have interests in, and hopefully benefits arising from, being involved in particular research projects, and that those interests and benefits are not necessarily or always convergent, either between or within the two groups. More broadly, this identification of the ethical and political dimensions of education research is fundamental to harnessing the potentially positive impact of collective mindfulness linking researchers and research participants and thereby to maximising the intended common and different benefits of stakeholders in a particular project. This is one among several important elaborations of Karen's bald but accurate statement, "So you're looking for difference" (lines 6-7).

Another way of conceptualising these ethical and political implications of collective mindfulness is to refer to Scott and Usher's (1999) useful and rather provocative

typology of three possible models for approaching researcher–research participant interactions (see also Danaher, Danaher, & Moriarty, 2003):

> The first – covert research – emphasizes the need to conceal from respondents the aims and purposes of the research and for the researcher to act in a clandestine way. The second – open democratic research – stresses the rights of participants to control which data are collected and which are included in the research report. The third – open autocratic research – argues the case against allowing respondents these rights of veto and therefore obligates the researcher to protect the interests of those who have agreed to take part in the research. (p. 128)

At first glance, the authors and readers of this chapter might be predicted to reject covert research out of hand and to opt for open democratic research as the ideal form of interactions between researchers and research participants. Certainly proponents of participatory action research are presumed to aspire to open democratic research; likewise Karen has enacted the principles of such research in a recent collaborative research project (Noble, Macfarlane, & Cartnel, 2005). At the same time, one potential enactment of collective mindfulness is centred on open autocratic research – not in the sense of a patronising enlightened despotism, but rather by implementing one concomitant of the researcher's benefits, interests and responsibilities. From this perspective, in the type of research in which I have engaged (qualitative, interpretivist, poststructuralist, non-action research), my fellow researchers and I have retained primary responsibility for organising the project, for identifying and interacting with participants and for conducting and publishing the research, although where possible we have been pleased to co-author publications with key participants. We have highlighted that the interpretations represented in those publications have been ours, and that they are necessarily partial, provisional and tentative. This is (hopefully) different from appropriating the participants' words and silencing them in the process; it is definitely different from assigning the power of veto (and of an equivalent silencing) to individual participants in relation to our responsibilities for conducting and reporting the research.

Thus, while I am uncomfortable about positioning myself as an open autocratic researcher, I eschew the specific characteristics of being an open democratic researcher (unless I engage in future action research) and also of being a covert researcher. This discomfort is probably an indispensable part of one particular approach to collective mindfulness – recognising that at any one time in any research project individual participants are likely to have different levels of benefits, interests and responsibilities. Although it is important to acknowledge the potential ethical and political risks such as appropriation and complicity attendant on such an approach (Danaher, 1998; see also Danaher, 2000; Danaher & Danaher, 2008), I contend that those risks are an inevitable part of the messiness of research as social action outlined in the introduction to the chapter. Certainly I see them as indispensable elements of Karen's reference to the necessity for a situation in which "each one of us can publicly defend the position we've taken, the work that we've done" (lines 17-18).

Synthesising the individual unpackings

In this section of the chapter we reflect on and synthesise our individual unpackings of Karen's articulation of the concept of collective mindfulness in relation to collaborative research and social action, and briefly consider some possible implications of the concept

for the functioning of research teams. Taking Karen's point that "actually sameness is good" (line 9), we note a broad similarity across the three unpackings. In particular, each of us highlighted, *albeit* drawing on different conceptual resources, the ethical responsibilities for researchers who are committed to collective mindfulness in their interactions with one another and with other participants in their research projects. These responsibilities underpinned Karen's discussion of the ethic of care, Karen's account of social practices and Patrick's reference to multiple benefits, interests and responsibilities in education research.

Similarly, each of us identified diverse elements of collaborative research understood as social action. Karen wrote about citizenry actions as well as reflection in-action and on-action. Robyn highlighted the potential power of academics and researchers working together and thereby sustaining one another in the challenging environment of contemporary higher education. Patrick focused on the social action involved in negotiating productive and ethical interactions between researchers and other research participants. The messiness and uncertainty associated with social action was evident in each account.

On the other hand, and again in keeping with Karen's reminder that "difference within the same group is also good and that one isn't worth more than the other" (lines 9-10), it is important to acknowledge differences of emphasis and orientation among the three unpackings. In part these differences derived from our varied disciplinary and paradigmatic backgrounds; in part they reflected the diverse conceptual resources that we deployed to illustrate our arguments; and in part they resulted from the sequence of our unpackings. That is, Karen presented a theoretically informed elaboration of the notion of collective mindfulness, Robyn followed with an application of that notion to the work of researchers and Patrick finished with an elaboration of that notion to researcher–research participant interactions. More broadly, each of us has different individual experiences of research (even when we have been co-researchers) that have informed our respective affective, behavioural, cognitive, intellectual, sociocultural and spiritual responses to what collaborative research, understood as collective mindfulness and social action, means to us.

These three points of synthesis suggest some possible implications of applying collective mindfulness to the functioning of research teams. Firstly, it is important for such teams to have in place techniques for identifying the similarities and synergies in thinking among all team members, in order to develop the elements of a collective understanding of particular issues and options related to their research. Secondly, it is crucial to avoid group think by developing both the means and the rapport and trust needed to articulate, celebrate and explore the inevitable diversity of team members' thinking, Thirdly, mindfulness requires rejecting an uncritical acceptance of difference in favour of a mature comprehension of the foundations of and reasons for such difference; this is necessary if research teams are to enact effective and productive ways of working together that build alike on the convergence and divergence of thinking that in turn signify those teams' ongoing commitment, engagement and success.

In proposing these implications, we are also mindful that it is easier to suggest than to implement these kinds of strategies. This is partly because the strategies employed by research teams (Clarysee & Moray, 2004; Flint, Simon Kurumada, Fisher, & Zisook, 2009; Spoth, Clair, Greenberg, Redmond, & Shin, 2007; Wallerstein & Duran, 2006) are

developed *in situ* and do not necessarily translate easily across contexts. It is also because the broader terrains on which university research teams function are increasingly complex and often equally hostile to the operations of such teams and the sustainability of academic work and identities (Biscotti, Glenna, Lacy, & Welsh, 2009; Dowling, 2008; Jain, George, & Maltarich, 2009; Winter, 2009). On the other hand, we are convinced that it is only by enacting the principles and practices of collective mindfulness and associated social action that those kinds of terrains and the wider social forces with which they are connected can be navigated and potentially transformed.

Conclusion

We turn now to examine what the preceding unpackings and synthesising suggest about the ways in which we construct meaning and build dynamic and sustainable relationships in the context of an outcomes-based approach to research. As we noted at the outset of the chapter, our group – the research team to which we belong – and this chapter and the book of which it forms a part are located in a spatial and temporal context that contains both challenges and opportunities. While the opportunities include the kinds of ethical and purposeful interactions articulated in our unpackings, the challenges entail a politicisation of research and an intensification of researchers' work that require us to be attentive to both quality and quantity in our research outcomes. These are not inconsiderable shoals to have to negotiate; at the same time, the issues canvassed in the chapter are helpful in evoking potentially useful strategies for approaching those negotiations.

It follows from all three of our unpackings that we see the construction of meaning as a collaborative and iterative enterprise. It is through caring, respectful and trusting interactions with fellow researchers and other research participants that we engage in an unceasing pursuit of multiple and sometimes divergent understandings of how each of us perceives the world and our purposes and places in that world. That pursuit requires an ongoing attentiveness to collective mindfulness and social action – both our own and those of the many others with whom we have contact. It also necessitates taking responsibility for contributing to our own and others' processes of meaning-making by means of listening, dialogue and a commitment to continued contact and communication.

This approach to meaning-making signifies in turn a particular approach to relationship-building in the context of collaborative research. It suggests that, although political nous mandates the attainment of externally sanctioned and personally beneficial outcomes, primacy must be given to the relationships rather than to the outcomes. The forms of collective mindfulness and social action outlined here are primarily social and relational; while individuals benefit from participating in research and need to do so, they cannot do so unless there is a robust foundation of mutual regard and trust. Or as Karen explained, "because there is no competition within the group … it is about collective value."

References

Anteliz, E. A., Danaher, G. R., & Danaher, P. A. (2001). *Norias* and ferris wheels: Benefits, interests and ethics in researching Venezuelan and Australian fairground people's educational experiences. *Queensland Journal of Educational Research, 17*(2), 221-236.

Biscotti, D., Glenna, L. L., Lacy, W. B., & Welsh, R. (2009). The "independent" investigator: How academic scientists construct their professional identity in university–industry agricultural biotechnology research collaborations. *Research in the Sociology of Work, 18*, 262-285.

Bryant, F. B., & Veroff, J. (2006). *Savoring: A new model of positive experience.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Butler, B. S., & Gray, P. H. (2006). Reliability, mindfulness, and information systems. *Management Information Systems Quarterly, 30*(2).

Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Clarysse, B., & Moray, N. (2004, January). A process study of entrepreneurial team formation: The case of a research-based spin-off. *Journal of Business Venturing, 19*(1), 55-79.

Collins, M., & Murphy, K. L. (1997). Development of communications conventions in instructional electronic chats. *Journal of Distance Education, 12*(1-2), 177-200.

Coombes, P. N., Danaher, M. J. M., & Danaher, P. A. (Eds.) (2004). *Strategic uncertainties: Ethics, politics and risk in contemporary educational research.* Flaxton, Qld: Post Pressed.

Coombes, P. N., & Danaher, P. A. (Eds.) (2001). <u>*Cui bono?: Investigating benefits and interests in educational research.*</u> Theme issue of the *Queensland Journal of Educational Research, 17*(2), 109-242.

Curtis, A. M. (2009, December). *From monologue toward dialogue: Using performative objects to promote collective mindfulness in computer-mediated group discussions.* Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN. Retrieved April 2, 2010, from http://gradworks.umi.com/33/58/3358911.html

Danaher, M. J. M., & Danaher, P. A. (2008, January). Situated ethics in investigating non-government organisations and showgrounds: Issues in researching Japanese environmental politics and Australian Traveller education. In L. R. De George-Walker & P. A. Danaher (Eds.), *Evaluating value(s): Issues in and implications of educational research significance and researcher identity*. Theme issue of the *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, *4*(1), 58-70.

Danaher, P. A. (1998). Ethics and researching educational itinerancy. In P. A. Danaher (Ed.), *Beyond the ferris wheel: Educating Queensland show children (Studies in open and distance learning number 1)* (pp. 57-69) Rockhampton, Qld: Central Queensland University Press.

Danaher, P. A. (2000). What's in a name?: The 'marginalisation' of itinerant people. *Journal of Nomadic Studies*, 3, 67-71.

Danaher, P. A. (2001, March). *Learning on the run: Traveller education for itinerant show children in coastal and western Queensland.* Unpublished Doctor of

Philosophy dissertation, Faculty of Education and Creative Arts, Central Queensland University, Rockhampton, Qld.

Danaher, P. A., Danaher, G. R., & Moriarty, B. J. (2003, December). Risks and dilemmas, virtues and vices: Engaging with stakeholders and gatekeepers in Australian Traveller education research. In *NZARE/AARE conference 2003: Educational research, risks & dilemmas, 29 November - 3 December 2003, Hyatt Regency Hotel and University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand* (9 pp.).

Dowling, R. (2008). Geographies of identity: Labouring in the 'neoliberal' university. *Progress in Human Geography, 32*(6), 812-820.

Elbanna, A., & Murray, D. (2009). Organizing projects for innovation: A collective mindfulness perspective. In *Americas conference on information systems (AMCIS): AMCIS 2009 proceedings*. Atlanta, GA: Association for Information Systems. Retrieved April 2, 2010, from http://aisel.aisnet.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1298&context=amcis2009

Flint, A. S., Simon Kurumada, K., Fisher, T., & Zisook, K. (2009). Creating the perfect storm in professional development: The experiences of two American teachers and a university research team. *Professional Development in Education.*

Forsyth, D. R. (2009). *Group dynamics* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourse.* London: Taylor & Francis.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Grossman, P., & McDonald, M. (2008). Back to the future: Directions for research in teaching and teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(1), 184-205.

Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, nature and the geography of difference*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Henderson, R. (2005a). *The social and discursive construction of itinerant farm workers' children as literacy learners.* Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy dissertation, James Cook University, Townsville, Qld.

Henderson, R. (200b). A Faircloughian approach to CDA: Principled eclecticism or a method searching for a theory? *Melbourne Studies in Education, 46*(2), 9-24.

Henderson, R., & Danaher, P. A. (2010, in press). Moving with the times: Pedagogies for mobile students. In C. Day (Ed.), *International handbook: Teacher and school development.* London: Routledge.

Henderson, R., & Noble, K. (2009). FYI (First Year Infusion): A vaccine for the first year plague in a regional university. In C. Boylan (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 25th national rural education conference: Education in a digital present: Enriching rural communities* (pp. 85-93). Adelaide, SA: Society for the Provision of Education in Rural Australia.

Hostetler, K. (2005). What is "good" education research? *Educational Researcher, 34*(6), 16-21.

Ingram Willis, A. (2009). Edu/Po*l*itical research: Reading between the lines. *Educational Researchers, 38*(7), 528-536.

Jain, S., George, G., & Maltarich, M. (2009, July). Academics or entrepreneurs? Investigating role identity modification of university scientists involved in commercialization activity. *Research Policy, 38*(6), 922-935.

Jordan, S., Messner, M., & Becker, A. (2009). Reflection and mindfulness in organisations: Rationales and possibilities for integration. *Management Learning, 40*(4), 465-473.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Berry, K. S. (2004). *Rigour and complexity in educational research: Conceptualizing the bricolage.* Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Knight, A. P. (2004). *Measuring collective mindfulness and exploring its nomological network.* Unpublished Master of Arts thesis, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (Eds.) (2006). *Education research in the public interest: Social justice, action, and policy.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Matook, S., & Kautz, K. (2008, December 3-5). Mindfulness and agile software development. Paper presented at the 19th Australasian conference on information systems, Christchurch, New Zealand. Retrieved April 2, 2010, from http://www.bsec.canterbury.ac.nz/acis2008/Papers/acis-0159-2008.pdf

McDermott, R. (2009). *The new essential Steiner: An introduction to Rudolph Steiner for the 21st century.* Los Angeles, CA: Lindisfarne Books.

Noble, K., & Henderson, R. (2008. January). Engaging with images and stories: Using a learning circle approach to develop agency of beginning "at-risk" pre-service teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 33*(1), 1-16.

Noble, K., & Henderson, R. (2009). The Flagstone experience: Universities building stronger links to rural education communities through technological creativity. In C. Boylan (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 25th national rural education conference: Education in a digital present: Enriching rural communities* (pp. 95-102). Adelaide, SA: Society for the Provision of Education in Rural Australia.

Noble, K., & Henderson, R. (under review). Productive partnerships: Foregrounding connections in a tertiary context.

Noble, K., Macfarlane, K., & Cartnel, J. (Eds.) (2005). *Circles of change: Challenging orthodoxy in practitioner supervision.* Melbourne, Vic: Pearson Publishing.

Noble, K., Macfarlane, K., Kilderry, A., & Nolan, A. (2005). Fields of practice as discursive projects. In K. Noble, K. Macfarlane & J. Cartmel (Eds.), *Circles of change: Challenging orthodoxy in practitioner supervision* (pp. 2-10). Melbourne, Vic: Pearson Publishing.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Noffke, S., & Somekh, B. (Eds.) (2009). *The Sage handbook of educational action research.* London: Sage Publications.

North, C. E. (2006). More than words? Delving into the substantive meaning(s) of "social justice" in education. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(4), 507-535.

Ohlin, J. D. (2007, Fall). Group think: The law of conspiracy and collective reason. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 98*(1), 147-206.

Petersen, C. (2006). *A primer in positive psychology.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press

Scollon, R., Bhatia, V., Lee, D., & Vung, V. (1999). Blurred genres and fuzzy identities in Hong Kong public discourse: Foundational ethnographic issues in the study of reading. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(1), 22-43.

Scott, D., & Usher, R. (1999). *Researching education: Data, methods and theory in educational enquiry.* London: Cassell.

Sellnow, T. L., Ulmer, R. R., Seeger, M. W., & Littlefield, R. S. (Eds.). (2009). *Effective risk communication: A message-centred approach*. New York: Springer.

Snyder, C. R. (2005). *Handbook of positive psychology*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Solomon, M. (2010). *Groupthink* versus The Wisdom of Crowds: The social epistemology of deliberation and dissent. *The Southern Journal of Philosophy, 44*(S1), 28-42.

Spoth, R., Clair, S., Greenberg, M., Redmond, C., & Shin, C. (2007, June). Toward dissemination of evidence-based family interventions: Maintenance of community-based partnership recruitment results and associated factors. *Journal of Family Psychology, 21*(2), 137-146.

Vogus, T., & Welbourne, T. M. (2003). Structuring for high reliability: HR practices and mindful processes in reliability-seeking organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*, 877-903.

Wallerstein, N. B., & Duran, B. (2006). Using community-based participatory research to address health disparities. *Health Promotion Practice, 7*(3), 312-323.

Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). *Managing the unexpected: Resilient performance in an age of uncertainty* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.

Winter, R. (2009, May). Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 31*(2), 121-131.

Strategies for sustaining synergies
- Write your own unpacking of Karen's articulation of collective mindfulness and social action.
- Write a response to Karen's articulation of collective mindfulness and social action, highlighting areas of convergence and/or divergence between her articulation and your engagement with it.
- Outline the external and internal environments in which your social practices as a researcher are enacted and how you see those environments framing and/or constraining your practices.
- State whether you are a covert, open democratic and/or open autocratic researcher, and explain why that is so.
- Topic for debate: "Collective mindfulness can too easily become prey to group think and mutual exploitation if outcomes become excessively important in collaborative research".

Further reading
Furlong, J., & Oancea, A. (2005). *Assessing quality in applied and practice-based educational research: A framework for discussion.* Oxford, UK: Department of

Educational Studies, University of Oxford. Available from
http://www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/

Hammersley, M. (Ed.) (2007). *Educational research and evidence-based practice.* Milton Keynes, UK: The Open University.

Kapoor, D., & Jordan, S. (Eds.) (2009). *Education, participatory action research, and social change.* Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Levinthal, D., & Rerup, C. (2006). Crossing an apparent chasm: Bridging mindful and less-mindful perspectives on organizational learning. *Organization Science, 17*(4), 502-513.

Weick, K. E., & Putman, T. (2006). Organizing for mindfulness: Eastern wisdom and western knowledge. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 15*(3), 275-287.