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Claims to originality

This research is the first research effort to explore facilitation and co-operative processes from within the context of a sustainable world. It highlights issues to facilitator ethics and accountability in a wider context than is usual, that of the group and the organisation.

It also contains the first survey of facilitators internationally in the area of ethics monitors the dialogue among facilitators involved in the International Association of Facilitators towards developing a Code of Ethics.

The co-operative inquiry is the first co-operative inquiry among facilitators to explore sustainability in co-operative processes.

There are gaps in the literature in the area of co-operative work, co-operative processes and 'co-operative logic'. This research begins to address these gaps without attempting to be definitive. There is much more research that can be undertaken in this area.
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Abstract

This thesis explores the quality and sustainability of facilitated co-operative processes in organisations, and the difficulties and opportunities associated with this way of working. Three complementary research methods have been used: a survey, an Internet dialogue and a co-operative inquiry of facilitators, managers and academics.

The survey revealed that facilitators have diverse and sometimes contradictory approaches to their organisational work; co-operative processes are not easy to sustain within hierarchical organisations, and that facilitator ethics need clarification. The development of a Statement of Values and Code of Ethics by the International Association of Facilitators formed the content for the Internet dialogue part of this research. The co-operative inquiry highlighted that sustainable co-operation depends on embodied whole people connecting with love and compassion, and with the commitment and courage to speak their own truth and deeply engage with the collective wisdom of the group.

I have shown that co-operative organisational forms, methods, processes, values and ethics are only part of what is needed to support co-operative endeavour. Underpinning all of these are ways of being that are learnt through modelling and mutually supportive interactions between persons in relationship. These ways of being need to be transmitted along with conceptual frameworks, processes and methods for ‘co-operacy’ to be sustainable in groups and organisations.
Section 1

1.1 Introduction

Research question

On my enrolment in the doctoral research programme at Hawkesbury in February 1999, I stated my research topic as 'sustainable co-operative structures and practices in organisations'. This later developed into 'the facilitation of sustainable co-operative processes in organisations'.

The research question with which I first engaged was 'What is needed for co-operative structures and practices in organisations to flourish and be sustained?' I explained this as follows:

My area of interest is in enhancing co-operative structures and practices in organisations ('co-operative technology'), as I believe that co-operative ways of working are both good in themselves, and also provide a useful choice for people from a range of ways of working (autocratic, hierarchical, democratic and consensual). Co-operative ways of working are associated with consensus decision-making.

Many organisations are now seeking to be team-based and non-hierarchical, often in response to the speed and flexibility available through information technology and the need for complex problem-solving involving many areas of expertise.

Often co-operative structures are introduced hastily, and without much thought as to what it takes for people to work together in non-hierarchical ways. There is a strong commitment to results but not to process. Co-operative technology is seen as a means to get better results without any understanding of the ways of being, beliefs, values, processes and behaviours, that are also necessary for co-operation to be sustainable. My concern is that present opportunities for co-operative work will be seen as a fad that fails or passes, rather than the expression of a deep and lasting shift in consciousness of which it can be an expression. Because working co-operatively is not easier and quicker in the short, or even the medium term, it
can be slower and messier. It involves confronting lifetime conditioning, and making difficult behavioural changes. In short, it is hard. It involves a commitment to a way of being where people and processes matter, and a new balance is forged with getting results. Out of this, individual and collective life can be enhanced in deeply satisfying ways.

What is needed for organisations to knowingly choose co-operative ways of working as life-enhancing, and good business, and have them work in practical and profound ways?

Personal context

My personal context for this research comes from a lifetime interest and involvement in the area of co-operative processes.

My first career was as a professional musician, eventually principal clarinetist in the Symphonia of Auckland, New Zealand, which later became the Auckland Philharmonia. I was involved in many chamber music performances and radio broadcasts, and also in the management of the orchestra as a players' representative, and later chairperson of the Symphonia of Auckland Incorporated Society – the governing body. I took part in a players' revolution in which the orchestra became a players' co-operative, which it remains to the present.

In the latter years of my involvement in the orchestra, around 1972, I became a member of a feminist consciousness-raising group, and was strongly influenced by feminism. This had a particular appeal, as our orchestral conductor was a Chilean, who considered that having too many women in the orchestra detrimentally affected his status as a world-class conductor.

From 1978 to 1990, I worked in community development at Manukau City Council, Manukau City. This southern quarter of Auckland City has a very mixed socio-economic and ethnic population including significant indigenous Maori and Pacific Island populations, and was often referred to by its Mayor, Barry Curtis, as a microcosm of New Zealand. During the time I worked for the council, I was involved in many co-operative processes, often learning the processes from community groups with which I was involved as a community development worker. I saw and
experienced how people empowered themselves through collective activity, and used co-operative skills and understanding to make positive changes in the community and their lives.

I was simultaneously involved in personal development work of various kinds, including work with John Heron in Co-counselling, facilitation skills training, and co-operative inquiry. This work included becoming a Co-counselling trainer and leading a substantial number of basic and advanced Co-counselling training programmes, and being involved in a number of co-operative inquiries, including some reported in detail by John Heron in ‘Sacred Science’ (1998) in chapters 13,15,18,20.

I was also studying management and organisational development, completing a Diploma of Management in 1986, and from 1986-90 was the manager of the Community Development Division of Manukau City Council, a group of 100 people involved in recreation, the arts and community advisory services. This role included a range of project groups concerned with performance management, future work practices, and change management. This was during a time of rapid change and restructuring of local government in New Zealand in an effort to introduce a more corporate style of management and increase transparency and efficiency. In my role as a senior manager I experienced the tension between my commitment to co-operative work and the workings of a large hierarchical, and bureaucratic organisation, based on the military model of control and command, yet subject to the democratic decision-making of an elected body of councillors.

After leaving Manukau City Council in 1990, I at first worked independently and then as part of a co-operative team, specialising in facilitation (of co-operative processes), and facilitation training through the company we created, the New Zealand-based Zenergy Ltd. During this time, I also co-wrote with two others, Anne Bailey and Bill Taylor, four books on facilitation, co-operative groups and ‘co-operacy’ (a term we coined to describe the technology of consensus decision making). These books have been published in the United Kingdom and the United States, as well as New Zealand (Hunter et al. 1992-1999). One of the books, ‘Co-operacy’ (Hunter et al. 1997) is published in South Africa and another ‘The Zen of Groups’ (1992) has been translated into Spanish and published under the title, ‘Management Zen: Facilitacion y eficiencia de grupos’ (Hunter et al. 1996).
A further stream of influence, social ecology (Bookchin 1991, Hill 1999) has emerged over the last decade, fuelled by my involvement with, and attendance at, many of the New Zealand Heart Politics (Peavey 1985) gatherings, held at the Tauhara Centre, Taupo, twice-yearly since 1990. Concerns over the viability of human occupation of this planet over-ride all concerns of individual, community and organisational development. This also brings an urgency to the development of co-operative processes (Hunter et al. 1997) which I believe could enable people to address environmental issues more effectively. The undertaking of my doctoral research through University of Western Sydney (UWS)-Hawkesbury is a direct recognition of the importance of this imperative and is a result of my connection with a Hawkesbury graduate, Rex McCann, one of the founders of Heart Politics in New Zealand.

Search for congruence

The experience of working co-operatively in a business setting, and working as a facilitator with a wide range of government, business and community sector groups and organisations, has brought together various streams of knowledge and experience that have been of particular significance in my life. From the intermingling of personal development, community development, organisational development, feminism and social ecology, synergies and tensions have emerged and contributed to the person I am.

Personal development (also known as self-development) tends to place the individual as central and gives primacy to individual autonomy. Community development has a different belief base. It is socialistic and egalitarian, with a strong accent on equity and fair redistribution of resources within society, as its central aim. It supports collective action to progress both individual and group aims.

Organisational development grapples with the tension between the goal of individual development of the employees within an organisation and the goals of the institutions, businesses and corporations within which they work. Organisational goals usually measure success in financial and profit-making terms. The financial goals usually have primacy, although ethical business and the 'triple bottom-line' approach, are beginning to broaden this narrow approach to success (Hawken 1993, Hawken et al. 1999, Daly et al. 1994).
Feminism provides an analysis of the oppression of women, and women's ways of knowing and seeing the world, and suggests ways to address this oppression.¹

I believe all these streams need to inform one another in contributing to the greater aim of ending exploitation of people and the environment, and of fostering personal, social and ecological health and wellbeing. This is the imperative of the discipline of social ecology (Hill 1999).

While applying for entry into the Social Ecology Research Group (SERG), at UWS-Hawkesbury, I was reading 'A Personal Remembrance and Conversation with Paulo Freire, educator of the oppressed', by Dada Maheshananda, recorded two months before Freire's death in 1997.

Maheshananda asked Freire what was the most important work he was engaged with at that time. Freire responded that it was consistency between beliefs and actions.

One of the major struggles in every individual is to diminish the difference between what one says and does, between the discourse and the practice.

Ethics really is fighting to decrease the distance. I think that in politicians one will encounter the maximum distance between the two. You listen to the speech of a candidate for mayor, but after being elected his or her actions do not look at all like the discourse. Like the educator and like the people, I think that one of the values that we should search for is exactly this – the value of consistency.

I remember when I started being a father. With my first wife what was important was the exercise to diminish the distance between what we did and what we dreamed. This is a fight, a daily fight, but a beautiful fight, a delicious fight. I remember that sometimes I asked forgiveness of one of my sons or daughters for the contradiction in what I taught. It is important that the child knows that the father is also incomplete, that he can make mistakes. We should be satisfied with the knowledge that we are daily fighting for this consistency (Maheshananda 1997).

¹ As a 70's feminist, I was initially influenced by feminist writers such as Germaine Greer (1970) and Shere Hite (1976). Feminism now has many flavours or 'feminisms' and I would probably place myself in what is referred to as the radical feminist grouping. I identify particularly with Susan Gilman's (2001) grandma who advised her to 'Take a few lovers, travel the world, and don't take any crap'. I have certainly endeavoured to live this advice.
These words of Freire, so close to his death, inspired me and formed a kind of backdrop or refrain to my reading, thinking and action throughout the research. They also express a quite similar idea to Argyris (1996) who distinguishes 'espoused theory' from 'theory in use'.

My research journey

I set out on a reading journey to clarify my thinking (key references are provided in Section 2). My approach was to first examine the organisational structures in which co-operative practices and processes needed to be sustained.

I began by researching the co-operative as an established organisational structure and was surprised and impressed with the extent of the co-operative movement in the world. I moved on to examine the form of the corporation, with its very distinctive history as a tool of colonialism and as the major instrument of International capitalism today.

From these two major organisational forms, I moved into the management theory area to assess the future organisational forms that were arising and were predicted for the future. The extensive recent literature on the future of organisations predicts an increase in multi-faceted, fluid, constantly changing and evolving organic structures. This complicated my efforts to clarify my research question. If organisations were in such a state of flux, how could co-operative practices within them be supported and sustained?

I refocused the research area towards sustainable co-operative processes in organizations and their facilitation, and my key questions became: 'What is needed for co-operative processes in organisations to thrive and be sustainable? What is needed for them to develop, be maintained and to evolve?'

I explored the term 'sustainability' and what I meant by it (Section 2.1). I wanted to place my research within a context of a thriving planetary ecosystem within which humans, and other species, could flourish and evolve.

I then considered the nature of co-operative processes, and chose to focus my attention on consensus-based facilitated activities, and build on the work already
done while researching and writing my book ‘Co-operacy – A New Way of Being at Work’ (Hunter et al. 1997). Organisations are extensions of people’s world views – their beliefs, assumptions and values in practice. I considered co-operative processes in relation to values, ethics, social ecology, sustainability and whole personhood (see Fig. 1 below).

During this time I undertook the three research projects described in detail in Section 3 of this dissertation. The processes of reading and researching informed one another and I added to the literature context as my thinking developed.

It is also important for me to acknowledge the importance of the experiential learning I have been involved with over many years, grappling with issues related to co-operative processes in organisational contexts. This drawing out of my own learning is an important part of my research process. My experiential learning has informed my research methodology and also my interpretation of that research. In the spirit of co-operative inquiry, I am always a participant researcher. I have endeavoured to bring myself fully into the research process and recognise this ‘whole’ experience as part of the research itself.
Fig. 1. The research context.

What this research does not cover

This research does not explore the theories of co-operation and game theory or argue that co-operation is better than competition. In other words it does not seek a competitive advantage. Co-operation is approached as a viable and life-enhancing choice but not necessarily the only way to work in organisations. There is no attempt to prescribe a 'one way fits' all solution (see chapter 2.4).

This research does not cover legal issues related to organisational forms nor is it an argument for particular organisational structures or specific co-operative processes. It assumes that there needs to be a diversity of structures and processes, from which the most appropriate and useful for the circumstances can be chosen by those involved.

In depth psychological analysis of the individual is also outside the scope of this thesis and this includes personality profiling and psychometrics.
1.2 Research Methodology

Three mutually supportive research methods were integrated in this research:

1) An exploratory survey of facilitators to clarify the kind of problems, including ethical issues, occurring at the interface between co-operative group processes and the host organisation. The survey also sought to establish the values underpinning facilitator practice. It was conducted at an international facilitators conference in Canada in May 2000.

The survey appealed as a means of accessing a reasonably large number of facilitators at an international conference (Toronto, Canada 2000), in a way that would be straightforward, accessible, and involve a very short period of facilitator time. The survey was designed to take only 10 minutes to complete. For this reason, it was possible to get a good response. Key references are Zikmund (1994) and Wadsworth (1997).

2) An extended focus group, or group dialogue, on the Internet with interested facilitators identified through the survey and with some additional people. This was held over 12 months, June 2000 - May 2001. The purpose of this dialogue process was to add depth to the understanding of issues raised in the survey and to identify and explore further issues that emerged during the dialogue.

The Internet dialogue provided an opportunity to follow up with those participants in the survey who expressed interest in further involvement, and allowed for further input, and reflection, from an experienced group of people over a period of 12 months. Key references are White (2000) and Mittleman et al. (2000).

3) A co-operative inquiry among a group of 11 facilitators and managers in New Zealand to inquire into the research question. This co-operative inquiry was based on the co-operative inquiry four-stage process developed by Heron (1996b). It was held over 14 weeks, August – December 2000. During the inquiry process the form of the inquiry changed and developed as commonly happens in such participatory research processes (Reason and Bradbury 2001).
Co-operative inquiry is a face-to-face collaborative method that allows for group synergies to develop. Because of this, it was necessarily limited to New Zealand participants. This method added richness, depth and the likelihood of new knowledge emerging through the cyclic, reflective process of the inquiry. Key references are Heron (1996b, 1998) and Reason (1988, 1998, 2001).

Choice of methods

In this research I placed myself fully within the community of facilitators in which the research took place. My approach was participatory and activist. My aim was to initiate action to improve the profession and forward my agenda of increasing the quality and integrity of the facilitation of co-operative processes.

The choice of research methods was initially somewhat intuitive, based on my knowledge of research methods and experience as a facilitator practitioner and co-operative inquiry practitioner. By intuitive, I mean that reflected on together the three methods chosen 'felt right' in my body (resonated) creating a sense of harmony and completeness. Although explicit inclusion of an intuitive sense may be unfamiliar, and even suspect, to positivist researchers, it may be argued that although intuition is invariably involved in decision-making, this is rarely acknowledged (Kaplan 2002). In 'Transpersonal Research' (Braud and Anderson 1998) and 'Action Research' (Reason and Bradbury 2001), failure to acknowledge the role of intuition may be regarded as deficient and even deceptive reporting.

The three research methods – the survey, the group dialogue on the Internet and the co-operative inquiry – were designed to complement one another and contribute to the depth and richness of the research, together providing data and methodological triangulation (Janesick 1994). By comparing and contrasting similarities and differences in the data produced, and by using three differing methods to study one research area the reliability and validity of the research process was enhanced.

Philosophical underpinnings

I sought a philosophical approach that resonated with my own lived experience and ways of knowing both in every day life and as a professional facilitator with a holistic, developmental approach.
In my review of the literature on researching, I explored the philosophical underpinnings of research, and the epistemologies, theoretical perspectives, methodologies, and methods that flowed out of, or were congruent with, the various stances concerning reality and ways of knowing (Crotty 1998, Guba and Lincoln 1994). The epistemologies of objectivism, constructionism and subjectivism, embedded in the different theoretical perspectives of positivism (and post-positivism), interpretivism, critical inquiry, feminism and post-modernism, form the basis of Crotty's (1998, p. 5) research framework.

The positioning of myself fully within (rather than as an observer outside of) the community that I was researching seemed to place me at odds with much of what I read. The epistemological debate with its (subjective/objective) polarity did not seem relevant. I considered myself a constructivist, with subjectivist leanings. (How do I know this? I exist. There appears to be some kind of world outside of my body and senses though much of it is mysterious. What it is and how it works is constructed by me and others collectively through shared assumptions, language and in conversation -- thereby creating diverse consensual realities).

However, none of the theoretical perspectives - positivism, interpretivism, critical inquiry, feminism, postmodernism etc. (Crotty 1998, p. 5) - completely reflected my own perspective. Some feminist perspectives came closest.

I enjoyed the feminist argument that objectivity and subjectivity are a male rationalisation of male and female ways of perceiving the world and I agree with Maguire (1987, p. 87) that this dichotomy is 'bogus'. In addition, feminists are grappling with changing the role of the social scientist from the expert, detached adviser to the involved activist (p. 100). Mies (1983) supports the role of researcher as an activist and declares that research must be pursued in order to act now. In the face of extensive poverty and oppression, producing knowledge for knowledge sake, or for some indefinite future application, is an exploitative, unaffordable luxury. Participatory research is clear that the social scientist must stand 'with the people' and err on the side of action for social justice (Maguire 1987, p. 100).

Feminists are also legitimising other ways of knowing; they are changing the criteria for what counts as knowledge.
For instance, feminist scholarship is proposing and using experience, intuition, and evaluation as alternative modes of knowing. Of course, male theorists and researchers have also proposed recognizing many forms of knowing and inquiry as valid. Intuition and acting as ways of knowing gain credibility from their masculine connections (Maguire 1987, p. 87).

Lincoln (2001, p. 128) identifies six kinds of knowledge. Lincoln includes ‘women’s ways of knowing’ and the role of gender in the construction of knowledge, and ‘non-dominant, non-majority and non-Western ways of knowing’. To these she adds four kinds of knowing described by Heron (1996) and Heron and Reason (1997). These a systemic logic (a form of internal coherence which assures that the other three forms of knowing are consistent with, and reinforcing of each other); practical knowledge (knowing how to exercise a skill); presentational knowledge (an intuitive grasp of the significance of imaginal patterns as expressed on graphic, plastic, moving, musical and verbal art-forms) and experiential knowledge (evident in actually meeting and feeling the presence of some energy, entity, person, place, process or thing).

Lincoln considers these six as exhibiting ‘elements which push research activities towards the holistic, towards the more egalitarian and towards forms which are more participative’ (p. 128). Although these may enable us to move towards more participative forms of research, the challenge remains as to when and how are we going to actually get there. And will this lead to a significant paradigm shift. It seemed that most theoreticians are still embedded within the mainstream Western positivist tradition, even if they claim to have moved well away from it. This raises the question as to whether participative ways of researching still need to be justified with reference to positivism?

Braud and Anderson (1998) describe their approach to research as holistic, integrative, intuitive inquiry and appear to have moved well away from positivism. Their focus is, however, on transpersonal psychology and on the study of extraordinary human experiences, such as unitive consciousness, peak experiences, transcendence, bliss, wonder, group synergy, and extrasensory and interspecies awareness (p. ix). To me, group synergy is commonplace and ordinary (even on the sports field and in the workplace) and in this sense different from the other phenomenon in this list. Because I wanted my research to be grounded in the ordinary and everyday experience of groups of people working together, I was of the opinion that their esoteric emphasis might detract from the focus of the research I was undertaking.
Lincoln's category of 'non-dominant, non-majority and non-Western ways of knowing' as one of her six categories (p. 128) raised questions for me about the validity of giving primacy to Western ways of knowing and bundling all the other non-Western ways together. The dilemmas of indigenous researchers are well articulated by Maori researcher Linda Smith (1999). Smith describes the exploitative nature of Western imperialist and colonialist research and how indigenous peoples have been framed as 'Other' by Western science. Nor has research been neutral in its objectification of the 'Other'. Rather it has been a process of dehumanisation.

Most indigenous criticisms of research are expressed within the single terms of 'white research', 'academic research' or 'outside research'. The finer details of how Western scientists might name themselves are irrelevant to indigenous peoples who have experienced unrelenting research of a profoundly exploitative nature. From an indigenous perspective Western research is more than just research that is located in a positivist tradition. It is research, which brings to bear, on any study of indigenous peoples, a cultural orientation, a set of values, a different conceptualisation of such things as time, space and subjectivity and compelling theories of knowledge, and structures of power (Smith, p. 42).

Indigenous researchers such as Smith (1999) are now focussing on developing decolonising methodologies, which centre research within the specific culture and express its values, orientation and ways of experiencing the world. Although I deeply appreciated the insights from indigenous research, the research project I was pursuing was cross-cultural and within a professional context and I was myself (somewhat reluctantly perhaps) from within the Western tradition.

Finding a place to stand

As I reviewed the researching literature, I found myself somewhat alienated. Most of the research literature did not 'speak' to me and my project. I was reminded of when I studied (mainstream) economics and could not fully relate to it. There was something basic that did not gel for me – in that case some of the key premises on which economics is based (e.g. all resources are limited – what about love?). I began to suspect a similar mismatch – perhaps a premise that I could not entirely align with. I found this when I considered the role of the researcher in research. The spoken or unspoken premise in most of what I read was that the researcher was an observer, an outsider looking in; a spectator with an elevated (expert) perspective. Even in
participatory action research, which seemed to place the researcher within the research context, the mental stance usually assumed a separation between the researcher and the subjects of the research.

For example, although Mark Baldwin (Reason and Bradbury, 2001) uses the co-operative inquiry method to facilitate research with social workers he does not fully place himself within the community of social workers being researched. He refers to his 'co-operative inquiry with social workers' (p. 289) not 'with other social workers'. Indeed, as an academic and lecturer in social work he is coming in from the 'outside' having initiated the research by submitting a proposal to a social welfare organisation and been 'offered' the role as convenor.

Eikeland (2001) however, provides a different approach with which I am more able to align my thinking. In his chapter, 'Action Research as the Hidden Curriculum of the Western Tradition', Eikeland links action research to Aristotle's 'practical knowledge'. He regards that the spectator ideal of the mainstream Western tradition for developing knowledge is counterproductive. He goes back to Aristotle to distinguish theoretical reason as a concept that is both political and ethical and based in practice and practical experience. Such research is not 'neutral' and situated in separate 'observatories', as most modern theoretical frameworks and paradigms have been.

Eikeland considers that it is important to emphasise the inductive, experiential, practical, intimately personal, 'searching', distinguishing, dialogical and 'therapeutic' nature of theoretical reason itself, where 'therapy' means what it originally meant, that is to cultivate and care for the soul, both thoughts, emotions and skills (2001, p. 149). He deconstructs and transforms modern theoretical reason back to what he considers was originally intended by Aristotle, and he claims that it primarily consists in the dialogical recollection, articulation, development, refinement and conceptualisation of the form or pattern of the knowers' own practical habits, routines, skills, emotions etc., both individual and collective, that is of ways of doing things, of the 'what-it-means-to-do-a-certain-thing' or 'to-be-a-certain-thing'; things that we, as actors, have and relate to in common (Eikeland 2001, p. 149).

Eikeland believes that this is something that many people would today tend to call a kind of action research (p. 149). Eikeland writes about the need for 'counter-public spheres' as free spaces for reflection and dialogue embedded within a profession,
organization, school of thought or institution where 'practical and emotional experiences of tensions within 'paradigms', 'discourse formations' or 'local traditions', between ways of thinking, speaking and doing, and external requirements and restrictions in people's lived, professional and private lives, can be disclosed uncensored, discussed and developed. A counter-public sphere is a forum for the dialogical and experiential learning and research within organisations or professions' (p. 152).

The ethics dialogue in this research is held in virtual space and could be seen as such a 'counter-public sphere'. Our co-operative inquiry meetings among the community of facilitators in Auckland, New Zealand were also spaces of reflection and dialogue.

Both modern and most post-modern researchers seem unable to escape from the position of the external observer and its variations and the focus on 'theory' and 'data' and in which order one is formed by the other (p. 150). Aristotle keeps experience and theory together and distinguishes between 'submerged and unconscious theory'. Theory is 'experience emerged and made conscious'. Experience and theory are merged in principle (p. 150).

The merging of experience and theory could also be described as collective wisdom. This term is used in the Draft Statement of Values and Code of Ethics for Facilitators developed in association with this research (see Appendix L). The Statement of Values begins with, 'As group facilitators, we believe in the inherent value of the individual and the collective wisdom of the group'. The Statement of Values ends with 'We value professional collaboration to improve our profession'.

A leading facilitator and writer on this topic, Roger Schwarz (2000 p. 33), commenting on facilitator competencies, suggested the importance of facilitators being able to rigorously reflect on our own practice in a way that enables us to identify gaps between espoused values/beliefs and actual values/beliefs, as reflected in the actions taken with clients and colleagues. He considers this competency fundamental to creating the same kind of learning and transformations, as the competencies advocate for the facilitator's clients.
Reengaging with diverse perspectives

Having drawn on the wisdom of the ancients, and found a place to stand, I was ready to reengage with the diverse perspectives of modern Western thought. I acknowledge all the different epistemologies, ontologies, theoretical perspectives and methodologies, as parts of the whole possibility of reality and knowing, and recognise that there will be tensions between them. Denzin and Lincoln (1994, 2000) explain this well.

Qualitative research embraces two tensions at the same time. On the one hand, it is drawn to a broad, interpretive, post-modern, feminist, and critical sensibility. On the other hand, it can also be drawn to a more narrowly defined positivist, post-positivist, humanistic, and naturalistic conception of human experience and its analysis (Denzin and Lincoln 1994, p. 576).

Constructivism and subjectivism, together with the theoretical perspectives of critical inquiry with its expression through co-operative inquiry (Heron 1988 and 1996b; Reason 1988, Reason and Bradbury 2001) and strategic questioning (Peavey 1985, 1993, 1997), provided a particularly attractive research pathway in relation to the focus of this inquiry.

I resonate with the feminist aim of dismantling the patriarchy and exposing and ending all forms of oppression (Maguire 1987). Indeed, this comprises a large part of my motivation for researching sustainable co-operative processes. For this research project, however, I did not want to give "discussion of gender a central place on the issues agenda" (p. 105). I considered it more useful to keep in mind a framework for feminist participatory research (Maguire 1987, pp. 105-107) and apply this where I usefully could, e.g., by paying attention to gender representation, the celebration of diversity and the aware use of language.

My experience of knowledge is as much through resonances within my body as through my thinking mind. Research in the mid-eighties by neuroscientist Candice Pert and her colleagues at the National Institute of Mental Health in Maryland found that specific peptides are involved in the relationships between thought and emotions. Capra (1996) referring to Port's (1989 p. 198) description of white blood cells, which are also involved in this linkage, as bits of the brain floating around in the body added that:
The discovery of this psychosomatic network implies that the nervous system is not hierarchically structured as has been believed before.... Ultimately, this implies that cognition is a phenomenon that expands throughout the organism, operating through an intricate chemical network of peptides that integrates our mental, emotional, and biological activities (Capra 1996, p. 277).

Braud (1998) explores a similar theme while describing his expanded view of validity. In this review of indicators of validity, he explores the roles of bodily wisdom, emotions and feelings, aesthetic feelings, intuition, resonance and impedance. In a section entitled 'What is real?' Braud notes:

The considerations of this [chapter] suggest a pluralistic epistemology. A pluralistic epistemology implies a pluralistic ontology. What is true or real for the body of one person may or may not be true or real for the mind of another person. Difficulties arise when one reality is privileged over all others (Braud and Anderson 1998, p. 235).

Heron (1996b) distinguishes between primary meaning (our experience that is 'lived through world'—'our being in a world, that is both prior to the use of language and continuously underneath, and within our use of language') and secondary meaning.

The lived experience of primary meaning is ontologically inclusive of the sensory and the nonsensory, the physical and the transphysical, the real and the imaginal, the subject and the object, the personal and the transpersonal, internal awareness and external form, individual and collective, the hierarchy of contexts and the ground of the hierarchy (Heron 1996b, p. 179).

Secondary meanings are the bifurcations and complementarities within primary meaning, and are conveyed through the non-verbal arts, the uses of language, the social practices and structures within a culture, and individual intentional actions (p. 180).

The recognition of diverse realities and lived experience of meaning, together with their multiplicity of expression through the arts, language, cultural practices and individual actions resonated with my experience of living in the world in a wide variety of roles. These have included professional musician, mother, sports person, community development worker, manager, student, professional facilitator of diverse groups of people and co-author of four books. I also considered that the use of the co-operative
inquiry method would allow for this diversity of backgrounds and knowledge to be expressed in this research project.

**Exploratory Survey**

Exploratory research is initial research to clarify the nature a problem. Descriptive research is research designed to describe characteristics of a population or a phenomenon (Zikmund 1994, p. 11). The survey of facilitators was both exploratory, in that it sought to clarify how facilitators internationally were thinking about ethical issues, and descriptive in that it provided some answers to ‘who, what, when, where and how’ facilitators do their work (p. 11).

The exploratory survey was pretested (trialled) with some facilitators in New Zealand to check the clarity of the questions and the time involved in completing the survey (Zikmund 1994, p. 216, Wadsworth 1997). Some of the questions were revised at this time to ensure clarity. The survey form was distributed during the International Facilitators Conference in Toronto, Canada in May 2000. Around 160 survey forms were handed out personally by the researcher and 126 returned, a 79% return. There were 1100 participants at the Conference.

The survey **took about 10 minutes to complete.** In the substantive section of the survey there were mainly fixed choice structured questions (10) with two or three choices. There were also two open questions designed to encourage respondents to reflect on their own practice and values (Wadsworth 1997, p. 47). The survey form is Appendix C.

**Internet Dialogue**

The facilitated Internet dialogue is a new and developing form. This method involves participants in Internet based written ‘conversations’ between two or more people in different time zones and potentially most places on the planet. Issues surrounding this medium include uninterrupted access to the Internet, choice of language used, reading and writing skills, agreed frequency and time frames, anonymity and feedback. Facilitation issues include courtesy guidelines, managing divergence and convergence and methods of decision-making, (Mittleman et al. 2000). Software tools to support and enable Internet dialogue are now in use and being developed (December 2003).
Misunderstandings between persons in Internet dialogue have arisen from cultural differences, lack of physical cues, and different perceptions of reasonable response time. The immediacy of the Internet and the formality of the written (rather than spoken) word tends to lend itself to exaggerated reactions by some people and temper outbursts known as ‘flaming’. Best practice protocols are now being developed as people grapple with and master the new medium (White 2000).

The opportunities for planetary global conversations and collective learning through the use of Internet as part of this research project far outweighed in my mind the newness and rawness of the method.

**Co-operative Inquiry**

The co-operative inquiry method is a participatory action research method, which gives primacy to practical knowing, critical subjectivity, and living knowledge (Lincoln and Guba 2000, p. 170). It is linked to experiential learning and humanistic psychology, and may be regarded as working within what Maxwell (1984) termed a ‘philosophy of wisdom’. Orthodox science operates within a ‘philosophy of knowledge’, and is primarily concerned with intellectual problems of knowledge and technology, which Maxwell regards as subordinate and peripheral to the main issue of human existence.

This subordinate knowledge enables us to articulate the basic problems we wish to solve and propose, and critically assess possible solutions. This is one of the features of Reason’s (1998) ‘emerging new paradigm’, which seeks to go beyond the common dualistic split between subjective and objective.

Reason (1998) regards co-operative inquiry, with its participatory and holistic knowing as ‘critical subjectivity’, and as knowledge formed in and for action. Emergent understandings he considers as indicators of a genuine new paradigm for human research. He believes that co-operative inquiry meets the essential requirements of such a paradigm shift, in that it presents a discontinuity with the previous dominant worldview and methods that emphasise separation and objectivity.

Critical subjectivity is a quality of awareness in which we do not suppress our primary subjective experience; nor do we allow ourselves to be overwhelmed and swept along by it; rather we raise it to consciousness and use it as part of the inquiry process (Reason 1998, p. 10).
John Rowan (1979), drawing on Hegelian thinking, has referred to this as a leap to the realised level of consciousness; and others (Teilhard de Chardin 1959, Prigogine 1980) have referred to such an holistic approach as evolutionary, with the possibility of whole systems spontaneously shifting to higher levels of complexity. Gladwell (2000) explores the key characteristics of a ‘tipping point’ in an effort to learn how to replicate this phenomenon and to apply this knowledge to social change.

Congruence with subject matter

Heron (1971) considers that orthodox research methods are inadequate for a science of persons, because they undermine the self-determination of their ‘subjects’. He proposes that it is possible to conceive of a research approach where all those involved are self-directed, and in a position to contribute both to creative thinking and to the research and associated action. Co-operative inquiry was developed to provide such a framework for integrating both personal autonomy and group collaboration. The use of strategic questioning (Peavey 1993) within the co-operative inquiry added to its dynamic nature and encouraged the uncovering of new information and the ‘deep desires of the heart’ (p. 1).

I have endeavoured to use research methods in this research in a way that is congruent with the subject matter. Facilitated co-operative processes, the subject of this research (and the sustainability of co-operative processes within organisations), are in themselves collaborative and based on collective decision-making. The following beliefs and values underpin collective decision-making: all people are intrinsically of equal worth; difference is to be valued, honoured and celebrated; it is possible for all people to live and work together co-operatively; and the best decisions are made by those people most affected by them (Hunter et al. 1997; also Fig. 3 The Co-operacy Tree, p. 66).

The research methods used in this research are compatible with co-operative values, including those that require the people involved in the research to also be involved in the design and implementation of the research methods. Both my Internet dialogue and the co-operative inquiry met these criteria and can also be described as participatory action research ‘(albeit social research which is more conscious of its underlying assumptions, and collectivist nature, its action consequences and its driving values)’ (Wadsworth 1998, p. 2).
The use of a survey designed by the researcher might seem less compatible with these participatory dynamic approaches. However, the survey was a way of gleaning useful, initial data and as an indication to participants of researcher initiative and preparation. The survey participants had free choice to be involved in the survey, a professional interest in its contents and were individually sent copies of the results if they requested this. Survey participants were also invited to take part in the subsequent Internet dialogue. In addition, the research findings were offered as inputs into further decision-making by facilitators on ethics, codes of practice and relationship management tools. For these reasons I believe the survey was a useful and valid supplementary method.

A pluralistic epistemology and ontology suggest pluralistic methodologies and methods. The use of three contrasting but compatible methods for the research - a survey, an Internet dialogue and a co-operative inquiry - allowed for comparisons and triangulation, and the possibility of richer and more useful outcomes. The survey provided valuable input into both the Internet dialogue and the co-operative inquiry. The disembodiment of the virtual international dialogue was mitigated by the localised real-time work of a group of people engaged in a co-operative inquiry over time.
Section 2 Literature Context

This literature review examines the key concepts of the research area, beginning with the areas of sustainability, organisational forms and organisational change. The review then addresses facilitated co-operative processes, values and ethics. The flow is from the broad to the specific, with facilitator values and ethics bringing us back full circle to sustainability.

The literature context is presented in a logical linear form, although it did not arise like this. It emerged in waves, each contributing to previous work. This chapter (2.1), which focuses on sustainability, was mainly written after much of the research was completed. Only then did it become of paramount importance. The sections on whole personhood and facilitation also emerged later. The whole personhood chapter (2.5) was difficult to place because it needed to be everywhere at once. Once it emerged, it infused everything else and changed everything, even if most of the words remained the same.

2.1 Sustainability

Choosing a social ecology department to undertake this research encouraged me to place organisations and co-operative processes in a larger context – the whole of humanity and the planetary ecosystem over the long term. Organisational development usually confines itself within the existing economic, social and political systems. I perceived this as often leading to tinkering and reordering, when what is needed is a deeper and more holistic approach. I wanted to keep values in the foreground of my research, and by doing this, contribute to the sustainability of humanity and the planetary ecosystem.

I began writing this chapter in January 2000 while I was attending a Heart Politics summer gathering at the Tauhara Centre, Taupo, New Zealand. Heart Politics is a network of social change catalysts, who gather twice a year as a peer learning and support community. The network takes its name from Fran Peavey’s book ‘Heart Politics’ (1985). I was writing in an chalet set among trees and overlooking New Zealand’s largest body of inland water, Lake Taupo, with the hills in the background rolling towards the towering mountains Ruapehu, Ngauruhoe and Tongariro, at the centre of the North Island. An elegant, lacy frond of the punga (a tree fern) waved
gently across the window. The sustainability of the lake is now considered under threat from pollution from chemical and effluent run-off from the high intensity dairy farms bordering it.

Jim Chapple, a tireless New Zealand environmental educator, was also at the gathering. He asked me about my thesis and what I meant by ‘sustainability’. ‘Not just surviving and keeping on and on,’ I said, ‘but also life-enhancing and life-sustaining’. ‘Good,’ he said, and referred me to two articles he had with him.

One of these was a review in Resurgence magazine by Chris Roth (2000) of Alan AtKisson’s ‘Believing Cassandra: An Optimist Looks at a Pessimist’s World’ (1999). AtKisson’s starting point was the computer modelling of the future described in ‘The Limits to Growth’ (Meadows et al. 1974). The computer modelling showed that no matter what the scenario, humanity’s accelerating growth in population, resource use and pollution, caused the computer model World3 to collapse. AtKisson considers that growth must cease by the ineluctable action of nature if not through conscious decision to rein ourselves in. By ‘Growth’, he means the increase in quantity – of population, resource use and the emission of waste. He uses the word ‘Development’ to refer to improvements in quality – human technology and advances in the human condition, including health, education, intelligence, wisdom, freedom and the capacity to love (AtKisson 1999, pp. 24-25).

AtKisson’s thinking links well with my own view that learning to work well co-operatively is part of the advance in the human condition, and is part of educating us to become more healthy, intelligent, wise, free and loving. We learn to use these ‘muscles’ when we work co-operatively (Hunter et al. 1997). This was also observed as our ‘natural’ behaviour in the Peckham Experiment (Stallibrass 1989).

The other article Jim Chapple gave me was by Wayne Ellwood (2000), in which he seeks to define sustainability, and describes the search that is on for a new approach to economics through redefining relationships – with each other and with the earth itself – based on rational sharing of the planet’s riches. Ellwood asks the following two questions: Can human beings devise a sustainable way of living with each other, and with the earth? And how can we ever expect to get there from here?

The new discipline of ecological economics introduces some key analytic tools for understanding the basics. Central is the idea of ‘natural capital’. This embraces the
complete stock of the Earth's natural assets – fish, forests, arable soil, fresh water, clean air. But it also includes the life support systems which are maintained by the planet itself – the water cycle, the carbon cycle, the protective capacity of the ozone layer, and the waste-absorbing abilities of land, air and water ...the human economy is a subset of the ecosphere, maintained by the ecosphere, not the other way round. That is the key lesson of the natural capital analysis.

The disparities in consumption and wealth are lost in a dizzying glut of numbers about trade deficits and gross national product. But the reality is no different from what George Orwell wrote in *The Road to Wigan Pier* in the 1930s. 'In order that England may live in comparative comfort, a hundred million Indians must live on the verge of starvation – an evil state of affairs, but you acquiesce in it every time you step into a taxi or eat a plate of strawberries and cream (Ellwood 2000, pp. 11-12).

If the way we live in the rich one-third of the world is at the expense of the other two-thirds of the world's population, how sustainable is this? And what effect does it have on our psyches to know that we are living well at others expense? It appears, in my view, simply untenable. 'Sustainability means securing a satisfying "quality of life" for all, one based on material equity and social justice. But it also means challenging fundamental notions of consumer society' (Ellwood 2000, p. 12).

The term 'sustainability' came into prominence in the 1970s when it was linked with 'development'. 'Sustainable development' moved into popular use after the publication of the World Commission on Environment and Development (Brundtland Commission) report, 'Our Common Future' (1987) and was further elaborated in two other major documents, 'Caring for the Earth' (1991) and 'Agenda 21' (1992), which called for policy research and policy making at international, national and local levels. 'Our Common Future' defined sustainable development as 'development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs' (p. 43). 'Caring for the Earth' defined sustainable development as 'improving the quality of human life while living within the carrying capacity of supporting ecosystems', and sustainability as 'a characteristic of a process or state that can be maintained indefinitely' (p. 211).

For a decade now, debate has raged about what sustainable development really means theoretically and in practical terms. Viederman (1994) has argued that sustainability is a vision for the future, providing us with a road map and helping us to focus our attention on a set of values and ethical and moral principles by which to
guide our actions, as individuals, and in relation to the institutional structures with which we have contact, including governmental, non-governmental and work-related (p. 37). Trzyna and Osbourne (1994), in the introduction to The World Conservation Union (IUCN) document ‘A Sustainable World’, quotes one colleague as finding the term sustainable development ‘ambiguous, unhelpful and as ill-defined as ever, not supported by a concrete body of theory and meaning all things to all people’.

Another colleague described the term as an ‘oxymoron’ and preferred the term ‘mutual enhancement’ (p. 16).

Sustainable development has been interpreted by some in business in a utilitarian way as maintaining economic viability, with variable levels of recognition of the dependence of this on the maintenance of social and ecological wellbeing. Professor Stuart Hill at the University of Western Sydney- Hawkesbury, regards his transdisciplinary metafield of social ecology as integrally concerned with sustainability. He advances the following provisional definition of social ecology:

For me, at the moment, it (social ecology) is concerned particularly with “the study and practice of personal, social and environmental sustainability and change based on the critical application and integration of ecological, humanistic, community and ‘spiritual’ values” (Hill 1999, p. 199).

Rather than the usual combination of economic, social and environmental categories associated with the ‘triple bottom line’ business ethics approach, Hill suggests that the inclusion of economics is inappropriately privileging this social construction over and above politics, religion, arts, sciences, education and ethics, and by so doing, perpetrating a narrow monetary system of decision-making, which concentrates power in the hands of the few who have lots of money.

The increasing accumulation of money in a few hands at the expense of the many is well documented with the gross domestic product of the poorest 48 nations (i.e. a quarter of the world’s countries) is less than the wealth of the world’s three richest people combined (World Bank 2001). A few hundred millionaires now own as much wealth as the world’s poorest 2.5 billion people (Forbes 2002). Hill considers money as a social construction that is best regarded as a ‘tool’ that needs to be subservient to, and supportive of, our values and used wisely to help us implement our values (p. 200).
The inclusion of the personal in Hill's definition recognises the importance of individual values, health, knowledge and relationships, as distinct from institutional structures, such as global economics and transnational corporations, which seek to colonise and compromise our individual and collective selves for their own advantage, whilst reframing people as sources of labour and as consumers. It also emphasises the important role of ordinary individuals and small groups in the implementation of desirable change, in contrast to the more usual popular assumption that this is the responsibility of governments, business, experts and others in general.

Hill (1999) explores sustainability, change and sustainable change, and believes that deep sustainable change must involve the integration of personal, social (including economics, political, religious etc.) and environmental considerations.

Hill considers that a dominant culture emphasising growth, greed, individualism, power over, hierarchy and compensatory, stimulatory consumption, the gentler, more connecting expressions of humanity such as maintenance, caring, sustainability, nits, collaboration, sense of enough and community become neglected and occluded.

The result of this is a neglect of that which we hold dear – i.e., the very values that are likely to generate connectedness with self, others, community and place and once, happiness. Hill has tabulated some of the ecological values that are being neglected, blocked and kept in the shadow of the dominant paradigm, in his article 'Social Ecology as Future Stories'. These blocked values need to be given more attention to create a better balance (Fig. 2a).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominant Grand Narrative of “Progress”</th>
<th>Neglected/Blocked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Production (regardless of cost)</td>
<td>- Maintenance, caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Growth, no limits</td>
<td>- Sustainability, limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(resources, ecological,...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Competition</td>
<td>- Collaboration, mutualism, synergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wealth</td>
<td>- Sense of enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individualism</td>
<td>- Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consumerism (emphasising compensatory wants)</td>
<td>- Conserver society (meeting basic needs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Homogenisation</td>
<td>- Maintenance of diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- “Controlling” science (“understanding” science and arts as a disposable luxury)</td>
<td>- “Understanding” science and arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Powerful technologies (often centralised, imported, inaccessible, unrepairable)</td>
<td>- Appropriate technologies (decentralised, locally accessible, repairable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Market forces (manipulated demand, excessive advertising)</td>
<td>- Values based decisions (participatory democracy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Economic rationalism (monetary system of values)</td>
<td>- Meeting the greatest &quot;good&quot; (social justice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transglobal corporate managerialism</td>
<td>- Regional self-reliance and responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mobile work force (disconnected from place)</td>
<td>- Sense of place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The myths that these are embedded in are inadequate for securing a "good" future for most in present and future generations. We need to search for new life-promoting myths that can accommodate these characteristics: some can be found within nature (and ecology).

Fig. 2a. Dominant pressures and areas of neglect in industrialised societies (Hill 1999, p. 204).

Also contributing to new thinking for a sustainable society is Milbrath (1996), who contrasts the values and goals between sustainable and modern societies. He believes that top priority must be given to the good functioning of the ecosystem and second priority must be given to the good functioning of our society. Only when these two are viable is it permissible to seek quality of life in any way we choose. He also regards it as a mistake to give top priority to economic values, as this would lead to a sacrificing of vital life systems at a time when the world population is
increasing and needing those life systems more. He affirms love, justice, security and self-realisation as core values.

A sustainable society affirms love as a core value. It extends love and compassion not only to those near and dear but to people in other lands, future generations and other species. It recognises the intricate web of relationships that bind all living creatures into a common destiny. Life is not mainly conflict and competition between creatures; rather a sustainable society emphasizes partnership rather than domination; cooperation more than competition; love more than power (Milbrath 1996, p. 190).

Fig. 2b. A proposed value structure for a sustainable society (Milbrath 1996, p. 189).

Futurists Barbara Marx Hubbard (1998) and Hazel Henderson (1981, 1991, 1996) are developing a context for conscious ethical evolution in which we can all play a part in a co-creative society. Hubbard believes that sustainable, life-affirming designs will emerge through the efforts of those who are part of the 'social potential movement'.
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In the area of business, she describes the goal as conscious evolution, and calls on businesses and entrepreneurs to apply their genius to the development of socially responsible businesses and investment.

The goal is a sustainable, regenerative economy that supports restoration of the environment, preservation of species and the enhancement of human creativity and community, including expanded ownership, network marketing, community-based currencies, microcredit loans and other such innovations (Hubbard 1998, p. 89).

Henderson (1981) stresses the need to redesign all our systems in the coming of a new age of enlightenment, which will be a ‘Solar Age’ based on light-wave and solar technologies. In this Solar Age, humans will engage in a bottom-to-top design revolution. The centralisation of industrialism would give way to a new devolution: we will reshape our production, agriculture, architecture, academic disciplines, governments and companies to align them with nature’s productive processes in a new search for suitable, humane and ecologically sustainable societies. In her recent work Henderson (1996) discusses the important role of reliable sustainability indicators to assist with this transition.

The developing vision of a sustainable society, indicated above, provides a context for my research. Sustainability requires attention to purpose, particularly if the world is made up of purposeful events and processes rather than random bits and pieces and occurrences (Birch 1990). Co-operative processes happen within organisations, organisations occur within society and society occurs within the world. For co-operative processes in organisations to be sustainable, the personal, social and ecological effects of processes need to be carefully considered.

This demands, for example, recognition that if co-operative processes are used to damage the person, the social fabric, or affect the environment in ecologically unsustainable ways, they would pose a problem. Thus, processes such as co-operation can be used in a variety of ways, both for good or ill. People can, and do, work co-operatively, to wage war, pursue genocide and destroy the environment. An important question arises - for what purpose is the co-operative process to be used? This needs to be clarified and carefully considered. Each group needs to address this question, and each participant needs to check the purpose of the group against their individual values, for alignment. Alignment is needed within the group, and facilitators also need to check their values against the purpose of any group with
which they work. In a similar way, the purpose and values of the organisation need to be considered and alignment needs to take place, both by individuals and groups within the organisation (Birch 1990).

Hence, purpose and values become key areas for considering sustainability with co-operative processes in organisations. Purpose and values determine acceptable behaviour and this is what ethics is about – the alignment of values and behaviour. Sustainable processes imply taking an ethical approach to co-operative activity. Ethical use of processes can be regarded as limiting for some. It involves making judgments about what one does and where, when and how one does it.

This need to recognise and respect 'limits' was the central message of 'The Limits to Growth' study, mentioned earlier (Meadows et al. 1974). It also underpins Aldo Leopold's (1968) concept of a 'land ethic' with the imperative for our species to co-operate and work in mutualistic relationship with the rest of nature. It can also mean that one needs to engage with grey areas where the issues are not clear-cut – all very inconvenient, yet essential, for a consciously lived life. Indeed, as one starts to live this way, most areas are recognised as 'grey' areas.

People's understandings, definitions, values and contexts differ, and so different choices will be made regarding the meaning of 'sustainability'. The intent of my research is to be supportive of the emergence of benign behaviour rather than being prescriptive and more fully aware rather than unconscious. Most things we do involve ethical choices of some kind whether conscious or unconscious. My aim is for this research to be life affirming in the broadest sense.
2.2 Organisational Forms

Organisations exist within the context of human society. Co-operative processes take place within the context of an organisation. The form of the organisation is likely to have an impact on the co-operative processes that occur within them. For this reason, I have examined and contrasted the two most common organisational forms – the co-operative and the corporation to assess how they might affect the sustainability of co-operative processes within them.

Co-operatives

Co-operatives are expressions of an organisational form designed to enable people to work together to achieve common goals. They are working examples of organisational structures and processes that practice economic democracy because the members are both the users and the owners of the business (Craig 1989).

Co-operatives are an important organisational form within which millions of people work and live and engage together in the world today. 730 million people are involved in a worldwide network of national and international co-operatives called the International Co-operative Alliance (ICA 2001, pp. 1-3). This represents 12 per cent of the world population, in over 100 countries of the world and includes the regions of India, Africa, China, Europe, the Americas, Asia and the Pacific.

The International Co-operative Alliance (ICA) defines a co-operative as an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social and cultural needs, and aspirations, through a jointly owned and democratically controlled enterprise (ICA 1995).

A co-operative is a business that is voluntarily owned and controlled by its member patrons, and operated for them and by them, on a non-profit or cost recovery basis. The people who use it own it. The values underpinning co-operatives are self-help, self-responsibility, democracy, equality, equity and solidarity.

The three major types of co-operatives are producer-owned co-operatives (owned by farmers, producers or a collection of smaller businesses producing goods for sale), consumer-owned co-operatives (such as credit unions and food buying co-
operatives), and worker-owned co-operatives (including intentional communities such as kibbutz). There are also co-operatives that combine two or all of these types. Some Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) initiatives, for example, combine producer, consumer and worker ownership (Van En et al. 2002).

The ICA sources the modern co-operative to the Rochdale Equitable Pioneers Society, a co-operative store in Rochdale, England, established in 1844, and when the co-operative principles were developed and which survive to the present day in much the same form. The seven Rochdale principles were adapted in 1995, after a 15-year process of exploring the fundamental values and principles of the international co-operative movement, by the ICA, to become part of a Statement of the Co-operative Identity. The co-operative principles are guidelines by which co-operatives put their values into practice. The seven key principles are:

1st Principle: Voluntary and open membership
Co-operatives are voluntary organisations, open to all persons able to use their services and willing to accept the responsibilities of membership, without gender, social, racial, political or religious discrimination.

2nd Principle: Democratic member control
Co-operatives are democratic organisations controlled by their members, who actively participate in setting their policies and making decisions. Men and women serving as elected representatives are accountable to the membership. In primary co-operative members have equal voting rights (one member, one vote) and co-operatives at other levels are also organised in a democratic manner.

3rd Principle: Member economic participation
Members contribute equitably to, and democratically control, the capital of their co-operative. At least part of that capital is usually the common property of the co-operative. Members usually receive limited compensation, if any, on capital subscribed as a condition of membership. Members allocate surpluses for any or all of the following purposes: developing their co-operative, possibly by setting up reserves part of which at least would be indivisible; benefiting members in proportion to their transactions with the co-operative; and supporting other activities by the membership.

4th Principle: Autonomy and independence
Co-operatives are autonomous, self-help organisations controlled by their members. They enter into agreements with other organisations, including governments, or raise
capital from external sources, they do so on terms that ensure democratic control by
their members and maintain their co-operative autonomy.

5th Principle: Education, training and information
Co-operatives provide education and training for their members, elected
representatives, managers and employees so that they can contribute effectively to
the development of their co-operatives. They inform the general public - particularly
young people and opinion leaders - about the nature and benefits of co-operation.

6th Principle: Co-operation among co-operatives
Co-operatives serve their members most effectively and strengthen the co-operative
movement by working together through local, national, regional and international
structures.

7th Principle: Concern for community
Co-operatives work for the sustainable development of their communities through
policies approved by their members (ICA 1995).

'These are the values and principles which give voice to the enduring soul of the co-
operative movement.' The ICA considers them as 'inherently practical principles,
fashioned as much by generations of experience as by philosophical thought' (Hoyt
1996, pp. 6-7).

Since its creation in 1895, the ICA has been accepted by co-operators throughout
the world as the final authority for defining co-operatives and for determining the
underlying principles that underpin co-operative enterprises. More than 230 national
and international ICA members represent agriculture, banking, credit and saving,
energy, industry, insurance, fisheries, tourism, housing and consumer co-operatives.
One of the major purposes of the ICA is to promote and protect co-operative values
and principles.

The ICA has close liaison with the United Nations. In a message to the ICA
Millennium Congress and General Assembly, in August 1999, in Quebec, the United
Nations’ Secretary-General Kofi Annan said:

With more than 760 million members, your movement is indeed one of our key
partners. In some countries, you have become the second largest employer,
surpassed only by the public sector.
Your work helps to promote all the values to which the United Nations is most devoted and to implement the decisions taken at the great global conferences of the 1990s. That means you are working for peace, for sustainable development, for human rights, for education and health care for all, for the advancement of women, for full and productive employment, and above all, for the elimination of poverty (Annan 1999).

ICA 1995 figures showed that virtually all of Sweden’s dairy production is marketed by farmer-owned co-operatives; in Norway, 75 per cent of forest products are processed and marketed by co-operatives; in Italy, 60 per cent of wine is co-operatively produced. Fourteen farmer-owned co-operatives in the USA are among the 500 largest corporations, and no fewer than eight of the ten largest Canadian firms are co-operatives (Cracknell 1996, pp. 1-5).

In New Zealand, most of the dairy and horticulture industries are managed by producer-owned co-operatives. The business entity with the largest turnover in New Zealand, Fonterra Co-operative Group, a producer-owned co-operative of nearly 14,000 farmers, is responsible for 20 per cent of New Zealand’s overseas earnings and 7 per cent of GDP.

Fonterra was formed in 2001 from a merger of the New Zealand Dairy Co-operative Group, Kiwi Co-operative Dairies and by incorporating the assets of the New Zealand Dairy Board. The new group, with NZ$11 billion in assets, will operate in 120 countries and employ 20,000 people. It is the 9th largest dairy company in the world and the world’s largest exporter of dairy products (Fonterra 2001).

In New Zealand in the 1970s, some groups of people (inspired by ‘alternative’ co-operative values) bought up rural land, set up intentional communities and organised themselves as co-operatives (Joan 1975). This trend had some encouragement in the early 80s when the Labour Government provided marginal land for further intentional communities (known as ‘ohonu’). Few of the ohunu survive today, but many of the intentional communities that are located on more productive land are still in existence, and they are a feature of the Coromandel Peninsula near Auckland.

Government support for co-operatives has at times included an advisory service and the provision of a manual for work co-operatives (Fitzsimons 1982). I have been engaged by a number of these communities over recent years as a facilitator of co-operative processes.
Co-operatives have their own legal structures, which vary somewhat from country to country. The co-operative is an entity, and is not synonymous with ‘working co-operatively’, or ‘co-operative processes’. These latter may be applied in any setting, including co-operatives. Co-operatives operate according to democratic principles – one person, one vote. Most use a majority decision-making process (rather than achieving consensus) among shareholders.

Peter Waterbasse (1950), in his book ‘Co-operative Peace’, describes the co-operative method as the epitome of democracy and the basis of peace.

Democracy springs from the people; autocracy is imposed on the people. Democracy gives everybody an opportunity; autocracy gives autocrats opportunity. ... The co-operative method, by the use of every device that promotes democracy, stands for peace; for peace is based on democracy.

Any method of business based on democracy, integrated among owners of business and consumers of its product, makes for peace. Indeed, permanent peace can be expected in a world where such a method of business is the predominant way of production and distribution (Waterbasse 1950).

The connection between democracy and peace is taken further in ‘Co-operacy - A New Way of Being at Work’ (Hunter et al. 1997). Here autocracy, democracy and co-operacy are compared and contrasted. Co-operative processes leading to consensus are promoted as a more peaceful way of operating than the majority decision making of democracy, which pits the majority of people against the minority and tends to polarise issues in decision-making.

Co-operatives are principled organisations, and can be monitored against their seven principles. The 7th principle, with its concern for sustainable development of communities, clearly places the co-operative in the conversation of sustainability. This is at a community level only, but given the now increasingly recognised ‘interdependence of all things’, it is a small step to take to work for a sustainable environment for the planet.

In the period since 1988, a change has been occurring in the environment for co-operative development. In particular, there has been an increased willingness by the World Bank to support co-operatives in Eastern and Central Europe as well as in so-called ‘less developed countries’. The Co-operative Agenda 21 has also been
developed and a Trust Fund for Co-operatives and Sustainable Human Development established (Thordarson 1996, pp. 1-2). The implementation of Agenda 21 was reviewed in August 2002 at a World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, South Africa. I was involved as a facilitator in the lead-up to this at a preconference stakeholder Implementation Conference.

Problems with co-operatives

Co-operatives are, of course, not without problems. Historically the major problem globally has been the dependence of co-operatives on state legislative and regulatory controls. The ICA’s 1992 Stockholm Congress Report stated this as follows:

If there is one fundamental obstacle to the long term growth and success of co-operatives in the South, it is their continued dependence upon, and in many cases control by national governments...The ICA have worked to change this attitude and claim some success which is reflected in legislation in many countries of the South giving autonomy and independence to co-operatives to enable them to serve their members (Thordarson 1996, pp. 1-2).

The large co-operatives, such as Fonterra in New Zealand and the farmer owned co-operatives in USA, are major world players that employ many thousands of people who are not themselves members of the co-operative. For these employees there is arguably little difference between being employed by a large co-operative and a large corporation. The internal hierarchical structures and bureaucratic ways of working are usually the same as in most corporations. Some aspects of co-operatives have also led to disappointment among members. These include the following:

a) rigid bureaucratic organisations oriented towards an elite rather than the membership;
b) organisations in which the business perspective dominates and the co-operative vision is lost;
c) situations where opportunists take over the leadership positions and the co-operative is used to defend the status quo rather than to create positive change;
d) organisations that are not large enough to transform the economy, but are perceived as too large for future generations to relate to;

e) lack of responsiveness -- situations where growth within the sector is followed by stagnation as the organisations prove incapable of shifting development to needs in other sectors (Craig 1989, p. 69).

Many of these problems have come about in both the West and the (former) Communist world because the ‘co-operative logic’, or mind set has not been part of the dominant world-view or 'paradigm'. Hierarchy and bureaucracy have been, and still are, seen as the natural way of doing things whereas the logic of co-operation is that of heterarchy and holism. Up to now, when co-operatives run into difficulties, these are usually 'solved' by experts who impose hierarchical and bureaucratic management solutions from within the dominant paradigm (Craig 1989, p. 72).

The old paradigm assumed a hierarchy of external controls with a strong centre; but the logic of co-operation implies internal controls and self-regulating groups co-operating with the centre rather than being dominated by it. Groups work together as equals in federations; here the centre is controlled by the periphery and not the reverse (Craig 1989, p. 70).

Management theory may need to address the complexity and diversity of equitable and participative processes, within decentralised and federated organisations, and embrace their different ways of working, different problems and challenges.

Corporations

The organisational form we know today as the corporation was a creation in the 17th century of the British monarchy, which granted charters to companies to carry out trade overseas, under certain conditions and for a specific time-span as set out in the charter. Charters could be, and were, removed if the sovereign considered they had been breached. Early examples were the British East India Company, the Hudson Bay Company and the Massachusetts Bay Company, all of which were granted charters by King Charles I in 1628. These were known as 'crown corporations' and they provided the main structure through which colonisation and settlement occurred (Grossman and Morehouse 1999).
In the USA, the colonies were known as crown colonies and were closely associated with the crown corporations. After the War of Independence 1776/7-81, the role of chartering the corporations was taken over by the individual states, which issued them with certificates of incorporation. In exchange for receiving the charter a corporation was obliged to obey all laws, to serve the common good and to cause no harm. Early state legislators wrote charter laws, and the actual charters to limit corporate authority, and to ensure that when a corporation caused harm, their charter could be revoked.

Having thrown off English rule, the revolutionaries did not give governors, judges or generals the authority to charter corporations. Citizens made certain that legislators issued charters, one at a time and for a limited number of years. They kept a tight hold on corporations by spelling out rules each business had to follow, by holding business owners liable for harm or injuries, and by revoking charters (Grossman and Morehouse 1999).

Over time, the corporations gradually extended their powers through the courts of law. Throughout the 1800s, under pressure from industrialists and bankers working through the law courts, judges gave corporations increasing rights. This culminating in 1886 when the US Supreme Court ruled in Santa Clara County vs. Southern Pacific Railroad, that a private corporation was a 'natural person' under the US Constitution, and therefore sheltered by the 14th Amendment (even though that amendment had been written and ratified to protect the rights of freed slaves).

This legally defined corporations as 'natural persons' and they were automatically covered by the Bill of Rights as human beings, with the same rights of freedom of speech, and the ability to participate in elections and lobby officials, and compete on equal terms with neighbourhood businesses and individuals. The history of commercial law is essentially the history of corporations extending their power - most recently through globalisation initiatives including the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) (Korten 1998, Karliner 1997).

Some prominent people condemned the excesses of corporations. Louis D Brandeis, a multimillionaire (from his own law practice and astute investments), and a Supreme Court Justice, referred in 1916 to corporations as 'the Frankenstein monster which states have created by their corporation laws' (Morris 1996, pp. 2-6).
The success, and rapid growth and development of corporations, is one of the defining trends of the 20th Century. By 1995, the combined sales of the world's top 200 corporations (employing 18.8 million people, 0.03 per cent of the world's population), equalled 28 per cent of the total world gross domestic product. The total sales of the Mitsubishi Corporation were greater than the gross domestic product of Indonesia, with its 200 million people – the world's fourth most populous country. The annual sales of Wal-Mart, the 12th largest corporation in the world, has an internal economy larger than that of 161 countries – including Israel, Poland and Greece (Korten 1998, p. 42).

The value base of the corporation

The assumption that individual profit is 'natural' and desirable is widely regarded as self-evident at least in the West. Unlike the co-operative, which has an explicit set of global principles, the value base of the corporation is neither explicit nor much discussed. The respectability of capitalism is seldom questioned.

I find it refreshing, therefore, to come across a dialogue between Paul Hawken and David Korten (1999) entitled 'Corporate Futures', in which they explore whether corporations contribute to positive change in the world, or whether they inevitably are part of the problem. Korten describes capitalism as a term that came into use in the mid-1800s to refer to an economic and social regime in which the ownership and benefits of capital are appropriated by the few to the exclusion of the many, who through their labour make capital productive. This seems to describe all too well the reality of the present global system of business.

I've chosen to take on the role of the small boy in the story, "The Emperor's New Clothes" and break the embarrassed silence to affirm that capitalism is about naked greed and is the mortal enemy of markets, democracy, and ethical values. It turns out that this is a very empowering message for most people as it affirms what they suspected to be true all along (Hawken and Korten 1999, p. 1).

Hawken responded that capitalism, as conventionally defined, is a system where the means of production are privately held rather than being in the hands of the state. Capitalism arose from industrialism without any particular framework or values. It was sometimes given lofty virtues by observers, much as conservatives do to this
day, but social and environmental values were never intrinsic. Capitalism simply emerged.

No one said, wouldn't it be cool to have a juggernaut economy of unprecedented productive capacity that destroys the capacity of every living system on Earth, where over 90 per cent of the world's wealth would be concentrated in the hands of 2 per cent of the people, and the other 98 per cent wouldn't mind because they were being anesthetized by shopping and the eventual prospect of having more material goods. My comment that capitalism might be a good idea is a rhetorical jab at the extreme internal contradictions of the present system. It is, in Hazel Henderson's words, a system where the divine right of kings has been replaced by the divine right of capital (money) (Hawken and Korten 1999, p.1).

Addressing the question, 'are corporations as they are constituted reformable?' Hawken commented that there are some that should have their licences taken away and individuals jailed. He believes that transnational corporations cannot perform an 'honourable' role, but they are nevertheless here and this is the dilemma.

Corporate mergers

Far from disappearing, in the last decade, especially since the reformation of the Soviet Union's state-controlled economy, there has been an increase in large corporations and corporate mergers, and a thrust to increase the power of corporations in relation to the power of national governments. The rate of corporate mergers and the consolidation of corporate power is escalating. European mergers and acquisitions set a record of $US400.6 billion in 1996, double the level of just two years earlier. Worldwide mergers totalled $US1.63 trillion in 1997, up 48 per cent from 1996 (Korten 1998, p. 43).

Fifty-one of the largest 100 economies in the world are now corporations rather than countries. These corporations are multi national and global in reach, and they are not democracies either. They are private organisations, accountable only to their shareholders, most of whom are non-participating silent partners. And they are co-operating aggressively through such bodies as the World Trade Organisation (WTO), and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), to improve their global position and gain parity with national economies through mechanisms such as
the Multilateral Agreement on Investments (MAI). The whole thrust is towards breaking down all barriers to ‘free trade’ (Mander and Goldsmith 1996).

Although many corporations still source their operations from the USA, this is changing rapidly as tax advantages and a lack of social and environmental regulations lead corporations to locate to countries that offer the best deal. This shifting of companies to find better deals and tax havens is also to be found within New Zealand. A notable government inquiry in New Zealand in the 1990s, the so-called ‘Wine Box’ inquiry, was about using the Cook Islands as a tax haven to avoid paying New Zealand taxes. One of New Zealand’s largest corporations, Brierley Investments, moved from New Zealand in 1999, and is now incorporated in Bermuda, has its main listing on the Singapore Stock Exchange, and holds its shareholder meetings in Hong Kong, despite the fact that most of its shareholders live in New Zealand (Gaynor 2001).

There is a growing concern about the danger of negative effects of corporations. Part of this concern relates to the lack of controls that corporations are subject to and their tendency to drive wages down in developed countries by relocating or threatening to locate wherever the source of labour is the cheapest (Klein 2001). There is also concern about the reduction in people employed as technology takes over jobs, the accent on short-term profits for uninvolved shareholders, rather than long-term sustainability, and the wrecking of the physical environment globally. Concern is growing about global initiatives to free up trade across national borders, through instruments such as the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), WTO, and initially secret treaties such as the infamous MAI, which seeks to break down all barriers to trade, including those relating to culture, environment and health.

Decline of co-operatives in the USA

It is interesting to note that the public discourse around the importance of co-operatives and the co-operative movement virtually disappeared off the agenda in the United States during the 20th century. This was largely because co-operatives were considered to be associated with socialism and, in the USA, little distinction is made between socialism and communism. The corporation, and capitalism, were increasingly regarded as the only path to progress, development and freedom.
Altenberg (1990) writing about Leland Stanford, the founder of Stanford University, and a great supporter of co-operatives, explores why Stanford’s efforts to pass legislation supporting co-operatives failed, and why his vision for a university that would provide education to support worker co-operatives was not translated into the structure and curriculum of the university. He refers to factors such as the absence of a mass movement, the election of McKinley as President, the defeat of the Populists in 1896, the crushing of the co-operative movement, and the ill health and premature death of Stanford himself.

Stanford had a vision of a co-operative commonwealth – a system of worker-owned co-operatives – and this formed the core of a mass political movement in the United States, the Populists, which was at its zenith in the 1880s. The Populists (involving millions of southern farmers and northern industrial workers) was the last mass movement in the United States to challenge the growing domination of society by burgeoning corporations. After the defeat of the Populists in the 1890s, the labour movement that emerged accepted a social contract that gave corporations the role of initiating and controlling employment, production, services and capital. The labour union movement merely sought to give workers better contracts within the structure of control. Ever since the defeat of the Populists, the idea of worker ownership of corporations has been relegated to the margins of political debate and creativity, a niche so marginal that, particularly in the USA, the idea is quickly dismissed by most as socialistic, utopian, or simply quaint (Altenberg 1990).

Lawrence Goodwyn, an historian of the Populist era, describes the ‘triumph of the corporate state’, which removed from mainstream reform politics the idea of people in an industrial society gaining significant degrees of autonomy in the structure of their own lives. ‘The reform tradition of the twentieth century unconsciously defined itself within the framework of inherited power relationships’ (Altenberg 1990, p. 17-22). In the USA, the co-operative vision disappeared from the public debate:

> the ultimate cultural victory being not merely to win an argument but to remove the subject from the agenda of future contention, the consolidation of values that so successfully submerged the “financial question” beyond the purview of succeeding generations was self-sustaining and largely invisible (Altenberg 1990).

Despite this invisibility in USA public discourse, co-operatives and the co-operative movement worldwide have continued to develop. With the rise of the mega co-ops,
the influence of the ICA within the UN, and the increased support from the World
Bank, the co-operative remains an important organisational form. Indeed, with 730
million people involved in the ICA network (ICA 2001) the co-operative movement
would appear to involve many more people than the large corporations, the top 200
of which directly employed only 18.8 million people in 1995 - only 4% of those in co-

Rethinking organisational forms

Management writers, including Handy (1998a and b), Korten (1998), Covey (1998)
and Osterberg (1993a and b), are beginning to question the basis of capitalism and
the corporation and its applicability for the future. Their references to core worker
ownership, stewardship of one’s own resources, and intellect as wealth, all point to
the need to develop new organisational forms that are possibly closer to that of the
co-operative than the corporation.

Handy believes that the whole system needs to be rethought. He reflected that
communism had a cause – which was, ideally, a sense of equality and prosperity for
all, that all people were and could be equal – but it didn’t have an ‘appropriate
mechanism’ to deliver that cause. Whereas capitalism is a mechanism that lacks a
comparable cause (Handy 1998a, p. 29).

> Capitalism depends on people working terribly hard to make other people rich, in the
> hope, often misplaced, that they will get rich themselves. Under capitalism, growth
> depends on making people envious of other people so they want what others have. I
> find this a rather distasteful view of the world (Handy 1998a, p. 28).

The first stage in rethinking capitalism is to be absolutely clear about its objectives,
beneficiaries and impacts. Handy argues that we have to realise that the new source
of wealth is intelligence, not land or money or raw materials or technology. It is the
brains and the skills of people.

It is intellectual capital rather than money that is more important, both now and into
the future. Although intellectual property can be owned retrospectively, (after ideas
have been written or codified in some way), Handy considers that, unlike money,
intellectual capital cannot be owned in any real sense. The people who own the
intellect are the core workers of the company. In other words, it is the assets who
own the assets, because one cannot in any real sense own another person, who can always take their intellect elsewhere (Handy 1998a, p. 30).

If the real assets of capitalism are people and we want to avoid exploitation, and slavery is no longer possible, then what are corporations for? Swedish media magnate Osterburg (1993a) believes that there is currently a raising of human consciousness, with a new kind of thought emerging, characterised by a balance between thinking, feeling, and a high regard for intuition. He believes the real aim of companies should be the personal development of the people in them.

In the old way of thinking, companies existed primarily to make a profit. In the new way of thinking, companies exist primarily as structures within which people come together to create cooperatively. The raison d'être for a company is to supply an environment within which personal development of the human beings in the company can best take place (Osterburg 1993a, p. 33).

Korten (Hawken and Korten 1999) supports the need for a mindful market economy that functions in a community-based, democratic, balanced and sustainable way. He believes that we need to move towards a mindful market economy – one that is self-organising, democratically accountable to all people, rewarding productive behaviour, providing a decent means of livelihood for every person, encouraging ethical behaviour, and functioning in a balanced and sustainable relationship with the other living systems of our planet.

A mindful market economy has no need for institutions created for the sole purpose of enriching those who are already wealthy and concentrating economic power without democratic accountability. The problems arise from a combination of excessive size, concentrated ownership, and lack of accountability, and are best resolved by replacing the global publicly traded, limited liability corporation with human scale, stakeholder-owner enterprises that are accountable to the communities in which they are located. Nor is there any place in such an economy for financial speculation (Hawken and Korten 1999, pp. 3-8). Furthermore the promise of economic growth, progress and the trickle-down effect, are false promises. What we have are societies made up of ‘haves’ and ‘have nots’ – with the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer (Handy 1998a, p. 26), and 20 percent of the world’s population controlling 80 percent of the resources.
If company law is not changed, the stock exchange will increasingly function as one huge casino, hardly a sensible basis for any economy. The law must be changed so that financiers can only be financiers and not owners. Handy (1998b, pp. 29-32) argues that the meaning of business will have to change from being an instrument of the owners to make them rich, and that employs other people as instruments of the organization to realise that aim, to being something more like a community with a defensible purpose.

Tension also develops as a result of increasing polarisation of financial rewards with enormous earnings being paid to the CEOs of large corporations. In regard to earnings, the gap between top management and the front line workers continues to grow. According to Business Week's 1998 annual survey of CEO compensation, CEOs of the largest US corporations have enjoyed an increase in total annual compensation, including stock options, of $7.8 million – 326 times the average factory worker.

US-style CEO packages are now moving into Europe, pressing European CEOs to focus on shareholder return to the neglect of other goals in the same manner as their American counterparts (Korten 1998, p. 81).

Ethical investment, environmental auditing, and 'green' accounting to internalise harmful environmental costs, are all becoming important populist mechanisms to influence corporations towards sustainable use of resources, and against exploitative practices. Significant amounts of investment capital are now being channelled through ethical investment funds such as the Calvert Group, promoted by Hazel Henderson (1996, p. 237). These funds use environmental and human rights criteria to inform investment decisions.

The issue of purpose, however, remains inadequately addressed. If the primary goal of corporations is to remain vehicles of 'naked greed' and to make as much profit as possible for shareholders, then their purpose is indeed mad (Jesson 1999). We must openly face the ethical challenge of this both personally and collectively.

Senge (1992, p. 17) has noted that the average lifetime of the largest industrial enterprises (the Fortune 500) is less than 40 years, roughly half the lifetime of a human being. Indeed, one third of the Fortune 500 companies are not even there
seven years later (Handy 1998a). Perhaps these large corporates do not live long because they are so unhealthy.

Owen (1994, p. 83) describes ‘millennium organisations' as open systems in which ‘spirit [is] becoming manifest in time and space'. He believes that an organisation is either expressing the spirit of the people in them, or is decaying towards death. Handy describes our times as chaotic, and the future as not completely ordained. This means that we are in a position to influence the future – and that’s what excites him (Handy 1998a, p. 17).

In ‘Co-operacy – A New Way of Being at Work', Hunter et al. (1997) explore the idea of peer-based organisations and suggest that an organisation is a community of people, a living system, a collective consciousness with an integrated web of mutually supportive relationships. Within them, people come together (organise) to achieve a common purpose and to flourish individually. In this book, we ask the question - If organisations are indeed communities, who would want to own a community or be in a community owned by others (p. 146).

This chapter has considered the two major organisational forms – the co-operative and the corporation – and shown them to be based on very different values. I have also outlined how both of these organisational forms are now subject to increasing processes of change and fluidity. In the next chapter I explore in more depth current management theory and how this might impact on people seeking to work together co-operatively.
2.3 Organisational Change

Organisational and management writing burgeoned during the later part of the 20th Century, particularly in support of the corporate sector. Research moved from the exploration of how to make large industries more effective by planning, command and control, and measurement, through performance management, quality control, restructuring, downsizing, and re-engineering, to the present trends, which promote maximum flexibility, flatter structures, real and virtual teamwork, franchising and contracting out, and to networked organisations, which may have no centre at all, but be of a system of strategic alliances.

Senge (1998), Covey (1998), Wheatley (1992), Toffler (1998), Hammer (1998), Semler (1993), and others, have documented a shift in awareness occurring from perceiving organisations as machines – complex objects to be analysed, understood, then directed, controlled and manipulated to become a better functioning object – to perceiving them as communities of people, each with its particular focus and defined purpose, who work and learn together as a collective intelligence to produce the best possible result.

The organisation is not mechanical: it’s organic. It lives and it grows, and it’s made up of living, growing people. People can’t be fixed. They have to be nurtured over time. The right conditions need to be created, together with the right climate for growth and opportunity. This takes time and cannot be rushed (Covey 1998, p. 44).

Words like plan, operate, control, and measure do not reflect the natural flow of events. Things can be steered a little, but we have got to learn to live with chaos and uncertainty, to try to be comfortable with it and not to look for certainty where we are unlikely to get it (Handy 1998a, p. 23).

Handy considers that information technology has robbed institutions of their authority, because with a computer on her desk and instant access to the Internet, each ‘knowledge worker’ can know as much as the boss does, and often much more. So these knowledge workers take on greater responsibilities and become, in a sense, liberated from traditional corporate authority. Institution and business controls, dependent on limiting access to information, are breaking down. Handy (1998a) believes that society, therefore, is out of control because we are systematically
destroying all the authority and all of the control that our institutions once had. We are giving society a mind of its own. We are ‘on the edge of chaos’ where there is a great potential for creativity and also for confusion (p. 26).

Structures are becoming much looser, more ‘ad hoc’, more ‘organic’ and more web-like. Hammer (1998) asserts that management as a concept, and as a major feature of organisations, is obsolete. He believes that there will be three main kinds of people in the future organisation, none of whom are managers in the usual sense. Most will be value-added performers, the people who do the real work – whether it’s routine or highly creative work. There will be a small cadre of coaches who facilitate and enable them; and a handful of leaders who will direct the organisation (pp. 99-100).

Senge (1998) also believes that there is still a need for some hierarchy within organisations, but it will be more of a hierarchy of guiding ideas. He cites Visa International and The Natural Step as examples of this decentralised networked way of working, noting that their distribution of power is very different from traditional organisations (p. 141).

Handy (1998a) proposes a highly flexible federalist model for organisations with a small core or ‘doughnut’ surrounded by networks and partnerships. He supports core responsibilities and room for self-expression and initiative, more autonomy and teamwork, and more portfolio workers. He asserts that the concept of work itself, and the very definition of work, is changing. Work used to mean having a job with an employer, but today it increasingly means working for yourself, and even by yourself. In the near future, half of the workforce of the developed world will be working ‘outside’ of the organisation. Handy envisions enormous flexibility and many contradictions in the future.

I believe that the key to progress and even to survival in life and work is to be aware that contradictions can coexist, and to learn to live with them. For instance, I argue that organizations have to be centralized and decentralized at the same time. They need to be both global and local. Differentiated and integrated. Tight and loose. They plan for the long term and yet stay flexible (Handy 1998a, p. 21).

The arrival of the third wave of wealth creation in the form of knowledge is heralded by Alvin and Heidi Toffler (1998). They distinguish the first wave as agriculture and the second wave as industry. Today’s knowledge revolution has launched a gigantic ‘Third
Wave' of economic, technical and social change that is forcing businesses to operate in radically new, continually shifting ways. The industrial faith in such things as vertical integration, synergy, economies of scale and hierarchical, command and control organisation is giving way to a fresh appreciation of outsourcing, minimisation of scale, profit centres, networks and other diverse forms of organisation. Every shred of industrial-era thinking is now being rescrutinised and, according to Toffler, brilliantly reformulated.

It is precisely when an old paradigm crumbles and the new one is not yet fixed in place that we get great bursts of creative thinking. This is such a moment (Toffler 1998, p. ix).

The creative thinking of such post-mechanistic organisational development is centered around the idea that organisations are, after all, just made up of the people within them. This optimistic approach contrasts sharply with Naomi Klein's (2001) analysis of corporations as obsessed with branding or 'strut over stuff' (p. 196) and intent on minimising the labour content of their production costs by outsourcing work to contractors in the Asian export processing zones (EPZ). These zones, estimated at around 1000 in number, are spread through 70 countries and employ around 27 million workers. Here contractors who supply to the major brands employ young non-unionised workers in unstable jobs for long hours at less than subsistence wages (Klein 2001, pp. 205-6). Handy, Covey and Toffler are presumably not referring to these workers when they refer to the knowledge wave.

Learning organisations (Senge 1992)

There are many management theorists, however, who regard the future as bright and do not perceive any unresolvable tension between organisational goals and those who work directly or indirectly to meet them.

Senge (1992) considers that people need to address their belief systems and take on more useful beliefs. For example, he believes that giving up the belief of a world of separate, discrete parts allows for the development of learning organisations, and this will be the key to organisational survival. If organisations are able to continually expand their capacity to be visionary and creative, and their ability to learn at all levels within the organisation - the individual, team, and the organisation - then it will be possible for both people and organisations to create the results they truly desire.
The organisations that will excel in the future will be those organisations that discover how to tap into people's commitment and capacity to learn. These 'learning organisations' can be distinguished from traditional authoritarian 'controlling organizations' in their mastery of vital basic disciplines; systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, team learning and shared vision (Senge 1992, pp. 4-9).

Real learning gets to the heart of what it means to be human. Through learning we re-create ourselves. Through learning we become able to do something we never were able to do. Through learning we reperceive the world and our relationship to it. Through learning we extend our capacity to create, to be part of the generative process of life. There is within each of us a deep hunger for this type of learning. It is, as Bill O'Brien of Hanover Insurance says, 'as fundamental to human beings as the sex drive' (Senge 1992, p. 14).

Alongside the learning disciplines, Senge identifies seven learning disabilities or barriers to transformational learning. These beliefs and attitudes make it difficult for people to shift to becoming self-directed learners. They include, 'I am my position', 'The enemy is out there', 'I can take charge', the delusion that 'I can learn from experience', and the parables of the management team (highly skilled incompetence), and the boiled frog (a frog boiled in slowly heated water will not jump out like a frog will if dropped into boiling water).

In addressing the need for team learning, and the importance of people dropping or leaving aside their hierarchical position to take part in dialogue, Senge (1992) advocates local decision-making as a way forward. He considers the challenge of less hierarchical organisations where managers need to become listeners, coaches and mentors. This is difficult for many and involves a mind-shift and commitment to continual learning.

The ambivalence of many senior managers to giving over greater authority and control of decision-making is, Senge believes, rooted in fear of loss – of becoming unneeded, somehow less important or more window dressing in the locally controlled organisation. One of the big problems plaguing organisations that become more localised is that corporate management, paralysed by the fear of what they might lose, is neglecting this very important new role (Senge 1992, p. 288).
As a senior manager in a large organisation who has made the shift to working co-operatively in a small business, I consider that Senge is only partly correct in his analysis. Fear is a factor, but the power of conditioning and patterned behaviour is a larger problem. One may want and be committed to change, but changing behaviour is not easy. It is hard work, requiring tremendous effort and changes are often hard won. Learning to treat people as equals and becoming a peer learning community is, I believe, an enormous shift that is often underestimated. Traditional parenting and schooling, as well as organisational life, do not train us to behave from a basis of equality.

**Spirit of organisations (Owen 1987, 1994)**

Harrison Owen (1987, 1994) has dedicated many years work to the development and practice of what he calls ‘open space technology’. This is a method through which people can meet and work through issues in a liberating way. Open space technology now has a considerable following and open space conferences involving up to 1000 people are being held regularly world wide.

Whereas Senge focuses on the development of learning organisations, Owen (1987) identifies the essence of organisations as ‘Spirit, or more exactly, the process of transformation and development through which Spirit takes form in the shapes and structures of our existence’ (Owen 1987, p. 4). Spirit cannot be bought, ordered or directed. It responds positively to what Owen calls ‘inspiration’. Furthermore, spirit will not stay in special little compartments of time and space, allowed out only at coffee breaks, or on the athletic field. When spirit is pushed into a box, it dies (Owen 1994, p. 48). Owen believes that the focus needs to be on spirit, and the ways it seeks to be expressed in an organisation, and on how the structure can be designed to follow the expression of the spirit.

In his book ‘The Millenium Organization’, Owen (1994) develops his ideas further, describing the organisation as a fluid, responsive organism with shifting boundaries. The fundamental character of this millenium organisation model is revealed in its celebration of life as an open system. It is constantly engaged in dialogue with the world around and indeed the difference between the world and the organisation is, more often than not, a matter of perception. *Inside* and *outside* become relative, and
sometimes meaningless terms, and boundaries a matter of focus and convenience rather than hard determination (Owen 1994, p. 25).

Owen believes that the relationship of organisations with competition will change. Rather than 'business is war, co-operation is for wimps, and winning is everything', competition will serve a larger purpose of realising potential and actualising their latent gifts (Owen 1994, p. 26).

Because the word 'spiritual', for many is associated with bizarre rituals, other-worldly or irrational behaviour, Owen prefers 'spirited', which he considers implies a certain power, zest, élan, or joie de vivre. It is at once earthy and transcendent, describing the sort of place where feet stay on the ground and heads touch the clouds.

It is pleasant in such organisations to see people enjoying themselves. It is awesome to watch their energy and satisfying to witness the results. Compared to other ways of being in organisations, Owen finds it embarrassingly simple. He believes that things work as well as they do because little if anything gets in the way. Inappropriate, multi-tiered structures, hung over from another day are banished. In short, barriers to doing a job quickly, with excellence and pride, are eliminated. 'It is an amazing fact: that left to themselves good people do good work, and enjoy it. And the Spirit is fantastic' (Owen 1994, p. 49).

The 'form follows spirit' approach to organisations is revolutionary and important, in the context of research into co-operative processes in organisations. If co-operative processes (including 'open space technology') provide a useful container for the spirit of an organisation, then such co-operative technology needs to be readily available. The structure of the organisation needs to follow this spirit and adapt, change and transform as needed, to express the developments and changes of the spirit.

A weakness with Owen's approach, however, could be that he does not adequately address the need to reflect on one's values and behaviour. He believes that people will behave well if they are given enough 'open space'. Alternatively, he considers that those who do not like or adapt to open space are 'Ego-driven control freaks [who] have found it useful to seek alternative employment' (Owen 1994, p. 49). This suggests that good people like open space and bad ones do not – a very judgmental stance. He does explore some of the limitations of open space in his writing and in a
private conversation with me, he agreed that open space often has critics at the
events themselves and that to work effectively the method requires a clear stated
purpose (Owen 2001). This confirmed my own experience as an open space
facilitator.

Person-centered approach to organisations

A half century ago, biologist Julian Huxley (1954), in an essay, 'The Evolutionary
Process', suggested that human beings are now developed enough to become self-
directing:

The present situation represents a highly remarkable point in human history in which
the evolutionary process as now embodied in man has, for the first time, become aware
of itself and has a dawning realization of the possibilities of its future guidance and
control. In other words, evolution is on the verge of becoming internalized, conscious
and self-directing (Huxley, quoted in Pedler et al. 1990, p. 8).

In an interesting article comparing the person-centered approaches of Carl Rogers
and Paulo Freire, Maureen O'Hara (1989) explores the differences and similarities
between these two influential thinkers and practitioners. O'Hara worked extensively
with Rogers, and also met and studied the work of Freire. O'Hara comments on both
men's 'unshakeable faith in human beings and their potential'. Rogers had placed his
faith in what he describes as 'the formative tendency' or 'self-actualizing tendency' for
growth born with each person. He assumed that as long as life remains, this tendency
remains. He even insisted that the self-actualizing drive survives, even in people so
abusively dehumanised that it appears that nothing of humanity remains. Rogers
never gave up on people, nor did Freire.

Freire's faith, like Rogers', in the inextinguishable push for transcendence, is
unshakeable. Whether he is speaking of downtrodden peasants, hotheaded terrorists,
oppressed women, or even life-negating torturers or agents of oppression, he insists
that all are born to live human lives, to be subjects of their own experience in a world of
other conscious beings (O'Hara 1989, p. 13).

Handy (1998a and b), Heron (1996), Owen (1987), and Pedler (1990), all draw
attention to the spiritual essence of individuals, groups and organisations. If we
consider the well-being of the individual as a whole person, we are likely to recognise a complex organism that has physical, emotional, intellectual and spiritual aspects.

Pedler believes that as human beings we are body, soul and spirit, and in organising we work with all of these three aspects of people and collectivities. A 'whole person' or 'whole organisation' approach to development is therefore, in part, a spiritual quest (Pedler 1990, p. 13). We need to radically change our ideas of what organisations are, he believes, towards an emerging view of them as focused energy, powered by self-developing people, continually changing shape and direction. His hunch is that this may have something to do with spiritual and ethical development (Pedler 1990, p. 15).

Roger Harrison (1983), a specialist in self-directed learning, also writes about participating in our own evolution. He uses the term 'conscious evolution' to refer to the idea that after millennia of evolution, we humans are at last on the verge of becoming aware of the transformative process in which we are involved. As we become aware, we can begin to participate voluntarily in our own evolution and that of the planet. We can influence the quality of life on earth through our thoughts and beliefs.

Believing that we need to discover a new relationship to autonomy, and uncover our core vision and values, Margaret Wheatley (1992) considers that the new science principle of 'self reference' is most important and uses this as a basis for creating order. This requires trust as it shifts the focus from the objective world to the subjective world.

Within the constant flux within nature there is global stability. Nature creates ebbs and flows at all levels. The motion of these forces is kept in harmony by a force that we are just beginning to appreciate: the capacity for self reference. Wheatley describes this as each part of the system remaining consistent with itself and with all other parts of the system it changes, instead of whirling off in different directions. Even simple cells recognise the intent of the system of which they are a part, and conduct their individual activity in relation to the whole.

Self-referencing is one of the best 'tools' for leaving behind the mechanistic world of Newton. We can use self-referencing to sort out the living from the dead. This gives us the means to identify the open systems that thrive on autonomous iterations from
the truly mechanistic things in organisations that do best at equilibrium. Before we can use self-reference, however, we need to address a deeper problem. We need to be able to trust that something as simple as a clear core of values and vision, kept in motion through continuing dialogue, can lead to order (Wheatley 1992, pp. 146-7).

Self-referencing and learning, like autonomy and co-operation, are not in opposition. They are necessary partners. Learning is a collective activity. We learn from, and with, one another. This comes about through the emerging of differences, which can be a painful experience at times. We need to develop emotional intelligence (Goleman 1995), emotional literacy (Steiner 1997) and emotional competence (Heron 1989), so that we can work through differences and handle the emotions that surface as we learn and integrate new and uncovered knowledge of self, others, and the world. It is important to recognise the shadow side and work with this also to achieve integration.

The aim of the learning process is to re-integrate the noted difference within the higher unity of the human being who, in so doing, becomes a more developed person. So, for example, if I see myself as a kind person and allow myself to become aware of my maliciousness, this will at first cause me pain, as it does violence to my self-image. If I can reach understanding, accept both the kindness and the malice in myself, accept and forgive myself, then I have developed from an earlier, now naïve position, to a later, wiser one. Development is here a struggle to become aware of our “shadow” selves and to integrate these into our acknowledged selves (Pedler et al. 1990, p. 12).

If we are to create organisations that are flexible and adaptable, equally adept at co-operation and competition, able to be appropriately conservative in the face of opportunities or threats, able to change in good order with, or even in advance of, the circumstances, then we will need to know how to make the most of our differences, and spend the time and resources to see the development process through.

Wheatley (1992) suggests a dynamic, open, ever-changing way of working and being, within organisations, which would take the focus off tasks and onto process, and require skills such as group facilitation.

To live in a quantum world, to weave here and there with ease and grace, we will need to change what we do. We will need to stop describing tasks and instead facilitate process. We will need to become savvy about how to build relationships, how to nurture growing evolving things. All of us will need better skills in listening, communicating, and
facilitating groups, because these are the talents that build strong relationships (Wheatley 1992, p. 38).

Co-operacy and 'co-operative logic'

Wheatley's vision is similar to that of myself and my co-authors in (Hunter et al. 1992, 1994, 1997, 1999). For example, in 'Co-operacy – A New Way of Being at Work' (1997), we explore co-operative ways of working together based on personal autonomy, strong, peer-based relationships and co-operative processes. We explored team work, coaching, mentoring, peer counselling (co-counselling), peer development groups, peer reflection (feedback, self and peer assessment), and peer inquiry (strategic questioning, strategic dialogue and co-operative inquiry). We detailed 61 co-operative processes for exploring and developing peer relationships, whole personhood, power, alignment, conflict, spirituality, the shadow side, teamwork, coaching, mentoring, peer counselling, peer development groups, peer reflection and organisational meeting models.

Where we reached the limit of our knowledge at that time, however, was in how these co-operative ways of being, relationships, and processes, could be sustainable in hierarchical or transitional organisations that did not know how to support them in sustainable ways. I concur with Craig (1989) that co-operative theory has so far failed to develop effective models for internal organisational democracy for large organisations and that this will need to come from deeper understanding of 'co-operative logic'. Craig considers this involves a non-exploitive, holographic mental approach that recognises that groups must understand and learn from their own contexts; that decisions are context dependent and therefore indeterminate, and that non-linear, multi-causal connections lead to morphogenetic rather than imposed change. Indeed 'co-operative logic' means grappling with the frustration that blueprints and blanket models will not and cannot be forthcoming.

With organisational forms in a fluid and chaotic phase at this time, the opportunity does exist, however, to influence some of the ways of working, and possibly the forms, that future organisations will take. If people and groups within organisations have the will and desire to create more individually empowering and co-operative workplaces, and have the tools (the processes), the practitioners (facilitators), and the understanding (the theoretical/political and ethical frameworks), then they will (as form follows spirit), create over time the organisations to sustain these practices. However,
individuals or groups will not necessarily be able to change existing oppressive structures that lack clear ethical frameworks and that are designed to support people motivated by greed, domination and control.

Given that organisational forms are becoming more and more fluid and variable, and that the whole area of organisational structure is in the melting pot, I have come to the conclusion that focusing further on the structure or form of organisations will not help to answer questions regarding sustainable co-operative processes in organisations. The focus of this research needs to be more on people, ways of being, values and processes. In particular, it needs to address how people who want to work co-operatively can influence change, and to identify what beliefs, mental frameworks and processes and behaviours are needed for people to effectively influence organisations to become more life-enhancing and co-operative.
2.4 Facilitated Co-operative Processes

Co-operative work is enhanced by, and dependent on, co-operative processes. This chapter explores this way of working and specifically the role of the facilitator.

A co-operative process can be defined as an activity involving people that is introduced with agreement by all participants, encourages full participation, provides ongoing choice, respects diversity and autonomy and uses consensus decision-making. It is not coercive, manipulative or autocratic (Hunter et al. 1994). This research focuses on facilitated, consensus-based co-operative processes, which I will refer to here simply as co-operative processes.

A process is 'useful' in some way. It is designed to meet a purpose - with results, outcomes or desired effects, e.g., chopped wood, sales targets or aesthetic satisfaction (as in a dance sequence). The sense a process makes depends on the understanding of the observer. Understanding comes by connecting beliefs, assumptions, and values into sets. We recognise a process because we have mental models that can accommodate it (Senge 1992). Understanding is itself a process, and one that is value laden. A process cannot be recognised or understood without attaching value to it. Therefore a process cannot be value neutral.

A process, in the above sense, is a series of actions or activities that have an observable sequence and a predictable outcome or range of possible outcomes. It has a beginning and an end; can be short or long, continuous or interrupted, and it can be observed and replicated. A process is more flexible and fluid than a structure. A structure is set in place to last over time. For example, a building is a structure, whereas the activity of building it requires a series of processes. Owen (1987) writes about organisations as 'forms' that follow spirit. Co-operative processes are also 'forms' that are more flexible and fluid than organisational structures.

Axelrod (1984) has examined under what conditions co-operation will emerge in a world of 'egoists without central authority'. He, however, admits that although people tend to look after themselves and their own first, they also know that co-operation does occur and that our civilisation is based upon it (p. 3). I will not be examining the theory of co-operation or game theory as part of this research. Key references to this include Axelrod (1984), Myerson (1997), Ridley (1996) and Gintis (2000).
As Axelrod (1984) explains, co-operation can evolve from small clusters of individuals who base their co-operation on reciprocity and have just a small proportion of their interactions with each other (p. 21). The co-operative processes discussed below all need to be freely chosen by autonomous individuals who want to work together.

Kinds of co-operative processes

Co-operative processes can be as simple as a 'check in' round at a group meeting, where each person speaks in turn uninterrupted, and as quick as a team 'high five' after a decision has been reached or an action taken. Co-operative processes can also involve many steps over several days, such as strategic planning or peer review. When a number of processes are involved, the consecutive processes may be referred to as a method. An example is the Technology of Participation (ToP) workshop method, which includes processes of contexting the task, brainstorming the data, ordering the data, naming the categories, and evaluating the work and its implications (Spencer 1989, p. viii).

The ToP focused conversation method (called ORID), Strategic Planning, and their Workshop Method, are described in Spencer's (1989) book 'Winning through Participation'. Hunter et al. (1992) in 'The Zen of Groups' describes 100 co-operative processes and refers to them as 'tools' (p. 89).

Common co-operative processes include:

- Visioning and planning session
- Facilitated meetings of all kinds
- Facilitated conflict resolution
- Open Space Technology conference
- Appreciative Inquiry process
- ToP processes, such as ORID
- Search conferences
- Self and peer-assessment processes
- Peer development processes
- Co-counselling sessions
- Wisdom circles
- Strategic dialogue
- Team decision-making processes
- Brainstorming
- Priority setting
- Co-operative inquiry

Co-operative processes are, of course, not new. Many indigenous peoples have given an honoured place to co-operative processes, although not all of these involve a
facilitator in the way we now define this role. The Maori of Aotearoa/New Zealand generally talk about major issues among the tribe or extended family, speaking one at a time without interruption until consensus emerges (Taurua 1986, Metge 2001). Co-operative processes are particularly associated with matriarchal societies, feminism, the Society of Friends (Quakers) and the peace movement. The feminist movement did much to disseminate co-operative processes and consensus decision-making among women (Eisler 1987, Starhawk 1987).

Community building

Co-operative processes are also associated with community building (Peck 1987). Peck found that groups need to move together through a predictable process of pseudo community, chaos and conflict, and emptiness to reach 'authentic community' (p. 107). By working sensitively through conflict, exposing weaknesses, hurts and vulnerabilities, a deeper level of relating can be reached. Such processes require experienced leaders who can gently guide the group to an awareness of unhelpful and unconscious patterned behaviours, which must then be worked with and through to achieve authentic community.

These processes of healing can be interrupted or sabotaged in unexpected ways, and people may feel even more hurt and damaged if the process is not handled well. Sometimes, even with the best of intentions, things can go wrong (Hunter et al. 1997). The result of a process cannot be guaranteed. A theoretical process can be judged 'good', or possibly 'elegant', if it meets all the necessary stated criteria towards meeting purpose and outcomes. The practical application and outcome cannot be entirely predetermined, however, as circumstances may have changed or be different from those anticipated and human error may have occurred.

In a chapter entitled 'Hammer and Nails: Technology is not Neutral', O'Hara (1989) explores power issues in group processes. She refers to the need for emotional openness in situations of unequal power and the danger of emphasising technique over intentions. Indeed, the same 'technology' can be used for vastly different (sometimes completely opposite) ends.

Farson, in O'Hara (1989), has discussed the contradictions for humanistic psychology that occur when too much emphasis is placed on technique. He points out, for
instance, how emotional openness and dialogue are enormously powerful techniques for the solution of some kinds of human problems. He notes, however, that between parties with unequal positions of institutionalised power, openness and dialogue tend to favour the most powerful. There are situations in which silence may be the only expression of power oppressed people have access to (O’Hara 1989, p. 16).

A problem that arises from using consensus decision-making as an integral part of the definition of co-operative processes is that a legally constituted, co-operative organisation that is democratic would not fit the definition.

Both corporations and co-operatives use a variety of decision-making methods — autocratic, majority and consensus. Both co-operatives and corporations use majority decision-making at the member/shareholder level. The main difference here is that co-operators have ‘one person, one vote’, whereas corporations have one financial share, one vote. This means that the people who have the most shares have the most influence. At a management level, both corporations and co-operatives may operate in a hierarchical manner, using autocratic decision-making, or they may encourage and promote co-operative processes based on equity, such as those involved with teamwork. It would seem apparent, however, that the ICA Statement of Co-operative Identity including the values of self-help, self-responsibility, equality, equity, and solidarity (ICA 1995) are aligned with co-operative processes as described in this chapter.

The role of the facilitator

Facilitation is the body of expertise within which co-operative processes are developed, implemented and maintained. Although some co-operative processes are codified, many are specifically developed to serve particular situations. A facilitator (or group facilitator) does this work. Significant knowledge of co-operative methods, processes and tools, is brought together in the various approaches or schools of facilitation. Facilitation is a key area for this research.

Facilitation, or group facilitation, is the term used to describe the practice of the person (facilitator) who introduces and guides the co-operative processes used to assist a group to achieve its purpose or goals. The facilitator has the role of introducing and maintaining co-operative processes, and she guides the process by which a group
meets its purpose, using co-operative processes that encourage group members to be both self-directing and co-operative whole persons. Facilitation is associated with consensus decision-making. The facilitator’s role can be contrasted with that of a chairperson in a committee meeting, who usually manages the processes with majority decision-making (Hunter et al. 1994).

Psychologist Carl Rogers (1969, 1977), a pioneer of facilitation, describes the role of facilitator as follows:

The facilitator is genuinely free of a desire to impose ready-made truths or to control the outcome.
The facilitator has skills in helping people engage in genuine dialogue.
The facilitator respects the capacity of the group to discover the nature of their own problems and has the skills in helping people to express that capacity.
A respectful hearing is given to all attitudes and feelings, no matter how ‘extreme’ or ‘unrealistic’.
The members of a group are permitted to choose, collectively and individually, their own processes and towards their own goals.
If these conditions apply, then a process is set in motion that has certain characteristics.

The Process

Long-suppressed feelings will surface, many of them angry and bitter. Because these feelings are accepted and not judged, more people will express themselves, and the range of feelings will widen.
As people become vocal, visible and known, trust and mutual respect will be strengthened.
Irrational feelings lose their power, both by being fully expressed, and by feedback from others.
Feelings based in common experience are clarified and strengthened, leading to a greater self, and group, confidence.
Collective understandings become more realistic and less irrational.
Power struggles between members are resolved, and collaboration increases.
Actions emerge that are aimed at changing the existing situation. In a good group, these actions will be innovative and transformational, as well as realistic.
Group solidarity is strong enough to support individuals to take even radical action.
(Rogers 1977, in O’Hara 1989, pp. 12-13)
Facilitation and decision making

One of the earliest manuals for facilitators, written by a group of facilitators based at the Centre for Conflict Resolution in Madison, Wisconsin, US, (Auvine et al. 1978), addresses facilitation in a values and consensus-based context, and contains a wealth of wisdom about facilitating groups. Auvine et al. (1978) names the values of democracy, responsibility, co-operation, honesty and egalitarianism as key for facilitation and also outlines a code of ethics for facilitators. This code covers demystifying the role, group responsibility, not using facilitation techniques to control and manipulate the group, sharing skills with others without personal profit, not pretending to be a psychotherapist or functioning in this role, not using the group to meet one's emotional needs, making sure the group understands what you are doing, and holding the facilitator accountable to the group. Consensus decision-making (also referred to as just ‘consensus’) is regarded as being value based and defined as follows:

A decision-making process in which all parties involved explicitly agree to the final decision. Consensus decision-making does not mean that all parties are completely satisfied with the final outcome, but that the decision is acceptable to all because no one feels that his or her vital interests, or values, are violated by it (Auvine 1978, p. xii).

In contrast to this, and writing around the same period, Hersey and Blanchard (1979) developed a flexible and context sensitive quadrant management model of telling, selling, participating and delegating, with the manager's role of encouraging participation the most similar to that of the facilitator. Part of their argument is that different situations demand different forms of communication, and that flexibility is required. There are dangers in being stuck in any one form. They identified seven bases of power, identified as potential means of successfully influencing the behaviours of others. These were coercive (based on fear), legitimate (based on position), expertise, reward (ability to provide them), referent (personal traits), information (access to), and connection (to the most important/influential people in or about the organisation).

The feminist movement has been closely associated with consensus decision-making and facilitation. The collective has been a popular structure used for women's consciousness-raising and working together. This form was favoured, as it was non-hierarchical. Hierarchy was critiqued as the way men worked and maintained power.
over women. (Social ecology pioneer, Bookchin (1991) also wrote extensively in condemnation of 'hierarchy'). Starhawk (1987), writing in 'Truth or Dare – Encounters with Power, Authority, Mystery' writes about consensus as the preferred decision-making structure for groups, and notes that it is also an expression of the value placed on each member as an equal.

Consensus is not so much a decision-making process as a listening and thinking process involving the group mind. It is a fully participatory way to explore issues, problems and options, not just a way to choose between alternative courses of action. The stronger a group is as an entity in itself, the better consensus works (Starhawk 1987, p. 183).

According to Starhawk (1987) many of those who love the consensus process regard it as a spiritual practice rooted in the idea of each person's immanent value. The North American peace movement adopted consensus from the Quakers, whose religion recognises the inner light of the spirit as immanent in each human being (p. 184).

Starhawk believes that facilitation is not always needed, but that clarity and brevity are served by using it, as the facilitator can recognise those who wish to speak, keep the group focused, and help move the discussion through the shared agenda. She considers it important for everyone in the group to be responsible for equalising participation, and speaking up about this, if people are over or under-participating in a way that stops the group being fully empowered. This view regarding equalising participation, however, needs to be finely balanced with personal preference and choice to participate.

Facilitation literature

The body of written material relating to facilitation has grown enormously over the last decade, with John Heron being a leader in defining this field. His book, 'The Facilitators' Handbook' (1989), was revised and republished in 1999 as, 'The Complete Facilitators Handbook'. Heron uses the term 'facilitator' to describe a person who has the role of empowering participants to learn in an experiential group which he defines as one in which learning takes place through an active and aware involvement of the whole person – as a spiritually, energetically, and physically endowed being, encompassing feeling and emotion, intuition and imagining, reflection and
encompassing feeling and emotion, intuition and imagining, reflection and discrimination, intention and action (Heron 1992). His approach is aimed at therapy, personal development, professional development, and management training, and all groups in higher, adult and continuing education.

He redefines teaching as facilitation of self-directed learning with a movement through three decision modes, from direction (hierarchy), through negotiation, (co-operation), towards delegation (autonomy). There is a danger here of implying that this is a useful progression with autonomy rather than co-operation as its goal. In addition direction does not always imply hierarchy, e.g., 'pass the salt' and effective co-operation arguably requires autonomy and choice.

This definition of facilitation as facilitating or empowering learning is shared by some other writers, including Frances and Roland Bee (1998), and tends to shift the primary focus more to the individual's development. Many would critique the idea that any one can 'empower' anyone else and prefer the idea of supporting participants to reclaim their abilities and act in powerful, aware, creative, collaborative, caring, joyful and loving ways (Hill 2000). This interpretation is congruent with the group and action-centred approach of Auvine et al. (1978), Schwarz (1994), Dick (1991), Hunter et al. (1992).

Hunter et al. (1992) consider the role of the facilitator as a leadership role in which the facilitator's job is to guide the group process towards a group achieving its agreed purpose. We explain that the facilitator guides the group through or past pitfalls and danger and towards the enabling and empowering pathways that will allow for synergistic action to show up. In a fully effective group, each participant may have the skills and experience to facilitate the group and the role may be rotated. In practice, the skills associated with group facilitation are not well developed or known, and the facilitator may be the particular person(s) in the group who has the skills most developed. An 'outside' facilitator may also be brought in by the group to carry out this role (Hunter et al. 1992, pp. 22-23). A facilitator's role is closely associated with collective decision-making and a set of values that support this. (Hunter et al. 1997, pp. 7-8).

Underpinning collective decision-making are some beliefs and values. These include the beliefs that:

- all people are intrinsically of equal worth
- difference is to be valued, honoured and celebrated
- it is possible for people to live and work together as peers
- the best decisions are made by those people who are affected by them.

The Co-operacy Tree

Fig. 3. The Co-operacy Tree (Hunter et al. 1997, p. 9).

For collective decision-making to work it needs to be underpinned by a commitment to reach agreement. This is sometimes spoken as an agreement to reach agreement. This does not mean everyone needs to agree on everything. Everyone may agree to disagree, delegate the decision-making to one or more, agree in smaller groups to do different things and even agree to use a simple majority or another percentage for decision-making as an interim measure.

It does mean, however, that everyone is committed to working issues through. There is an imperative for the people disagreeing to propose another course of action and actively take part in the effort to find a solution which will work for everyone. There is no power of unmovable veto, e.g., "This is my position, I'm sticking to it and I won't discuss it." This would be autocracy in reverse.
In our book 'Co-operacy - A New Way of Being at Work', (Hunter et al. 1997) we coined the word 'co-operacy' to distinguish the co-operative paradigm (which rests on collective decision-making) as distinct from democracy (which rests on majority decision-making) and autocracy (which rests on one person deciding on behalf of others) (p. 7).

Working co-operatively is often challenging because the technology is either not developed or not learnt as part our social conditioning. We asserted that co-operative ways of working need to be developed, invented or rediscovered so that they can become a readily available choice. These ways of working are what we named the 'technology of co-operacy' (p. 8).

In Hunter's approach to facilitation, the facilitator is clearly chosen by, and accountable to the group. Roger Schwarz (1994) also takes a group-centred approach.

Group facilitation is a process in which a person who is acceptable to all members of a group, substantively neutral, and has no decision-making authority, intervenes to help a group improve the way it identifies and solves problems, and makes decisions, in order to increase the group's effectiveness (Schwarz 1994, p. 4).

Schwarz (1994) divides facilitation into basic and developmental facilitation. The two approaches imply different roles for the facilitator. In basic facilitation, although the group may influence the process at any time, in general, it expects the facilitator to guide the group using what he or she considers effective process. In development facilitation, members expect to monitor and guide the group's process, and expect the facilitator to teach them how to accomplish this goal (p. 6).

Schwarz also stresses that facilitation is value-based, and that these values guide effective group behaviour, and effective facilitator behaviour (p. 8). He lists the key values as valid information (sharing and understanding information), free and informed choice, and internal commitment to these choices (people being personally responsible for the choices they make as part of the group). Schwarz (2002b) added a fourth core value, that of compassion. Interestingly, the co-operative inquiry in this research (see Section 3.6) also identified 'love and compassion' as central to sustaining co-operative processes in organisations (see pp. 177-178).
Facilitators enable groups to improve their process by helping them to act in ways that are consistent with the core values. In development facilitation, the group members develop the ability, over time, to identify when they have acted inconsistently with their core values, and to correct their behaviour — without a facilitator's help. In basic facilitation, the group uses a facilitator to help it act consistently with the core values, temporarily, while working with the facilitator (p. 9). Harrison Owen (1987) describes the facilitator's role as facilitating the journey of spirit using mythos (story) as a key. He describes some interesting case studies using his approach.

There are seven key characteristics of facilitation in the literature (e.g., Schwarz 1994, Starhawk 1987, Rogers 1969 and 1977, Hunter et al. 1994):

1) a group with a purpose and/or goals
2) free and informed choice by individuals and the group
3) internal commitment to, and accountability for, choices made
4) accent on empowerment, consciousness-raising, whole personhood.
5) the facilitator as process guide
6) values of autonomy, participation, collective wisdom and synergy
7) preference for consensus, both for decision-making and as a way of being.

The various writers emphasise different aspects, often according to their primary field of experience — education, therapy, community development or organisational development.

As more teamwork and co-operative processes are being introduced into organisations, including businesses, over the last decade, facilitation has become a burgeoning area of practice and of writing. This growth is illustrated by the increasing number of titles on the amazon.com global bookstore, which now has more than a hundred titles on facilitation and group facilitation, most of them practical handbooks written over the past five years (www.amazon.com).

Despite the existence of this literature, the profession of facilitation is still in the early stages of its development. Some of the better-known approaches are now being referred to as 'schools'. These include the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA), a committed group of social pioneers who have been active in designing and applying methods for human development in communities and organisations in many parts of
the world since 1972 (Stanfield 2000); the worldwide network of open space facilitators (Open Space World 2001) and the Zenergy College of Co-operative Technology with its Diploma of Facilitation (Zenergy 2001).

**International Association of Facilitators**

In 1994, a group of ICA facilitators established the International Association of Facilitators (IAF), which since 1995 hosted an annual international conference, and since 1999 has published an academic journal. The IAF has developed an accreditation process, and runs an Internet dialogue group of 900 members worldwide (IAF webpage www.IAF-world.org).

After discussion at forums sponsored by the IAF and ICA over the period 1999-2000, a set of facilitator competencies was drawn up and presented in the second IAF Journal, Winter 2000, in an article by Virginia Pierce, Dennis Cheesebrow and Linda Mathews Braun. This article outlined a model that had been developed by a task force of the IAF. The task force identified 18 competencies, grouped into six categories. These categories are: (A) engage in professional growth, (B) create collaborative partnerships, (C) create an environment of participation, (D) utilise multi-sensory approaches, (E) orchestrate the group journey, and (F) commit to a life of integrity (Pierce et al. 2000, p. 27). The article explains that the model is an aid to understanding what the roles and value of facilitators are, and what they do.

Facilitators are committed individuals of any age from various walks of life who have a wide variety of educational backgrounds. They value the positive power of group decision-making. In their activities, they honour the individuals who participate in a group, and the group wisdom that emerges through the facilitated process. Facilitators employ processes that include the contribution of each individual within a group (Pierce et al. 2000, p. 25).

Valued competencies include: evoking group creativity, blending learning and thinking styles, honouring and recognising diversity, ensuring inclusiveness, facilitating group awareness, modelling profound affirmation, asking the depth questions of oneself and others, trusting the group's potential, and modelling neutrality (Pierce et al. 2000, p. 24).
This competency model is value-laden, although values are not usually addressed directly. Schwarz, commenting on the competencies in the same journal, notes a missing competency as the ability for facilitators to rigorously reflect on their own practice in a way that enables them to identify gaps between espoused values/beliefs and actual values/beliefs, as reflected in the actions taken with clients and colleagues. He believes that this competency is fundamental to creating the same kind of learning and transformations in facilitators, as the competencies advocate for the facilitator's clients (Schwarz 2000, p. 33).

The expansion of facilitation into the business area over the last 10 years has seen the term 'facilitator' often used loosely to describe managers, consultants, trainers, and others who use some facilitative techniques as part of their work in other professions. This co-option of the term 'facilitator', has meant that facilitation skills are also sometimes used by people who have little or no training, are unable or unwilling to work through conflict, are uncommitted to consensus, and do not have an understanding of emotional competence (Hunter et al. 1994).

The use of facilitation in businesses and large corporations brings with it some interesting ethical issues, particularly around the relationships between the organisation, the owners or shareholders, the manager, the group, and the facilitator, and the use of consensus decision-making in a hierarchical organisation. Misuse of co-operative processes to 'manufacture consent' (Chomsky 1988) and manipulate people to agree to management goals has been identified as a practice by some facilitators. Values and ethics is an area that is just beginning to be addressed by the IAF. They were and are explored in detail in the Internet dialogue (reported in Chapter 3.3).

Another emerging issue is that of 'virtual' facilitation for telephone, video, and Internet conferencing, using different place/time participation. A variety of software tools now designed to assist in these processes, including polling and priority-setting tools. As these technologies are new, little information exists to guide facilitators as to the best practices for conducting virtual facilitation (Mittleman et al. 2000, p. 5). Facilitators are also identifying that lessons are to be learnt from facilitating people who are dispersed over time and space (see Chapter 3.4).
Facilitated co-operative processes as described in this chapter are found to be integral to co-operative ways of working and aligned with the values of the co-operative organisational form. The sustainability of co-operative processes, however, depends on their use by persons who are themselves integrated and compassionate. Compassionate and embodied whole personhood is explored in the next chapter.
2.5 Whole Personhood

The co-operative inquiry part of this research (sections 3.5 – 3.7) culminated in a realisation that each of us as whole persons, fully present in our bodies (embodied) and therefore able to connect with others and the environment, was the critical factor for enabling co-operative processes to flourish.

In this chapter I explore theory relating to whole personhood without attempting to be definitive. I purposely exclude detailed areas of psychology such as personality profiling and psychological testing (Kline 1993), and psychometrics (Rust and Golombok 1999). These associated areas though interesting and helpful are not of primary importance to this research.

The social environment, the organisation, and the group are all comprised of individual human beings. A human being intent on control, domination, oppression, resource stripping, denial of such behaviours and other 'distress behaviour' cannot necessarily be stopped by a co-operative process, or a supportive group or organisation. Firstly a human needs to value co-operation, equity and compassion and be willing to put these values to work in practice. Even then, co-operation requires a degree of personal development that not all individuals possess.

For a person to come fully into being, there needs to be a deep level of self awareness, together with positive regard for both self and others. These three qualities work consistently together to support development and the actualising of inherent potential (Rogers 1989). If this process is interrupted, then there may be denial, distortion and defensiveness, together with an inability to empathise with others. If a person is unable to empathise or has no awareness of 'you' as distinct from 'me' (Derrida 1984), then their ability to work together in co-operative ways will be seriously impaired. Co-operation is about self-directed individuals relating.

We are separate and we connect, we are autonomous and collective, separate and together. We are also individually wholes and collective wholes. Wholeness means that all the parts belong together, and that means that they partake in each other. Thus, from the central idea that all is connected and that each is part of the whole, comes the idea that each must participate in the whole. Thus participation is an implicit aspect of wholeness (Skolimowski in Reason 1988, pp. 10-11).
Skolimowski (1985, 1995) has examined the history of knowledge in terms of a succession of world views or cosmologies, each of which has held sway for a while, to be replaced by one that is more adequate for its time. The mechanical Newtonian cosmology has brought enormous material benefits through the development of science and technology; but it has also has a dark side such as ecological devastations, human and social fragmentation, spiritual impoverishment. A replacement for this mechanical metaphor has not yet fully crystallised although new themes are emerging quite consistently as aspects of a new world view. One of these is wholeness. Another is the idea of evolution (especially co-evolution) in which whole systems may spontaneously shift to higher levels of complexity.

The four quadrant multilevel transpersonal meta models of Wilber (1985, 1996) and the integration of these with spiral dynamics and 'memetics' by Beck and Cowan (1995) and Beck (2001a and 2001b) have provided interesting ways of mapping our psychosocial and psychocultural evolution. The idea is of a human spiral consisting of a coiled string of increasingly complex world views, each the product of its times and conditions and containing remnants of previous systems, which remain on call as circumstances require. Each world view is born out of chaos, in a non-linear fashion, so there is no straight arrow of time back into history.

Our universe, as a spiraling pattern of tendencies beginning with the spiral nebula, is also the inspiration for Paul Ritter (2001), who regards spiraling itself as a relating combination of cyclical tendencies for preservation and directional evolving from A to B. For Ritter, the discovery of the nature of the energy process of relating was crucial, because he recognised that it is the functioning order of nature that encompasses creative unpredictable chaos. He identifies three phases of the rhythm of relating:

Attraction: the initiating phase: tendencies come together;
Fusion: the creative combination of tendencies;
Liberation: the availability of newly created tendencies for further attractions.
We relate to grow. I relate therefore I am. I become. We relate therefore we are. We become. Spiraling fusions all! What a potential! (Ritter 2001, p. 1).

This basic universal tendency to attract, fuse and liberate can be life positive or life negative, from the 'Homo sapiens viewpoint'. The development of 'sensitive positive futures' is a choice and the 'thrill of life' (Ritter 2001, p. 1).
Heron (1999) grounds his approach to facilitation in the work of developing human potential and whole personhood, and describes ‘feeling’ as distinct from emotion as the ground of personhood, and the capacity to participate in ‘wider unities of being, to indwell what is present through attunement and resonance’. Through feeling we become at one with the content of experience, and at the same time know our distinctiveness from it. This is the domain of empathy, indwelling, participation, presence and resonance (Heron 1999, p. 45). Feeling is part of ordinary perception, and does not require any special psychological journey to experience.

Heron also regards whole personhood as a web of relations, and hence within the framework of general systems theory (Bertalanffy 1968) and the post-positivist paradigm of Bateson (1980). A whole person then is not simply the integration of internal parts but also the integration of wider wholes of which the person is a part. A whole person is defined in terms of both internal and external relationships. Heron (1999, p. 310) describes these relationships as intrapersonal, interpersonal, cultural, ecological, and transplanetary (see Fig. 4, p. 75). Others (Koestler 1978) have viewed these as holons within holons.

The placing of the whole person within an ecological web (which may also be part of a dynamic spiral) matches the essence of this thesis, which also places persons, cooperative processes, and organisations within cultural and ecological fields. Heron (1999, p. 311) considers that human ecology has both a biological relationship between organism and environment — and a cultural component. Within the later, he emphasises relationship, including dialogue and engagement between the people in a culture, and with the more-than-human world of nature and all its diverse entities and presences. He also includes in this ecological web the culture’s economic relations, in the use of natural resources in industry and agriculture, 'and the various sorts of interactions involved in town and country planning, communication and transport systems, wildlife conservation, climate control, waste disposal and so on'.

Within the transplanetary field, Heron includes the psychic and subtle, and the unitive fields of universal consciousness (Fig. 4.).
The total web is shown as a set of circles sharing a common periphery. This is to symbolise that through the intra-personal ground of feeling, with its source in immanent 'spiritual life', the person has the capacity both to participate in all of the circles and to differentiate between them.

Given the logical structure of this model, one could argue that the latent capacity for autonomy is greater for each successive inner circle, simply because it has a more dense web of relationships with which to engage, and on which it can exert its influence. Heron (1999, p. 312) argues that although individuals are most subject to all of the combined effects of the web, they also have the greatest potential capacity to change it.

Just as a sustainable planetary ecology is the macrocosm, whole personhood is the microcosm, and both are inexorably linked in the dynamic web of life. In addition, the two create the context for my research, and also highlight the need for congruence.
between beliefs and action. This requires a framework of values and ethics within which the facilitation of co-operative processes can be held.

**Embodied personhood**

The work of Candice Pert (in Capra 1996) which identifies peptides as key biochemical components of a psychosomatic network that operates throughout the body, reinforces the close relationship between thought and emotions as a whole body experience. In the same way, whole personhood is very much an embodied phenomenon. It can, however, only be experienced in the physical body and is fully dependent on having a physical body. Awareness of the integrated nature of this body/mind has been recognised in many traditions such as yoga, sufism, martial arts, sacred dance, holistic health methods, energy work and many kinds of body work, such as rebalancing and Heller work (Golten 1999, St. John 2002).

In the Zenergy (2001) facilitation training programmes, practitioners are encouraged through simple exercises and practices to bring their energy into the body, and especially into the belly and heart, as this seems to assist facilitators to connect more easily with the energy of the whole group and individual members.

A Hawkesbury graduate, Annabelle Solomon (1999), describes embodied, whole personhood in the context of women’s ways of knowing:

**Image as embodiment**

I have recently heard repeated the words of Mexican poet, Pablo Neruda, which have taken on many layers of meaning for me regarding my research. “The word was born in the blood”, he wrote. These words echo what I found to be so, particularly in the case of mothering, that experience is the best teacher, and experience is born from the wholeness of the physicality of being, which includes intellect, emotion, intuition. Such a knowledge is embodied, and defies attempts to encode, to reduce and separate process from the product. Just as women’s forms of creativity, particularly the acts of childbirth and raising, have been devalued and hold little status in patriarchal and capitalist systems, women’s ways of knowing similarly hold little value (Solomon 1999, p. 27).

This sense of developing embodiment goes against the dominant narrative of conventional views of progress and consumerism, which requires a sense of need
and greed to keep it rolling. Embodied personhood is more likely to lead to fulfilment, compassion, and enoughness (values emphasised in social ecology) (Hill 1999).

The body as the ‘temple of the holy spirit’ is an intrinsic part of the Catholic tradition (and many other spiritual traditions). John O'Donohue (1997) in ‘Anam Cara – A Book of Celtic Wisdom’ describes the body as mirror of the soul. He poetically describes the invisible and unseen world finding expression through the body.

The body is a sacred threshold; and it deserves to be respected, minded, and understood in its spiritual nature. ... To describe the human body as the Temple of the Holy Spirit recognizes that the body is suffused with wild and vital divinity. This theological insight shows that the sensuous is sacred in the deepest sense.

The body is also very truthful. You know from your own life that your body rarely lies. Your mind can deceive you and put all kinds of barriers between you and your nature; but your body does not lie. ... The body also has a wonderful intelligence. All our movements, indeed everything we do, demands the most refined and detailed cooperation of each of our senses. The human body is the most complex, refined, and harmonious totality (O'Donohue 1997, pp. 47-48).

Rather than the soul being in the body, he believes that the converse is true – the body is in the soul and the soul suffuses us completely with 'soul light' (p. 49).

A Hawkesbury faculty member, David Wright (1999, p. 178), explores the relationships between ecology and divinity. He is seeking ‘embodied understanding’ and concludes that divinity must ‘exist in my body or my interpretations of my embodied experience’ and goes on to ask, ‘How do I find it then, how do I recognise it when it occurs? How do I know?’ He then explores how listening to singing in a church is experienced as something ‘vibrating deeply in my body’.

If we are to ‘know’ these things, or even to approach that knowing, the way we might do it is phenomenologically, on a feeling level, in the body. Then we must struggle to give voice to that feeling: to feel our way into representing it. What does it feel like, this knowing? (p. 181).

Perfunctory conversation that ignores emotional connection and depth is described by Scott Peck (1987) as being in a state of ‘pseudo-community’. When emotions arise, as they inevitably will, the group cannot sustain co-operation if there is little or
no genuine connection and understanding in this emotional domain. The emotions of anger will erupt, and rational discourse will not be able to deal with what is essentially non-rational. In a similar way, intuition will arise and be unaccepted by rational thought. The group will need to find ways of connecting with this emotional (heart) expression, to move into a more real and ‘authentic’ state in which people will be more fully present (in their bodies) and more able to relate and co-operate.

Working with the shadow

To experience whole personhood we must be willing to acknowledge and bring into consciousness all those parts of ourselves that we most dislike, and least want to acknowledge and own. These are the aspects of what is often termed the ‘shadow’ personality and the parts of it we will be most in danger of projecting onto others. ‘Co-operators’, like myself for example, can have difficulty in owning parts of ourselves which are unco-operative, such as the ‘autocratic abuser’ and the ‘powerless victim’. We may, however, readily recognise these in others. The therapeutic professions commonly label this as ‘shadow’ material within the unconscious (Jung et al. 1960).

Medical psychotherapist Guggenbuhl-Craig (1971), drawing on Freudian and Jungian thinking, distinguishes between the personal, collective, and archetypal shadows. He considers that the personal shadow contains all that is not acceptable in the cultural milieu to which that individual belongs, which consequently may be considered to have a cultural shadow.

Linked with these two kinds of shadow and providing them with energy, yet fundamentally different, is what he terms the archetypal shadow. Here he believes, focus is something secondary, since it is light that creates shadow. Conscious personal and collective ideals have their shadows, their dark other sides. In this sense individual and collective shadows are different from archetypal shadows, which might be better described as ‘Evil’, although this word conjures up too many collective moral associations (Guggenbuhl-Craig 1971, pp. 113-114).

Individuals, groups, organisations, communities and nations all have shadow sides. It takes effort and courage to acknowledge and bring out the shadow parts, and subject them to the light of consciousness. In the process of bringing the shadow
into the light of awareness, there is always a lot of resistance. It is as if the shadow wants to hang on to its own, and remain secret. Sometimes the shadow presents as an enormous and insoluble problem, sometimes it presents as a niggle that seems hardly important enough to share. This could, however, be the tip of an iceberg. The acknowledgment and naming of the shadow, is central to the move towards integration. Naming the shadow weakens its potency, and allows it to be addressed (Hunter et al. 1997, pp. 69-70). For example, part of the work of a group facilitator is speaking the 'unsaid', naming those projections within the group that are not recognised or owned and not backing off or colluding when faced with denial.

**Love and compassion**

The ability to acknowledge the imperfections of human beings, and to accept and value the whole person nevertheless, requires an ability to access and express love and compassion.

In 'The Courage to Lead', the task of a social pioneer is described by Stanfield (2000) as 'to love all human kind'. This book, written as a team effort by members of the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA) in Canada, contains a wealth of experience in facilitation, co-operative living, and grass-roots community development. When he speaks of love Stanfield means:

> depth care, passionate commitment, structural justice, the healing of wounds, releasing people to live. The love we are talking about here is not making people feel good or buttressing their illusions. It is more like waking people up to their full possibilities, and recreating the structures of society so that everyone is cared for (Stanfield 2000, p. 200).

This is a beautiful description of sustainable love, and it is relevant to another of the co-operative inquiry findings, which was that love and compassion (together with embodied whole personhood) is a necessary co-requisite for co-operative processes to flourish.

Shem & Surrey (1998) explore healthy relationships between men and women and focus on the processes involved with 'connection' and 'disconnection'. In their practice they have found that if a couple is in connection, then anything can be
talked about well; whereas if a couple is in disconnection, nothing can. ‘Talking without connection is as much an impasse as frozen silence’ (p. 52).

Yet people do not exhibit love and compassion or connection all the time. Groups are made up of individuals who are often fragmented, disassociated, projecting onto others, and are defensive or in denial. This is indeed quite common. How then do co-operative processes work at all, or as well as they do? Group skills, facilitation skills, personal development training, counselling and emotional competence training, such as co-counselling and psychodrama, all have an important role to play here (Jackins 1977, Heron 1999, Moreno 1972, Hunter et al. 1997, Goleman 1995, Lemer 1985).

Is this sufficient though, and can it ever be? Perhaps co-operative work is for the emotionally privileged and well adjusted only, and for those who can afford to hire a facilitator. There is, however, also another way that people can be assisted to make this shift to co-operation. That is through the ‘daily fight to be congruent’ (Freire in Maheshananda 1997, p. 16), through striving to obtain congruence between theory and practice, values and behaviour - the practice of an ethical life. This is the topic of the next chapter.
2.6 Values and Ethics

The literature context has flowed from ecological sustainability through organisational forms and change, co-operative processes and their facilitation, to the individual and the importance of developing towards embodied and integrated whole personhood. Even the most conscious individuals do not always behave consciously or well, however, so the examination of explicit values and ethical practice must underpin, support and allow the monitoring of facilitated co-operative processes. This is an area of professionalism and accountability that needs to be addressed.

Paulo Freire recognised the personal need for congruence between beliefs and actions and considered that one of the major struggles in every individual is the diminishing of the difference between what one says and does, between the discourse and the practice (Maheshananda 1997, p. 16). Ray and Anderson (2000) in ‘Cultural Creatives’ document value changes in America and refer to this growing need for congruence as ‘authenticity’. ‘Authenticity means that your actions are consistent with what you believe and what you say’ (p. 8).

Facilitator ethics

Bodies of knowledge and skills, such as mediation, counselling, social work, journalism, engineering, law, and accounting, all have codes of ethics and practice that protect the practitioner, the participants and society. Most facilitation practitioners have yet to subject themselves to this scrutiny.

As a practicing mediator (as well as a facilitator), I was involved in the development of a Code of Ethics for Mediators in New Zealand. This code came into effect in August 1996 (Appendix A).

In 1994 I discussed the issue of ethics with other New Zealand facilitators, but the interest was not there to proceed with the development of a professional code at this time. Within our own company, Zenergy, the facilitators decided that a code was needed and this was extensively discussed. The dialogue among Zenergy facilitators led to the development of a provisional code of ethics – a work in progress that was reported in The Essence of Facilitation (Hunter et al. 1999, pp. 102-103).
Code of ethics for Zenergy facilitators

The facilitator:
- maintains the integrity of the purpose and culture
- guides the process and does not influence content
- maintains confidentiality of group content
- honours individual boundaries and provides choices
- uses consensus decision-making and co-operative processes
- encourages personal autonomy and group co-operation
- encourages power equity in the group
- ensures there is sufficient time to complete processes with integrity
- obtains agreement before working with a group
- shares the processes they use with the group (Hunter et al. 1999, p. 103).

In 1999, a discussion initiated by myself was held on the Australasian Facilitators Network (AFN) egroup about facilitator ethics (afn-l@scu.edu.au). I requested information on individual, organisational, Australian and international codes.

There were a number of responses, which included three personal codes of ethics and a link with the St James Ethics Centre, in Sydney, as a resource. A suggestion was made that the Australasian Facilitators Network consider articulating their facilitation code of conduct, and that someone might offer to moderate this. This was not taken up at that time (March 1999).

Facilitator Andrew Donovan (2000), writing in the Autumn Newsletter of the St James Ethics Centre, followed up this dialogue with an article about facilitator ethics, quoting from the discussion held among Australasian facilitators (including myself). The article raised a number of questions: Why do we talk about ethics? Are we trying to build relationships and improve performance or is the real motivation enforcement and compliance?

The article canvassed the usefulness of a code to counter the loose use of the word 'facilitator' by consultants, teachers, and managers, who use some facilitative techniques, and describe themselves as facilitators when their agenda may be quite contrary to that of a neutral process guide. Donovan raised the question of whether a code of ethics offers protection and wondered if those who fear the fear itself, that is, the fear that co-option and bastardisation of the intent of facilitation, will lead us down
a deadening path of control, regulation, professionalisation and accreditation, hallmarks of the quality control era of the ‘80s and ‘90s (Donovan 2000, p. 4).

At the same time as the dialogue took place in Australasia, I also approached the International Association of Facilitators’ (IAF) online group to see what was happening about facilitator ethics. There was almost no response. I corresponded with Sandor Schuman, the egroup moderator, who suggested the possibility of an IAF ‘think tank’ at the upcoming annual conference in Toronto. He noted that in the IAF there was a lot of interest in certification. Schuman was interested in the area of values and ethics, and held a workshop on ‘Critical incidents: How do our values and principles guide us?’ at the Toronto (Canada) 2000 IAF Conference.

Sandor Schuman, Roger Schwarz (author of ‘The Skilled Facilitator’) and I, met at the conference, and the idea of an online group was discussed. The monitoring of, and my participation in, this online think tank, subsequently became part of my research for this thesis (see Chapter 3.3 Internet Dialogue).

Organisational ethics

Organisational ethics and, in particular, business ethics, is an area that is growing in importance. One of the initiators of the New Zealand Business for Social Responsibility group, Roger Spiller, recently completed his Ph.D. on business ethics, in which he addressed the issue of business and market morality. He found that some writers argue that the market system is intrinsically amoral, whereas others assert that the market does have a distinctive morality that favours the values of individual liberty and equality (Spiller 1999, pp. 29-30).

Spiller cites The Body Shop and Ben and Jerry’s as pioneers in the field of business ethics and believes that: the purpose of new paradigm business (NPB) is to create environmental, social and financial wealth, thereby making a positive contribution to the environment and society in a financially responsible way. This is supported by ethical investment (Henderson 1996), which seeks to make a positive contribution by investing in environmentally, socially and financially responsible NPB. For both new paradigm businesses and ethical investors, the goal is environmental, social and financial performance. The NPB focus on the triple bottom line includes the goal of creating shareholder wealth. As shown in his thesis there need not be a trade off between financial performance, and environmental and social performance (Spiller
1999, p. 60). To this triple bottom approach can now be added the fourth bottom line that every enterprise should pursue, i.e., purpose, or as Beck (2001b) puts it - purpose, profit, people and planet (p. 7).

Australian management consultant, Attracta Lagan (2000), in her book 'Why Ethics Matter' explores the growing importance of ethics in business, and the need to get values alignment between employees and the organisation, and to develop ethical codes. She also recommends the 'sunlight test' (see below) as an ethical framework to use when individuals feel they are uncertain how to act in a situation.

- Would you be happy if others acted in the same way towards you?
- Would you be prepared to have your behaviour reported in the newspaper?
- Would your parents approve of your actions?
- Would other stakeholders approve of your actions?

Another version of this would be the "could I tell mum?" test (Lagan 2000, p. 80).

Lagan also notes the importance of the ethical investment trend, which is growing at a rapid rate, particularly in the United States. Socially responsible investment now accounts for one out of every eight dollars or $2.16 trillion of the $16.3 trillion in investment assets under management in the United States in November 1999 (Lagan 2000, p. 57).

**Principled organisations (Covey 1998)**

Covey (1998) believes that organisations need to address the huge gap usually present between the things people value and the way life actually operates in almost all large organisations. He observes that, from his experience, there is a remarkable consistency in the values people have for how they would like their work life to be. They virtually all value spirit, trust, excitement, meaningfulness and working with people they like. But comparing that list to what people actually have in their organization currently, he has found it hard to find many people who will say, 'Yeah, I've got 80 per cent of what I want' (Covey 1998, p. 37).

He found that what has happened in most companies is that they are trying to bring in new technologies and the language of 'empowerment', 'team building' and 'partnering', but the old benevolent-authoritarian paradigm has stayed the same. He
believes that the problem is that you can’t put ‘new wine in old bottles’ or talk yourself out of problems you behave yourself into.

In the preface to a Harvard Business Review article about principle-based electric company AES Corporation, Suzy Wetlauf (1999) notes that 30,000 articles about worker empowerment have appeared in a wide variety of print media over the past four years alone. Most of these articles have been positive with empowered organisations being cited as ‘hothouses of autonomy and trust’, and with people at all levels taking full responsibility for the organisation’s performance. She cites an interview with management expert Chris Argyris (1996) in which he argues that most talk of empowerment is lip service, with employees becoming increasingly cynical (pp. 111-112).

Bringing in new and different ways of thinking is a process that takes a great deal of patience, because you have to work at it from the inside out. Covey favours every person in the organisation undertaking to change their hearts and minds, so that they become principle centered. He believes that you have to get right down to the individual, hopefully starting with the people at the top although he has also seen the pragmatic fruits when people at the middle and even the lower levels become a leavening influence throughout the entire organisation, and ultimately transform their organisations. He considers it is very difficult to go through a fundamental paradigm shift, especially at an organisational level, but it is possible, even when the old paradigm is deeply ingrained.

Covey suggests it is important to clarify our principles and use them as a touchstone for checking our theory and practice. He believes that tomorrow’s successful leaders will value principles more than they value their companies. Co-operative organisations already have widely recognised principles, including democratic member control and community concern. Corporations have historically no such imperative. Their purpose is to use capital (money), to make more money, to reward those people who invested money in the first place.

Covey (1998, p. 36) believes that the key principle is trust. Trustworthiness precedes trust, which precedes empowerment, which precedes quality. He also believes that belief in human potential is necessary.
This is why I say it’s not enough just to treat people well and then use them well, like the old model taught us. You have to help people find meaning and fulfillment in what they do. They don’t want to be ‘used’ by the organization like victims and pawns. They want stewardship over their own resources. They want to feel they are making a personal contribution to something meaningful. And that’s when you get real motivation and real fulfillment. That’s when you truly release the human potential and all that tremendous energy and creative power that is hidden inside people, waiting to be unleashed (Covey 1998, p. 37).

This appears to be the kind of language that would be used in support of co-operative organisations, but this is not what Covey is proposing.

Covey is proposing a kind of co-operative process, which he calls 360-degree feedback, through which every person, every department, every team and every division in every company is accountable to those principles. People who cannot get high grades against these principles cannot stay. ‘Shape up or ship out’. People are warned when they come in: ‘You’d better be prepared to live by these principles or your future will be jeopardised.’ He cites General Electric as a company that has put values at the centre of the organisation. It took Jack Welch 12 years to get a set of values that everyone could buy into. It created a metamorphosis in the company (Covey 1998, p. 42).

This ‘shape up or ship out’ approach to principles could easily be experienced as coercive and oppressive by defensive and insecure employees afraid of losing their jobs if they are regarded as different from others in the organisation. They may become afraid to speak out authentically. Organisations need their mavericks and dissidents to provide creative tension (Semler 1993). In any case, organisational values that everyone can or must sign up for are not as likely to engender the same degree of ‘ownership’ as a worker owned organisation.

**The shadow side**

The effects of creating ‘learning companies’ can only be imagined, but we should not suppose that, because they look attractive from our present perspective, they would not have a ‘shadow’ side. We can learn better to exploit and destroy as well as create and build. Any company can be a ‘learning company’ in theory – whether they are in business to save lives or to kill people; but could the latter easily be dubbed a ‘good company’? The ‘good company’ creates and accepts responsibility for quality in an

Pedler believes that such a company will need to be morally strong enough to engage in the struggle to 'manage for mutual advantage' – seeking to make ethical decisions about priorities, weighing profit against environmental impact and public service against members' well-being.

For those of us working on the bringing forth of the new paradigm, such as the 'good company' and the technology that will support this, where do we best place ourselves and do our work? One danger could be that co-operative processes (integral to the paradigm shift) are co-opted by the keepers of the old ways, who could take the co-operative technologies, without (or paying lip service to) the underlying values and ways of being, and misuse them.

Co-operative processes are tools, and as such, can be used and misused and there are grey areas between encouragement, persuasion and manipulation. The right to choose one's involvement in such processes becomes important. Co-operative processes can be useful as a means to encourage commitment and ownership of decision-making within organisations. They can enable the release of creativity, and can increase self-esteem in participants who have previously been denied involvement in decision-making. Co-operative processes can be used as an effective means to gain loyalty and productivity among workers. This can lead to empowered and creative workers, who are more willing to 'go the extra mile', challenge the status quo and seek involvement in further decision-making.

The use of co-operative processes can, however, be a calculated effort to gain the hearts and minds of employees without any intention of involving them in important decisions. Decisions made may be kept purposely trivial or contained in specific areas, and be subject to veto by more senior people higher up the management tree. This cynical use of co-operative processes is becoming more common, and is disheartening for the participants. It is of increasing concern to facilitators, who become pawns in someone else’s game. The question arises – can a co-operative process exist with integrity, and remain sustainable, within organisations that lack commitment to clear values, and a firm, ethical base that also extends to subcontractors?
Because processes are value laden and outcomes can be sabotaged, or be dependent on world view, it is important that co-operative processes, and their use, are subjected to scrutiny and critique. This can be done in a purely subjective way, or a more objective way can be found. It is helpful also, to produce some commonly agreed understandings, such as guidelines, benchmarks, and codes of ethics and practice, which can then be debated and adapted in collective dialogue and used to monitor congruence.

**Thoughts at end of literature search**

After an intense engagement with the literature over the last three years, I can see how my own 'whole person' approach fits into the growing body of knowledge in this area and have identified a number of allies (Craig, Schwarz, Rogers, Freire, Hill, Starhawk, Hawken, Henderson and more).

I contend that positive experience with developmental, co-operative processes can lead to individual and social transformation. This will happen in a sustainable way if whole-person and ethical approaches are taken and participants given choice regarding their involvement. A code of ethics or code of practice will be helpful but not sufficient in itself to ensure that co-operative ways of working are deeply empowering, and have the potential to change the future shape of organisations in life-enhancing ways.

I have found that there are gaps in the theory that underpins and supports co-operative ways of working. This area has been neglected and I agree with Craig (1989) that a deeper and more extensive understanding of 'co-operative logic' and the 'co-operative paradigm' is needed if effective frameworks and approaches are to be developed through which larger organisations can become genuinely co-operative.
Section 3 Research

3.1 Introduction to the Research

The literature review in the preceding chapters has focused on sustainable co-operative processes in organisations. It has examined these in relation to social, personal and environmental sustainability and the major organisational forms of co-operatives and corporations. In particular, the fluidity of organisational change is examined, together with the opportunities and traps for those using co-operative processes within organisations. The importance of recognising the existence of a paradigm clash between hierarchical organisations and co-operative processes is addressed, and the need for group facilitators to be clear about and committed to the values and ethics underpinning consensual co-operative ways of working.

The research that follows is an attempt to uncover new knowledge that will assist in ensuring the sustainability of co-operative processes within organisations. The research methodology employed is described in Section 1.3. The research was conducted in three parts, the first two of which are linked.

Part one comprised a survey of 126 facilitators attending the International Association of Facilitators Conference in Toronto in May 2000. The survey focused on facilitator perceptions relating to ethics and values.

Part two involved an Internet dialogue between 50 to 60 facilitators associated with the International Association of Facilitators, and interested in developing a Statement of Values and a Code of Ethics for facilitators. This dialogue took place between June 2000 and May 2001.

Part three of the research comprised a co-operative inquiry between a group of 11 New Zealand facilitators, managers and academics interested in the research question. This inquiry took place over 14 weeks from August to December 2000. The inquiry continued informally after this time for some of the participants.
3.2 Survey

Introduction and overview

The first part of the field research into 'the facilitation of sustainable co-operative processes in organisations', involved conducting an exploratory survey among the professional group who are most associated with designing and implementing co-operative processes in organisations, i.e., group facilitators. The purpose of the survey was to find out from facilitators what they consider are the ethical issues occurring in their work, and to establish the values underpinning their practice as facilitators.

The survey was conducted at the International Association of Facilitators Conference held in May 2000 in Toronto (Canada). A total of 1100 people attended the conference, with most participants coming from Canada and the USA. There was also representation from the United Kingdom, Europe, Asia, Africa, Latin America and Australasia. As this was the only global conference for facilitators taking place in 2000, it was the obvious choice for conducting the survey.

The conference was large and involved many concurrent sessions spread throughout a large hotel. This posed a challenge for distribution and collection of the survey. The survey was designed to be completed in 10 minutes while the participants were taking morning and afternoon tea breaks or while waiting for sessions to begin.

I wanted to obtain a general picture of the ethical concerns and underlying values that concern facilitators. Living relatively isolated in New Zealand, I was interested to know if my view of facilitation was shared by others in the rest of the world. The survey questions were designed to give me the data I needed.

The survey form comprised two double-sided A4 sheets; three sides containing questions and one a covering letter. In the substantive section of the survey there were 10 fixed choice structured questions and two open questions. The survey form is in Appendix C. By proactively handing out and collecting survey forms between breaks, giving them out at the two workshops that I presented, and making the forms available on a table in the display area, I (the researcher) was able to distribute 160
survey forms and get back 126 completed surveys by the end of the Conference. 79% of surveys distributed were returned. This response represented just over 10% of the people at the conference as a whole.

Demographics

The female gender bias of the profession was reflected in the 80 female and 46 male respondents who did the survey. Most participants came from North America: Canada (46), USA (58), with much smaller numbers from elsewhere: Europe (10), Asia (6), Australia and the Pacific (2), the Caribbean (3) and South America (1). This was a fair representation of Conference participation.

Half of the respondents (69) were employees of organisations. One-third (40) were self-employed and 7 worked as part of co-operative groups. The work sectors in which the respondents were engaged included business (55), government (34), community (22), education (21), health (21), and other (12). Many facilitators worked in more than one sector. About half of the respondents cited facilitation as their primary work (62).

As the International Association of Facilitators had grown out of a particular school of facilitation that had its origins in the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA) in Texas and Illinois, I also asked about the school or method of facilitation that respondents identified with the most. One-third (42) mentioned the ToP (Technology of Participation) or ‘participation’ indicating the approach championed by the ICA. Most others gave general responses such as ‘various’, or they did not answer the question. Only one or two others gave clear answers such as Open Space (2), experiential learning (3) or Search Conference (1). This raised questions in my mind concerning the extent of training these facilitators had received and in what methods. Had they perhaps just picked facilitation up from observing other facilitators or informally developed their skills from a variety of sources?
Consensus decision-making

An area of importance to the research question that I addressed in the survey was the extent that facilitators were using consensus decision-making. I have used consensus in this thesis as a means of clarifying and narrowing the field of 'co-operative processes' to a more manageable form, and also in defining facilitation as a body of knowledge. Most of those for whom facilitation was their primary work (84%) use consensus decision-making: mostly (59%) or always (25%). Those for whom facilitation was a secondary source of work were slightly less committed (73%) to consensus approaches: mostly (55%) or always (18%). Facilitators in the business sector also use consensus 7-8% less than their counterparts in other sectors (government, community, education, and health sectors). There was little gender difference in this regard.

Fig. 5. Use of consensus decision-making process.
Fig. 6. Use of consensus decision-making process by facilitation as primary work.

Fig. 7. Use of decision-making process by work sector.
Fig. 8. Use of consensus decision-making process by gender.

**Scenarios**

To find out what issues created ethical or other problems for facilitators working cooperatively in or with organisations, I posed a range of eight scenarios that I believed illustrated problem areas. The choice of these scenarios was made on the basis of my work as a facilitator over many years, both working within an organisation and as an external contractor and as a trainer of facilitators. I had experienced all of these scenarios and believed they were typical of those experienced by other facilitators. The respondents were required to respond to a range of choices.
The eight scenarios were:

a) You are hired to facilitate a work or community group without the group’s agreement.

b) You are unable to negotiate sufficient time to complete the group process satisfactorily.

c) You are asked to report on the group’s progress by another member of the organisation (e.g., a more senior person or the person who hired you).

d) You are asked to report on individual group member’s behaviour in the group by another person not in the group.

e) Consensus decisions of the co-operative group are revoked by others in the organisation outside the group.

f) Consensus decisions of the co-operative group are revoked by some group members without the agreement of the whole group.

g) The co-operative group is stopped from completing its work by others in the organisation.

h) Your role as facilitator is terminated without the group’s agreement.

There was a clear response to scenarios d) e) and f). Facilitators regarded these as problems involving ethical issues. Most facilitators had direct experience of situations e) and f) and almost half had experienced situation d).
10d. You are asked to report on an individual group member’s behaviour in the group by another person not in the group.

Fig. 9. You are asked to report on an individual group member’s behaviour in the group by another person not in the group.
10e. Consensus decisions of the co-operative group are revoked by others in the organisation outside the group.

Fig. 10. Consensus decisions of the co-operative group are revoked by others in the organisation outside the group.
10f. Consensus decisions of the co-operative group are revoked by some group members without the agreement of the whole group.

I See This as a Problem

I See This as an Ethical Issue

I Have Experienced This

Fig. 11. Consensus decisions of the co-operative group are revoked by some group members without the agreement of the whole group.
In the other five of the eight scenarios, the response was fairly evenly divided as to whether ethical issues were involved. Most facilitators had experienced b) and saw it as a problem, but only 35% considered it an ethical issue (see next page).

This result surprised me as it contrasts with the ethics of a related profession, mediation, where the New Zealand Code of Ethics for mediators states that:

RULE ONE: A mediator should uphold the integrity and fairness of the mediation process.

Commentary: A mediator must observe high standards of conduct so that the integrity and fairness of the process will be preserved. A mediator should only accept appointment if the mediator believes there is time to conduct the mediation promptly. (Code of Ethics for the Arbitrators' and Mediators' Institute of New Zealand Inc., see Appendix A).

It could be argued that this rule applies more to the prompt beginning of the mediation process. However, it also indicates that the process itself requires time, and that sufficient time needs to be allowed to bring the process to a satisfactory conclusion. To leave people incomplete and emotionally "stranded" is surely an ethical problem for a facilitator as well as a mediator.

Given, however, the nature of the survey, I was not able to find out the reasoning of the facilitator respondents.

Three other scenarios a), g), and h), related to the autonomy of the group. They addressed the right of the group to choose a specific facilitator, the ability of the group to complete its work, and the right of the group to decide to terminate the employment of the facilitator. The respondents were divided on group autonomy as an ethical issue. Most facilitators had experienced a) and g) and saw it as a problem, but were evenly divided on whether or not it was an ethical issue. Many respondents also answered that they did not know.

Only 21% had experienced h). This may, in part, account for the differences as to whether it involved an ethical issue.
10b. You are unable to negotiate sufficient time to complete the group process satisfactorily.

Fig. 12. You are unable to negotiate sufficient time to complete the group process satisfactorily.
10a. You are hired to facilitate a work or community group without the group's agreement.

Fig. 13. You are hired to facilitate a work or community group without the group’s agreement.
10g. The co-operative group is stopped from completing its work by others in the organisation.

Fig. 14. The co-operative group is stopped from completing its work by others in the organisation.
10h. Your role as facilitator is terminated without the group's agreement.

Fig. 15. Your role as facilitator is terminated without the group's agreement.
The scenario c) was included as a check to see if facilitators were clear about what was and wasn't a problem, as distinct from an ethical issue. In my view, c) was not a problem, but could be an ethical issue depending on how the facilitator responded to the request. Most of the respondents (79%) considered c) as a problem and close to half (44%), considered it an ethical issue, which suggested they were aware of the distinction I was suggesting. One third (35%), however, considered c) as not an ethical issue. This suggests to me that some facilitators may have been unclear, possibly about the question, or perhaps they interpreted the question in a different way than intended.

10c. You are asked to report on the groups' progress by another member of the organisation (eg. a more senior person or the person who hired you).
Fig. 16. You are asked to report on the group's progress by another member of the organisation (e.g. a more senior person or the person who hired you).

Avoiding problems

After the scenario questions, participants were asked how they avoided the problems and ethical issues outlined. Most facilitators indicated that they use verbal agreements, and some use written contracts. Almost half the facilitators (47%) never use a code of ethics. It was assumed that those who use a code were referring to personal or organisational codes as there are not yet nationally or internationally recognized professional codes for facilitators.
11. Strategies/practices to avoid problems and ethical issues.

**Use of Verbal Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Did Not Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use of Written Contract**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Did Not Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use of Code of Ethics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Did Not Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 17. Strategies/practices to avoid problems and ethical issues.
Facilitation is a new profession, which has blossomed within the last 10 years. The lack of a professional code of ethics is most likely related to this immaturity as a professional grouping, and possibly some reluctance to self regulate.

Values

Facilitators identified the central values that guide their practice and gave priority to participation, honesty, respect, integrity and trust.

The wide range of responses were not easy to analyse and interpret. There appeared to be no agreed set of values which facilitators as a group have aligned on as essential to their profession. The six most named values (participation, honesty, respect, trust, integrity, planning) are all basic to co-operative work, but most – perhaps with the exception of ‘participation’ – are also named as key values in most organisational contexts, whether the organisation is co-operative or hierarchical. There seemed to be no clear gender patterns or other group related responses (e.g., business, non business).
Fig. 18. Values That Guide Facilitators' Practice.
Reflections on the survey

I had intended that the survey would identify some of the key problems related to co-operative group work within organisations, and how facilitators approached these. My hunch was that many of these are ethical problems that arise as a result of a profound paradigm clash between co-operative and hierarchical work. These two ways of working are underpinned by very different sets of values, belief systems and desired behaviours. This clash leads to ethical dilemmas that when unaddressed can result in co-operative processes being judged as ineffective and unsustainable within the dominant, hierarchical paradigm.

At the same time, there is little incentive for facilitators to draw attention to these dilemmas through fear that this could lead to alienation between them and their organisational clients. Organisations usually seek to introduce co-operative processes for pragmatic reasons – such as the necessity of involving numbers of people with different areas of expertise in complex decision-making. They may not initially be aware of the deeper issues that will emerge as a group works co-operatively, and inevitably encounters values and ethical clashes.

Facilitators may collude (awarely or unawarely) with the silence around this paradigm clash. The unfortunate result of this collusion is that it may result in co-operative processes becoming unsustainable.

Different methods and schools

There are several different schools and approaches to facilitation (Appendix K, p. 2). The school I am grounded in, known in New Zealand as the Zenergy school, can be traced to community development methodologies (Friere 1993), co-operative work in New Zealand (Fitzsimons 1982), and the personal development method of Co-counselling (2001), with its philosophy of self-direction and autonomy, mutual support and validation, and the use of regression and catharsis to interrupt distress related behaviour patterns.

Many of the respondents (42%) were from the ToP (Technology of Participation) school, which was developed in the USA by the Institute of Cultural Affairs through a group of dedicated people who sought to develop effective tools for participation in grass roots community development. Their tools include focused conversation
(ORID), a ToP workshop method, a ToP events planning and orchestration method and a ToP strategic planning process.

These tools were later used by facilitators in large organisations with some excellent documented results. These methods, and their successful application, are described by Spencer (1989) in ‘Winning Through Participation’, one of the school’s key texts. ToP methods do not claim to be leading edge in organisational development, believing that this edge lies with the creativity, innovative, openness, and courage of the organisation using them. ToP facilitators claim that their methods create a climate that nourishes those qualities necessary for transformation – alignment, leadership, communication, co-operation, commitment, creativity, innovation, and implementation (p. 163).

Although differences between facilitation methods and schools are not the subject of this research, they nevertheless need to be noted, as they may have led to some differences in interpretation of the survey questions and also differing approaches to the various issues raised in the Internet dialogue.

Another factor to consider when interpreting these findings is cultural differences, including different ways of using language and deriving meaning. I am a New Zealander, and most of the conference participants were from the United States or Canada. This may have led to some misunderstanding.

In retrospect, this was of lesser importance than another factor I had not anticipated and which did not become crystallised in my thinking until towards the end of the Internet dialogue. This was the discovery of ‘corporate (or management) facilitators’, employed internally by, or contracted into, large organisations to assist in implementing corporate goals using facilitative techniques. Some of these practitioners had not been trained as facilitators with the framework and value base of co-operative work. Half of the facilitators who completed the survey did not clearly state the method of facilitation they used and some seemed confused by the idea of a school or method.

The danger of using the ToP technology without proper training was anticipated by Spencer.
them in such a “how to” style. They fear that the methods will be diluted or distorted by unskilled or unscrupulous practitioners. Others suggested that we print a disclaimer, stating that unless a facilitator is trained in ToP methods by the ICA, we assume no responsibility for the results of their efforts (Spencer 1989, p. 183).

Unfortunately, organisations exist that are strongly hierarchical and oppressive, and that see an advantage in providing an appearance of a co-operative approach. They involve their employees in providing input in facilitated sessions, but are not committed to act on any outcomes that challenge their structure and processes. Facilitators can be drawn into this manipulative role as ‘fixers’ and reap significant financial rewards from doing so. Corporate ‘facilitation’, or ‘fascipulation’ (Brenson-Lazan 1999) has grown to the extent that some group facilitators are calling for a review of the name of facilitation itself to avoid this confusion.

The use of the transformative facilitation techniques of ToP and other schools into unscrupulous organisations or by untrained facilitators is worrying, and this trend may have gone too far to be stopped. It is most timely that a code of ethics is being developed for IAF facilitators.

Strengths and limitations of the survey method

I was interested to use the survey method in both its quantitative and qualitative forms for my research and be able to evaluate its effectiveness.

The survey gave me a snapshot impression of the ethics and values of the group of people in society who label themselves as facilitators.

The choice of quantitative responses to the scenarios meant that subtleties and nuances were not available, and some ambiguities emerged. In addition, there was no opportunity to reframe the questions based on knowledge discovered during the analysis (unlike the co-operative inquiry or the Internet dialogue).

The survey was followed by the Internet dialogue reported in the next chapter.
3.3 Internet dialogue

Introduction

The second research method involved an extended focus group or group dialogue on the Internet, with interested facilitators identified through the survey, with possibly some additional people. This was to be held over an initial period of three months. The purpose of this dialogue process was to add depth to the understanding of issues raised in the survey, and to identify and explore further issues that were not covered, but that emerged in the dialogue. It was envisaged that around 30 people would take part.

Survey respondents identified at the end of the survey if they wished to be part of an Internet dialogue about facilitator values and ethics. Forty (30%) of the 126 facilitators who completed the survey in Toronto at the International Association of Facilitators Conference indicated an interest in being involved.

Shortly after the Toronto Conference, as a result of my discussions with Roger Schwarz and Sandor Schuman, an IAF Ethics and Values Think Tank (EVTT) was set up. It was initiated by Sandor Schuman, and employed an Internet dialogue as its vehicle for communication. IAF members interested in developing a values statement, and/or code of ethics for facilitators, were invited to join the EVTT. An invitation was issued through the IAF egroup, which had about 900 subscribers internationally. The EVTT commenced on 19 June 2000. The dialogue was held on (http://groups.yahoo.com/group/EVTT) a public list accessed direct from the Internet. I advised the address twice that I was using the dialogue for research purposes and invited anyone who wished to discuss this with me direct. There was no response.

The Internet dialogue stated purpose was to create a 'code of professional ethics', 'statement of core values', or similar document, that can be formally adopted by the International Association of Facilitators and made available for adoption by individual members.

Although I had planned to initiate my own Internet dialogue with the 40 interested survey participants, because the EVTT dialogue group was sufficiently similar to mine I decided not to proceed with it and instead monitor and participate in the EVTT dialogue as a participant researcher. I invited the interested survey participants from
Toronto to join the EVTT. Most of them would have also received an invitation to do this directly through the IAF egroup.

Initially, 47 people joined the EVTT online group, including 9 who completed my survey. During the 10-month period 1 July-30 April 2001, the EVTT membership increased to 50-60, with 25-30 active participants. Monthly message flow reached a high of 72 messages in February 2001, with 30-50 for most months. A total of 429 postings were received.

The names of active EVTT participants are listed in the Preliminary Report of the Ethics and Values Think Tank compiled by Schuman (Appendix D).

Internet Dialogue

On 19 June 2000, Schuman posted the following proposal:

Proposal for an IAF Ethics and Values Think Tank

Rationale
IAF has moved forward in adopting a set of competencies and a certification program.

Purpose
To create a 'code of professional ethics', 'statement of core values' or similar document.

Major tasks:
1. Develop a two-year plan for creating and implementing a code.
2. Gather and examine similar documents from other professional organisations.
3. Develop among Think Tank members a draft document. Consult with professional ethicists.
4. Draft a document for review by ACT.
5. Revise and make available a draft to all members.
6. Conduct a Think Tank session at IAF Conference 2001.
7. Revise and recirculate a draft to ACT and make available to all members.
8. Develop training materials.
9. At IAF 2002 present code to ACT (and perhaps to general membership) for formal agreement.
10. Test our training materials at Think Tank session at IAF 2002.
11. Finalise training materials and make available to IAF members. (EVTT file, Ethics-Values-TT.txt, 19 June 2000).

On 5 July, a participant, TN, challenged the group to go about the task ‘more efficiently’. He stated:

If we need a Code of Ethics and Values (or whatever we may decide to call them) then taking two years to decide our conscience may be too long. More realistically our group could have a Code for presentation at the next IAF Convention, May 2001.

Perhaps we should be taking more of a facilitation approach to the task, and apply some process. If I were facilitating this group the first thing I would do is to ask the group to develop some criteria, or as a colleague of mine says ‘How would I recognise the perfect IAF Code of Ethics and Values if I were to run into it on the street? What would it look like – what are the characteristics?’ I wouldn’t make this complicated – perhaps concentrating on ‘must meet’ as opposed to ‘nice to have’ criteria. For example, from the discussions thus far it would seem that any set of statements would need to provide for ethnic and/or cultural differences – therefore one criterion might be: ‘Must be able to be applied across all cultures’.

Once the criteria are developed – I imagine we could get speedy feedback in this regard from 47 people – the same group could be invited to come up with at least one ‘ethic/value/principle’ each. The group might want to appoint a ‘virtual’ task force of some 3-5 people who would consider the input, apply the criteria, and come up with the ‘first cut’ to be considered by the group (EVTT message 9, 5 July 2000).

In response to this email, Schuman approached TN and asked him to take on the facilitation role. TN (after this referred to as the facilitator) then requested agreement of the group to his facilitation and the proposed process. Permission was given through a poll, and a timetable was suggested:

What / Who / By When

1) Brainstorm 'must meet' criteria / EVTT group / September 22
2) Finalise 'must meet' criteria / EVTT group, task force / October 16
3) Provide feedback to task force on 'must meet' criteria / EVTT group / October 30
4) Brainstorm ethics, values etc. / EVTT group / November 10
5) Deliver 'first cut' to EVTT for feedback / task force / December 18
6) Provide feedback to task force on 'first cut' / EVTT group / January 15 2001
This timetable is not carved in stone and may need to be amended, as circumstances dictate, to provide for adequate discussion. When we've accomplished all that we've set out to do by January 15 2001, we will need to consider another timetable to position ourselves for presentation of a 'final cut' to the 2001 IAF Conference participants (EVTT message 16, 27 July 2000).

The first step was to develop a 'must meet' criteria for the Statement of Values and Code of Ethics. Participants suggested criteria and these were put together by a small self-appointed task group of five people (including the facilitator).

The criteria agreed on for the Statement of Values and Code of Ethics was as follows:

Must be clear, concise and credible – easily understood by facilitators, clients and others – expressed as succinct concepts and supported by additional information that enhances understanding.

Must include a preamble which incorporates:

a) a clear definition of what 'ethics' means;
b) what the organization aspires to;
c) why a code is essential for the organization; and
d) the voluntary nature of adherence by members.

Must state ethics in a positive manner, i.e., what we 'will do' rather than what we 'should not' do.

Must provide guidance to facilitators in designing their business practices.

Must provide guidance to facilitators as they design process.

Must provide guidance in ethical dilemmas.

Must be applicable across national boundaries, economic and cultural boundaries.

Must be applicable to facilitators working in the widest possible variety of circumstances and sub-disciplines (EVTT message 108, 29 October 2000).

The next step was to 'brainstorm' the contents of the statement and code. This took place over October and November 2000. Participants were invited to contribute a key value and a statement to support this. About 25 people, including myself, contributed to this part of the process, and a number of lively dialogues ensued. The different mindsets of the participants were beginning to emerge, particularly in relation to who was regarded as the facilitator's client (the group being worked with or the project
manager), and to the importance of consensus decision-making. The extent of the
different approaches became clear when the first draft of the statement and code, put
together by the task force, was posted in early February 2001. The substance of the
key value and supporting statement that I contributed was included in Clause 6.

First Draft of Code

International Association of Facilitators

Statement of Values and Code of Ethics

Facilitators are called upon to help groups become more effective. We fill an objective
role that creates a balance between participation and results. We understand that by
engaging us, our clients have placed a trust in us. As members of the International
Association of Facilitators (IAF), we recognise the importance of defining and making
known the ethical principles that will help us act in such a manner that we honour and
respect that trust.

We recognise that we have a number of duties that, at any given time, may be in
conflict with each other: our duty to our client; our duty to group participants; our duty
to ourselves; our duty to the profession. Ethical dilemmas occur when values are in
conflict.

Recognising the complexity of our roles, including the full spectrum of personal,
professional, and cultural diversity in our membership and in the field of facilitation, this
Code of Ethics states the values to which we are committed and embodies the ethical
responsibilities of the profession.

The principles of this Code are expressed in broad statements to guide ethical
decision-making. These statements provide a framework and are not intended to
dictate conduct for particular situations.

Statement of Values

As facilitators we believe in the inherent value of the individual and collective wisdom
of the group, understanding that participants come with varying levels of familiarity,
readiness, knowledge, and ability to engage in the process. We recognise that our role
is one of trust and our presence in the group, an intervention. We act in service to the
client and participants, consciously adopting the intentions of inclusiveness,
participation, respect for all stakeholders, including those not present, and that
collaborative and co-operative interaction will produce meaningful outcomes.
Code of Ethics

1) We are in service to the client and participants, working within our sphere of competence to add value through facilitation.

Our clients include those who engage us to support them in making decisions on what is critical or urgent in their operations, and the group participants who benefit from the processes that we design. It is important that we understand our clients’ expectations, that we provide the appropriate service, and that we produce the anticipated results. It is our responsibility to ensure that we are competent to handle the intervention.

2) We disclose any real or perceived conflict of interest prior to accepting a facilitation assignment so that, together with our client, we may make an informed decision about proceeding.

3) Once we agree to provide facilitation service to a client, we follow through on our commitment.

We work closely with our client to clearly establish the purpose of the facilitated event, the desired outcome, and the role the client wishes us to play. We align with the client group on group purpose, establishing norms for acceptable behaviour. During an intervention, if the group decides it needs to go in a different direction, our role is to help the group move forward, balancing the intent of the original goals with the needs of the participants.

4) We respect the needs and culture of the group, designing interventions to take them from where they are, to where they want to be.

Groups of people come together for a variety of reasons. How the group will work together is a conscious decision by the group and requires agreement and commitment by each individual group member. We assist the group to establish a clear, workable definition of the processes that will be effective in the culture within which they function. We design thinking frameworks that provide the group the opportunity to achieve sustainable results.

5) We create an environment of respect and safety where all participants can speak freely from the heart.

We strive to engender a safe environment within which we honour individual boundaries, where all participants trust that they are able to express their views in a
non-judgmental climate in which all participants feel equal in the process. When people trust each other, and their efforts are encouraged and supported, there is confidence that success will be achieved. We respect and protect each individual's right to express themselves in a manner with which they feel comfortable.

6) We use our skills, knowledge and wisdom to elicit the voices of all participants, employing a variety of methods to enable the group to access the natural gifts, talents and life experiences of each member.

We work in ways that honour the wholeness and self-expression of others, reflecting mind, body, spirit, emotion, and innate abilities. Facilitators embrace a wide array of strategies and methods from which to choose during a facilitative process. We design sessions that respect various styles of interaction to assist participants in releasing their full potential.

7) We encourage generosity of spirit in dialogue, supporting full and frank discussion, providing time for the group to reflect.

We speak with intent and care for the well being of the group and each participant, understanding that any action is an intervention that will affect the process. We ensure all relevant stakeholders have an opportunity to articulate their ideas, and that individuals or groups are not excluded or marginalised. We support individual and group reflection by creating opportunities for participants to examine and share their thoughts and feelings on what has happened.

8) We remain content neutral, bringing objectivity to the process.

Generally, facilitators remain content neutral during a facilitated session. However, we are sometimes engaged because we have specific content knowledge. We practice stewardship of the process, while participants bring content knowledge and their expertise to the discourse. When our content knowledge could add clarity to the discussion, or prevent damage to the effectiveness of the process, or unblock the group's progress, we share this knowledge in a responsible and objective manner, being clear with the group about what we are doing.

9) We do not disclose confidential information without the consent of the client.

As with other professions, facilitators observe confidentiality of client information. Therefore, we do not share information about a client within or outside of the client's
organisation, nor do we report on group content, or the individual opinions or behaviour of members of the group.

10) We are committed to continuous learning, skill development, personal exploration and the growth of our profession.

We recognise that our profession offers a great opportunity to learn from the groups and people with whom we work as part of our facilitation delivery. As facilitators, we continuously learn and grow, and we are open to new learning and experiences to improve our knowledge and facilitation skills. Through continuous personal growth and development, we are better able to assist groups in their work. We actively participate in the growth of our profession (EVTT message 245, 2 February 2001).

In my response to the Statement and Code (12 February 2001) I listed the following points in my critique of the draft document:

1) The preamble did not describe the role of a facilitator. My suggestion was to describe the facilitator as a process guide (Paragraph one).

Suggest: A facilitator is a process guide who promises to add value to group deliberations, or: Facilitators are process guides who enable groups to become more effective.

2) The preamble described conflicts of interest, but not a way of addressing them, and the responsibility of the facilitator to do that. I agreed with another participant's suggestion that paragraph two be changed to:

We recognise that we have a number of duties that, at any given time, have the potential to be in conflict with each other unless they are clarified and agreements are formed regarding them: our duty to our client; our duty to group participants; our duty to ourselves; our duty to the profession. Then add: We accept the responsibility to do this.

3) The Statement of Values was confused and incoherent. I suggested that it be aligned with the facilitator competency work already done by the IAF. Other than the first part of the first sentence of the statement: 'As facilitators we believe in the inherent value of the individual and collective wisdom of the group.' I was unable to align with it.
The addition to the first sentence of ‘... understanding that participants come with varying levels of familiarity, readiness, knowledge, and ability to engage in the process' can be seen as giving the facilitator the high ground from which to judge participants competency. I believe that as facilitators, we must always come from an acceptance of competence in others without reservation. I went on to say:

The rest [of the Statement of Values] is not acceptable to me. I believe, for example, that a group/client has the right to set its boundaries around who is included. It is not the facilitator’s role to ensure inclusiveness other than in the group, though we can make suggestions. Respect is a value in itself (for everyone in the world) and not just about stakeholders. I do agree that participation is a key value. We have a lot of information on values given during this dialogue. This section does not take it on board.

A better statement would be to take key statements from the IAF Facilitator Competencies statement such as:

A facilitator honors the wisdom of the group, acknowledging that the group’s wisdom is often more than the sum of its individuals’ wisdom. Facilitators sincerely believe in the capacity of others and encourage others in this belief. They set aside personal opinions, maintain neutrality, and grant the group the right to make its own decisions. The facilitator’s objective, non-judgmental stance is key to guiding the group towards consensus (Pierce et al. 2000, p. 29).

I went on to comment on each section of the code in further detail and suggested a number of changes. These included the following:

Add in Section 3: If a facilitator finds a group purpose is in conflict with their own ethical code or this Code of Ethics, the facilitator will state this and withdraw from the contract.

A facilitator can facilitate only with the agreement of all the participants. If the group fails to give this agreement or withdraws it, the facilitator will withdraw or move aside until the matter is resolved.

Section 6: change to: A facilitator uses their skills, knowledge and wisdom to enable group participants to express their natural gifts, talents and life experiences.
Reason: This is simpler and recognises that it is individual choice, not group choice, to express ourselves.

Rest of section is good, but delete ‘strategies’ and keep ‘methods’.
Reason: Strategies sounds a little manipulative.
This will then read. Facilitators embrace a wide array of methods from which to choose...

Last sentence. ‘We design sessions’ (then add) ‘and work in the moment in ways’...
Reason: Masterful facilitation also includes the ability to work in the moment and generate synergy.

In the section on content neutrality, Section 8, I had a concern that there was too much emphasis on the exceptions than on the principle itself. In my view, exceptions should be infrequent, if at all, and clients should be safe from our opinions. I suggested changes; (to read)

8) A facilitator remains content neutral, bringing objectivity to the process.

Facilitators bring process expertise and stewardship of the process, while participants bring content knowledge and expertise to the discourse. We endeavour to pass on process knowledge but do not contribute to content.

If we are requested to provide content knowledge by the group, we ensure that this is done in a way that clearly distinguishes this from our facilitation role.

In conclusion, I wondered if we might be running the risk of watering down facilitation into a subset of management consulting (EVTT message 265, 12 February 2001).

The response to the Draft Code was strong and continued throughout February. Although initially positive, the discussions at times were heated and the dialogue became polarised around the issues of ‘who was the client’ and the importance of ‘consensus’.

In an attempt to find common ground, the facilitator expressed his own view of consensus (12 February) and saw it as a specific process among many.
Personally I am uncomfortable in trying to 'institutionalize' such a specific process in an overview document such as the Code that must serve us in all facilitation contexts and situations (EVTT message 264, 12 February 2001).

This involvement of the facilitator did not help, as his neutrality on this issue was breached. The different views seemed to be contained in a polarity between institutional and community facilitators which I termed the 'corporate facilitators' and the 'group facilitators'. In a posting on 5 March (EVTT message 325) I articulated this insight:

I have been thinking about my disquiet with our draft code. Where I have got to is that there are two major approaches to facilitation and these differences somehow need to be distinguished for a code of ethics to work for everyone — particularly on an international basis.

This is my take on it:

1) **Corporate facilitation**
   In this form the primary client is the project manager (the funding agent). The facilitator works with the project manager to clarify purpose and possibly the process to be used with a group(s). The relationship with the group(s) although important is secondary. The facilitator may act as the liaison between the project manager and the group(s) and has considerable power that needs to be used with awareness and within ethical guidelines. The facilitator's contract with the group may be implicit and the focus is on efficiency and effectiveness, outcomes and forwarding corporate goals. Group records belong to the organisation and are cared for by the facilitator.

2) **Group facilitation**
   In this form the group is the client. The facilitator's contract is with the group; the group defines the purpose, forms agreements and works together using consensus decision-making to reach their objectives with the process expertise provided by the facilitator. Liaison with the funding agent is by the group representatives (and the facilitator if requested) and the power remains with the group(s). The focus is on purpose, commitment, clear agreements, rich relationships, working through conflict and synergy. Group records belong to the group. Ethical issues for the facilitator include dominating and manipulating group members, lack of process transparency,
not observing confidentiality, inability to work with the whole person, and assuming ownership of group material.

Both these forms use professional (paid) facilitators. Corporate and public organisations may use either form. Community organisations and not-for-profit organisations use mostly (2). These two forms may require different names and different ethical codes or need to be distinguished in some way in the same code (EVTT message 326, 5 March 2001).

This posting elicited a number of responses:

One of these (5 March) included:

Dale — You have hit upon one of the dilemmas we face in this task. I have a friend who facilitates groups as part of being a consultant and I often cringe when I see him treat group participants like ‘data points’. He argues that he gets the job done, doesn’t often have the time for ‘touchy feely’, and the clients love him. I think OD consultants who facilitate groups as part of an organizational change effort have the same dilemma – do they serve the clients’ interests or the group’s? Or is their value in building bridges and aligning everyone in the organization? I have heard this dilemma described as the difference between ‘active’ facilitation (facilitator directs the group process) and ‘passive’ facilitation (facilitator does whatever the group wants).

I like to think that, as professional IAF facilitators, we are able to ‘stand in the middle’ of any of these ambiguous settings and ‘move the ball forward’ in the situation. Regardless of the official role we have (consultant, internal/external facilitator, change manager, project manager, facilitative leader, etc.) we use our facilitative skills to help people work together to do what needs to be done (EVTT message 327, 5 March 2001).

Other participants also responded. One on 6 March said:

There are probably 30 (roles). We use a wide variety of approaches and operate in a wide variety of settings. What I have seen so far goes a long way toward covering the values and ethics involved in the full spectrum. We are all accountable to the end user as well as — our primary contact person (EVTT message 329, 6 March 2001).
This accountability to the end user – the primary contact person, identified this participant, from my perspective, as a 'corporate' facilitator. Also on 6 March a participant added:

In my research project that looks at leadership practices in the evolution of a multi-stakeholder planning system, I did an inquiry circle with a group of facilitators. ... One of the most significant dilemmas this group identified was the one of balancing the needs of the person who hired us with the needs of the group (EVTT message 330, 6 March 2001).

For the facilitator to take on this management role of 'balancing' was an ethical issue that I believed needed to be addressed in the Code. The facilitator, in my view, may facilitate this kind of negotiation, but must not take any active role in such decision-making because this would transgress facilitator neutrality.

Another participant, in a posting also on 6 March, regarded the two types of facilitation as the two ends of a spectrum and agreed there were these two large categories out there. He said that he would hate to see this lead to a split and that we needed to look for the commonalities that were greater than the differences. He saw the key as the scope of the decision-making afforded to the group, and the clarity around this for the group.

A critical consideration here is that the client, the facilitator, and the participants, must be absolutely clear before going into the session about how the group’s input will be used, post-session. If the project manager is only looking for input, and the group expects to make the decision, the recipe for disaster is complete. The worst part of it is that you could have a wonderful session and disaster doesn’t strike until after the fact, when the group gets surprised with an unexpected outcome (EVTT message 331, 6 March 2001).

These contributions failed to persuade me that the distinction I had made was not valid.

The reference to the many roles a facilitator might play, for example, seemed to ‘beg the question’ that we were writing a code of ethics for facilitators, not project managers, consultants, or facilitative leaders. We needed to be clear about the differences so that groups knew that they could trust a facilitator to work in a certain way, as one could for a mediator or a doctor, for example. It would not work for a
mediator to change roles to that of an arbitrator, and make a decision for the parties concerned, rather than bring them to an agreement. Yes, there are commonalities between corporate facilitation and group facilitation, but there are also commonalities between facilitators and mediators. Which of these commonalities are the critical ones that distinguish facilitation?

The dialogue was getting to the key issues that lie at the heart of facilitation in organisations. The most persistent controversial issue related to the importance of consensus. Some facilitators (including myself), asserted that consensus was integral to facilitation. Others considered that it was optional. The division was again along corporate/group facilitation lines.

The sticking point seemed to be whether people regarded consensus as an ideology, a way of being, a value, a specific process, or as an outcome. We were often talking past one another without acknowledging our different underlying assumptions. In a posting on 14 March, a participant moved the issue forward by considering three related values (Schwarz 1994), that of free and informed choice, valid information and internal commitment.

I am thinking about two definitional questions regarding this issue. First, what is the relationship of group facilitation to decision making? Second, is consensus a value, or a manifestation of values put into practice? …

If free and informed choice is a value that underlies group facilitation, does it necessarily mean that all of group facilitation must, by definition, involve the making of choices? Or does it mean that when it is necessary to make choices, they should free and informed? If free and informed choice, valid information, and internal commitment are values that underlie group facilitation, does it necessarily mean that all group facilitation must, by definition:

• result in consensus? (if so what do we call it when a group in fact fails to reach consensus and ceases to continue trying?)
• work toward, or intend to reach consensus?
• build as much agreement as possible in the time available?
• make decisions in some way that takes into account the amount of internal commitment that has been achieved in the group in the time available?
Another way of reflecting on this: Is consensus the 'only' way to manifest the underlying values of group facilitation, is it one of many ways, or is it the most preferred or many ways? (EVTT message 345, 14 March 2001).

In response, the following posting of 14 March took this further, by drawing attention to all the little decisions that groups make along the way:

We make decisions in groups all the time – small and large – process, content, and outcomes. When people want a consensus it is helpful to ask them what it would look like in relation to the group and the topic at hand.

One way of viewing this is to see consensus as an immutable core value. Many of those who do, use it as a foundation and a vehicle for social and organisational change. I don't mind saying that I believe that organisations that operate on the basis of a carefully and respectfully formed consensus actually build social capital that leads to substantial improvements in organisations and in society as a whole. Organisations that operate out of consensus over a long period of time tend to have healthy and productive cultures (EVTT message 346, 14 March 2001).

I responded to these postings by saying:

What I am getting at ... is that all meetings involve decisions, but not necessarily as results.
Will I turn up?
Will I accept the facilitator?
Do I align with the group purpose?
Am I a party to the group agreements and committed to them?
Will I engage in this process?
Will I contribute constructively?

We need a 'yes' to all of these to do our work. We need consensus to do our work. We keep building consensus all the time – and many of our interventions are geared to this.

We can keep people involved through oppression or seduction or through their active agreement as adults, which means taking requests and challenges seriously and honouring them all as valid. ... Without this level of engagement, generating synergy is not possible. We get half-hearted obedience – which I guess is the norm (EVTT message 347, 14 March 2001).
Also on 14 March, another participant added:

... these little things can have a big effect on the group climate and set the tone for how the big decisions are made at later meetings.

By having consensus decision-making an explicit value and behavior in our ethical code, we are only acknowledging what we know to be the ethical way to treat participants in any group process (big decision meeting or good conversation meeting.) It is also the most effective way to get good results, as Argis, Schwarz, and Schuman remind us (EVTT message 348, 14 March 2001).

As a result of the above dialogue, a number of the EVTT members, including myself, were able to design a statement of facilitator values with which all the active members of the discussion at that time were comfortable. This was articulated in the following way on 20 March.

As facilitators we believe in the inherent value of the individual and the collective wisdom of the group. We strive to make the contributions of each individual available to the group and to help the group to make the best use of all the contributions of its members. We set aside our personal opinions, maintain neutrality, enable groups to develop their own results, and support the group's right to make its own decisions. Our non-judgmental stance with regard to specific perspectives and outcomes is key to guiding the group towards consensus (EVTT message 364, 20 March 2001).

The development of this statement was the result of a collective online effort, and therefore demonstrated in action, the building of a consensus. It took us forward without the compromise that seemed to be the fear of some participants.

In the meantime the task force was putting together the second draft of the statement and code offline. This Draft 2 was posted on 24 March. The task force had made a concerted effort to include a number of changes, including some I had suggested, e.g., describing the facilitator as a process guide (in the Preamble), rewriting the Statement of Values based on the work by the group outlined above, and clarifying the section on eliciting and honouring the perspectives of all (Statement of Ethics No 7 in Draft 1 and No 5 in Draft 2).

The full Draft 2 of the code is provided in Appendix D.
Participants were then asked by the facilitator to read Draft 2 with fresh eyes.

If you are satisfied that, although not perfect, you can live with this latest version being presented at the conference, then I invite you to share this with the group. If you remain silent, we will never know what you are thinking (EVTT message 367, 24 March 2001).

Feedback on Draft 2 was particularly requested from people who were not able to attend the May 2001 IAF Conference in Minneapolis at which two sessions were programmed to discuss the draft further. Online feedback was received from 15 participants, mostly supportive, and with six participants suggesting further changes.

These suggestions included a discussion about Clause 1 of the code – ‘We are in service to the client and participants, using our competence to add value to their work through facilitation.’ On 28 March a posting commented:

If the ‘client and participants’ are separate (assuming client means the person or organisation paying us), which is often the case, then it is incongruent to be in service to both. This creates (in my opinion) irreconcilable difficulties.

Consider mediation where the mediator is clearly and unequivocally working on behalf of the conflicted parties regardless of who is paying. If we cannot take this stand as facilitators we undermine our ability to work effectively with groups.

The thing is – it is not, I believe, the Facilitator’s job to decide what the client needs to know or be involved in, the facilitator needs to work with the group to have them manage these relationships as they see fit. The group needs to be clear about their areas of accountability and what they will do when they reach these boundaries. ...

Facilitation is about liberation of the human spirit through working with the group in such a way that people claim their own authority and move into a space of potent partnership and relationship with those around them. It is not working on behalf of management (client?) to achieve management (EVTT message 378, 28 March 2001).

After some discussion with another participant on this topic, the above contributor concluded on 2 April by saying:

We must stand for something, either, forwarding the status quo OR liberating the human spirit – We can not have it all ways! (EVTT message 382, 2 April 2001).
This issue of responsibilities in a number of different 'client' relationships is addressed in a Code of Ethics of the New Zealand Association of Psychotherapists (1986), that I was given after the Internet dialogue was completed. In this Code (Appendix B) an order of priority is given in the general exercise of responsibilities and then each area of priority is addressed in detail.

The areas of priority in the Code are ordered as follows:

The first responsibility of the therapist is to his or her clients. Due regard should also be paid to the interests and self-respect of the therapist in this relationship.

Next comes responsibility to the wider community, to colleague, the profession, and the therapist's responsibility to his or her employing institution. The Association considers this ordering of responsibilities important for determining professional priorities and for according preference in the settling of disputes involving conflicting interests. (my underlining).

Facilitators in their future deliberations could usefully address prioritising of responsibilities, such as in this Code¹.

A further discussion developed around the use of the word 'trust' in the preamble and a request to take this out. A 14 April posting:

Trust in Australia means accepting something without inquiry. I don’t accept that our role as facilitators is to ask people to accept facilitators without inquiry. There has been profound misuse of trust by those in public office over the last few generations, and I don’t believe that Australia is alone in this misuse of trust by those in public office.

We are an international organisation, and perhaps there needs to be sensitivity to international connotations of words, particularly when we are talking 'preamble' and the 'role' of the facilitator (EVTT message 391, 14 April 2001).

On 15 April the facilitator requested feedback on the whole process. This feedback is addressed in the next section as part of the reflections on the Internet dialogue.

---

¹ The debate regarding 'who was the client' was continued online (EVTT@yahoogroups.com), after input by Roger Schwarz (2002a). In the ensuing discussion agreement was reached that 'Our clients are the group(s) which we facilitate and those who contract on their behalf' (26/3/2002).
The Code was considered at two IAF Conference forum sessions in Minneapolis, May 2001, co-led by Sandor Schuman, Roger Schwarz and myself. A variety of issues were raised, including those mentioned above. A further round of consultation took place online during June 2001-May 2002. The revised Code was then presented to the IAF Board in May 2002 and adopted as a Draft Code to be revised in 2004.
3.4 Reflections on the Internet dialogue

The research method of Internet dialogue was chosen as a practical way of accessing a global conversation. Facilitated online discussion groups are a new kind of co-operative process, and so it was also an opportunity to learn more about this way of working.

Online facilitation does have similarities to face-to-face facilitation, and it also has differences that result from the more flexible use of time and space, which Internet technology allows. As these technologies are new, little information exists to guide facilitators as to best practices for conducting online facilitation.

Issues specific to Internet dialogue

Some of the differences to face-to-face facilitation that have been identified in the literature (White 2000) are the lack of physical cues (body language and voice), the different perceptions of time (asynchronicity) which may lead to feelings of being ignored, the anonymous and disembodied nature of the medium, different perceptions of private versus public spaces and perceptions, and limitations in people’s reading and writing skills. Also, the anonymous nature of online groups may lead to behaviour outside normal social limits.

Initial ‘lessons’ identified from work with virtual groups using video conferencing showed similar results (Mittleman et al. 2000):

- People don’t get feedback when working over a distance
- People forget who is at a distributed meeting
- It is harder to build a team over a distance
- It is harder to follow a meeting process from a distance
- Network connections are unpredictable
- It is tough to sort out multiple communication channels
- There is an art to using audio and video channels at a distributed meeting
- It is harder to converge over a distance
- Different-time virtual meetings are different from same-time virtual meetings
- Lack of physical communication cues (p. 5).
The facilitator of the EVTT group expressed the difficulty of facilitating online on 22 October 2000:

1) I have no idea how many participants are 'in the room' at any one time.
2) I cannot see your eyes.
3) I don't have the opportunity of reading body language or facial expressions.
4) I'm unable to discern voice inflection, or sense the nuances of what you have to say.
5) If you choose not to participate, I'm unable to read your mind. ...
6) Unless I'm mistaken, some members of the group appear to address their responses to the facilitator, rather than the group as a whole. As the facilitator I'm averse to attempting to respond to everyone's input, issues and concerns.
   My preference is for a member of the group to pick up on a topic, should they be so motivated (EVTT message 96, 22 October 2000).

Participants expressed similar problems:

I hope that the next week or so will generate some constructive discussion, although I admit I find this listserv way of doing things rather difficult. I believe if all of us were in a room together, we could hammer this out and have a Code of Ethics we could agree on. I guess I'll wait until May to be in that room [referring to the IAF Conference] (EVTT message 278, 23 February 2001).

Working on a project like this, online, with the limited tools we have chosen, is difficult at best. ... With the lack of tone and body absence of the medium, it is harder to tell what a writer is expressing. ... The processes need to be more explicit online. Agreements on roles need a greater level of visibility and clarity because it is dang easy to make an incorrect assumption (EVTT message 289, 24 February 2001).

Disembodiment
The one-dimensional nature of text-based communication meant that we did not know how people were feeling when they wrote their contributions. It seemed that some protocol was needed to express feelings, and therefore become more 'real' people. Two suggestions were that we imagine ourselves sitting in a circle as real
people, and that we express our feelings [in brackets]. On Feb 24 a participant suggested:

Imagine each member of this group sitting around in a circle. Imagine the faces. Their voices. The human behind the words. I've met a few of you. I have some clear pictures. Others are pure imagination. But we're still a group of people. Not words on a screen (EVTT message 289, 24 February 2001).

The issue of convergence
Convergence online can be difficult (Mittleman 2000, White 2001). The EVTT had difficulties when attempting to converge towards a second draft for the Code of Ethics. The EVTT used the device of a task force off line to put together the draft documents. Some good wordmithing work was done by a number of the participants around the issue of consensus.

Entry and exit from EVTT
There were no boundaries around entry or exit or contribution to the Ethics and Values Think Tank. Even non-facilitators popped up from time to time with only one comment. Sometimes these seemed to come out of left field, and their authors were never heard from again. Some people who registered for the dialogue contributed nothing, and others contributed a lot, either over time, or at particular times in the life of the group. There was no way to know why people didn't contribute, or what they thought about other contributions, unless they specifically commented on that. We did not start the group by introducing ourselves, or by sharing our purpose for being there, which often happens in a face-to-face group. We were aware of one another only when someone wrote a message.

Other facilitation issues

Not all the process issues that arose were specific to online facilitation. Many of them related to facilitation generally. Key ones are examined below.

Cultural differences
In the dialogue participants were not specifically identified by country, gender or any other characteristic. From the email addresses, it did appear that active contributors were mainly American and Canadian with a lesser number of European, Malaysian
and South African participants. There appeared to be one Australian and one New Zealand participant (myself). During a heated period in the dialogue, a suggestion was made that cultural differences could be a problem: On Feb 13 the Australian participant wrote:

... we may be discussing culture/national diversity here. Being myself a part of the Australasian Facilitators Network, I concur with Dale's hesitation to present the EVTT draft as is, although there are many good points about the draft and I know that the intention is to work on the draft some more.

In general, Australians and New Zealanders prefer, even expect, the kernel/intention of things to be stated clearly, and do not much like 'beating about the bush' (a colloquialism for using a lot of words and still not saying some of the things which seem important to say).

**The activation of the shadow**

The tendency to become activated by one another and react was noted on the EVTT. This is not specific to online work, but has been noted in that context by Nancy White, an experienced online facilitator who was also a participant in EVTT.

Shadows are aspects of oneself that we might not acknowledge or be ready to accept.

The behaviour of the other person is, in itself, a neutral event. How we react to that behaviour is the sign that we may have fallen in the 'trap'. The more inflamed we feel about someone's behaviour, the clearer it is that we have activated our shadow and are in projection mode (White 2001, pp. 2-3).

The issue of the shadow surfaced in reference to a 'tone of judgment', which was commented on a number of times. (e.g., 27 November) and is related to the next issue of facilitator neutrality.

**Facilitator neutrality**

A number of times the facilitator involved himself in the content of the dialogue. This was not a request from the group, or part of any agreement with the group; the facilitator initiated it. In a posting 23 Feb, the facilitator referred to a posting of mine and said:

... I'm going to step out of my role of facilitator, and into my role of participant, or 'angry (not so) young man'...
I've been waiting for the past week to see if anyone would respond. [to your comments criticising the draft code]. No one has so I'll be the bad guy.

If this was your attempt to inflame and insult the group, then, in my opinion, you succeeded. You managed, in a couple of sentences, to diminish the wonderful work this group has accomplished over the last few months. I believe you also shut the group down with your comments (EVTT message 285, 23 February 2001).

This contribution from the facilitator suggests a lack of understanding of the role of facilitator, and the power attached to it. It raised the issue of whether a facilitator saying they are stepping out of role, does in fact mean that they do, or can. Did it compromise his neutrality? In my view, yes.

**Self-directing process**

There was some unwillingness on the part of the facilitator to accept that the dialogue was a self-directing task among peers. The facilitator referred to the initiator, Sandor Schuman, and to the IAF, as clients to whom we were accountable.

On 21 October the facilitator said:

I believe that this group is not tasked to determine the 'WHY' of having an IAF Code of Ethics -- that decision having been taken already at a higher level in the organisation. Having said that, at the appropriate time some dialogue will be required to satisfy the criterion that calls for the preamble to incorporate 'why a code is essential for the organisation'.

The 'HOW', i.e. implementation/follow up, and how the IAF will use the code etc., is something that will likely take place later, and may, at present, be outside the mandate of this EVTT. If I'm off base please let me know (EVTT message 95, 21 October 2000).

In response to the above posting regarding the 'why', I responded on 22 October (EVTT message 97) that: this group came out of a conversation between Sandor Schuman, Roger Schwarz, and myself, and I did not believe that any higher decision has been made, other than for an IAF task force on professional development to support our dialogue, by recognising it as a think tank, and Schuman setting up this egroup.
A participant added to this in a further posting:

To support Dale, IAF is not organised as a hierarchy, so there is no 'higher level'. Volunteer co-ordinators from task forces, who have worked hard on tasks and shown interest in putting in energy to focus work in that area, represent the task force on the Association Co-ordinating Team, which is its governing board.

IAF, in tune with its facilitator values, encourages and relies on individuals within small groups and task forces to initiate dialogue on important topics, and then to bring their work forward to the larger organisation. There is a Professional Development Task Force ... The task of creating a code of ethics and values is certainly part of that area. As we do this work, we are all active members of the task force (EVTT message 104, 24 October 2000).

This concern by the facilitator about the outside client surfaced again several times, which suggested it was part of a mind-set rather than the reality. This mind-set is referred to in the previous chapter as that of the 'corporate or management' facilitator.

Transparency
Concerns were also expressed about process transparency, particularly around the work of the task force. One participant suggested that each clause, together with suggested changes, be posted online so we could all consider them. This request received some discussion, but did not proceed into action.

Voting
There were several voting procedures during the dialogue. We voted on the facilitator, and the proposed process. This use of voting was somewhat out of kilter with the use of consensus. There was no discussion around the repercussions of a split vote. Did we need to vote, and what would have happened if someone voted against? An alternative would have been to ask if anyone was uncomfortable with a proposal, and handle that concern.

We were again asked to suggest the criteria that a Statement of Values and Code of Ethics 'must meet', and then to vote on these. Less than half the people on the discussion group voted. They all voted in favour. Would voting against have stopped the process? There was no discussion about why people were choosing not to vote.
What seemed to result from using voting, was to set the decisions in concrete, and make them difficult to reconsider later. The possibility of more organic changes was lost.

**Relationship building and group agreements**
There was no relationship-building phase to the dialogue. There were no ground rules suggested by the facilitator, and although he requested that people suggest 'rules', none were suggested. This lack of group agreements became a problem during the convergent phase when the first draft was being critiqued. There was no sense of group boundaries – several people who had never been involved before popped into the conversation, and their contributions seemed irrelevant, as no-one responded.

**Prescriptive process**
The question must be raised as to the appropriateness of the process chosen to the development of values and ethics statements. The prescriptive nature of the process was commented on by a number of participants. These criticisms were met with – 'we have a difference of opinion, that's life' kind of response. This tended to model a lack of flexibility and responsiveness by the facilitator. A more appropriate response might have been to call for a process review every 2-3 months and adjust the process on the basis of the feedback.

The prescriptive nature of the process seemed to be related to the facilitator's desire for efficiency as reflected in his initial critical intervention about the proposed longer time scale for the task. Most of the process shortcomings arose from this (in my opinion) misplaced endeavour. A task of this kind (involving alignment on values and ethics) requires time, thought, and reflection. Depth of this nature is not served by an artificially created imperative for efficiency.

**Evaluation**

On 16 April towards the end of the Internet dialogue, the facilitator requested feedback from participants (EVTT message 392). On 20 April (EVTT message 401) I contributed the following to the evaluation process:
1) What you liked/what went well for you

I enjoyed the more in-depth discussions when we began to wrestle with what ethics means in relation to the work of a facilitator. The discussions moved my own thinking forward.

I enjoyed engaging with the regular contributors, and sometimes found myself waiting for their input with great interest.

I enjoyed learning about online, facilitated dialogue experientially – by being part of it – my preferred learning method.

2) Your concerns

a) The appropriateness of the process for the issue.

Starting with the 'must meet' criteria did not work for me. I would have preferred to start with identifying the key ethical issues we grapple with as facilitators (form follows spirit). I did express these concerns at the time, but most people seemed comfortable. I chose not to vote. I think to vote, I would have needed to clarify the implications of a 'no' vote.

Similarly, the request for one value and one statement of belief, was difficult for me to respond to at all meaningfully, as I had been wrestling with these issues for a long time, and wanted to discuss them.

The process seemed like a recipe, rather than alive and developing. Once we voted, it seemed that it was set in concrete. There was no interim review of how it was working for us.

b) The facilitation

The interventions of the facilitator sometimes appeared defensive, and the switching of roles was confusing. I felt 'reprimanded' at one stage.
It would have been helpful for the facilitator to have indicated that he was new to online facilitation, when the offer was made. There were experienced onliners in our group, who could have taken on the job, or perhaps served as a coach for the facilitator.

c) The outcome

I am not convinced that the process took us to a great outcome. The statement and code seem to lack internal alignment now.

3) Suggestions as to what you would do differently, if we had the opportunity to do the whole thing again.

This was my first major online, facilitated dialogue, and a great learning experience. What I learnt generally was to apply good face-to-face practice, and also to find/develop ways to express myself through words, which would compensate in part for lack of embodiment.

a) Relationship building

i. Start the process with an introduction from each participant -- a little about ourselves, our interest in the topic, our online experience, and how we would like to contribute to the dialogue. Use these contributions to come up with a suggested process.

ii. Develop a group agreement (ground rules, culture) at the start to which we all contribute and commit to. This would include how we will make decisions, and possibly minimum contribution agreement (e.g., no less than once a fortnight/month).

iii. Introduce feelings checks, ongoing process feedback, and group acknowledgment techniques, where we acknowledge one another’s contributions from time to time.
b) Transparency

Seek to create transparency throughout, e.g., facilitation, work of task group. Possibly use chat room function for task group as previously suggested.

c) Interventions

Develop interventions that encourage people to contribute. Questions are good, but also requests to share may be needed as well, e.g., share an incident which involved an ethical dilemma for you.

d) Cultural differences

I do not know the answer to this, other than knowing it is a big issue, which we have barely tapped the surface of, in this online setting. Part of this seems to be different cultural norms about criticism.

What I learnt from the experience of taking part in the EVTT

I very much appreciated the opportunity to be part of the EVTT, and I learnt a great deal about different ethical perspectives in facilitation, and about online, facilitated dialogue (EVTT message 401, 20 April 2001).

Comments about the number of inactive members led to responses from participants, some of whom referred to technical problems of working online and other priorities. Some enjoyed being able to join and rejoin as it suited them. One person defended the right to 'lurk', and several commented on the 'constraining' nature, or tone, of some of the dialogue. Schuman commented on April 26 in response to some of these comments:

I do not presume to respond to your concern, but would like to suggest a few things that distinguish this discussion from most others.

(1) We have performed both divergent and convergent thinking. In most online discussions, there is expression of diverse ideas (divergence) but there is seldom need to thoroughly summarise and reach agreement (convergence).
(2) We have maintained a prolonged (10 months) discussion focused on a single task. Most electronic discussions are free to address a broader range of topics, which may be more stimulating and spark the interest of various subscribers.

(3) We have completed a task and produced a deliverable result. Most electronic discussions are educational, problem solving, and/or entertaining. Relatively few are product-orientated (EVTT message 425, 26 April 2001).

Final comment

In conclusion it is important to restate that the newness of the method meant that almost all of us were feeling our way as to the best way to have a facilitated Internet dialogue.
3.5 Introduction to the Co-operative Inquiry

Introduction

The third research method used in this project was that of co-operative inquiry. The intention was to directly address the larger research topic – 'sustainable co-operative processes in organisations' - with a group of facilitator practitioners and attempt to advance our collective thinking. Our learnings could then be compared and contrasted with the findings of the survey and the Internet dialogue, and placed within the context of the literature.

Background to the method

Heron (1996b) describes a co-operative inquiry as follows:

Co-operative inquiry involves two or more people researching a topic through their own experience of it, using a series of cycles in which they move between this experience and reflecting together on it. Each person is co-subject in the experience phases and co-researcher in the reflection phases. While this model has affinities with the account of action research of Kurt Lewin (1952), its source, range of application and epistemology – as I have conceived these – are quite distinct and takes it to a different plane. It is a vision of persons in reciprocal relation using the full range of their sensibilities to inquire together into any aspect of the human condition with which transparent body-mind can engage (Heron 1996b, p. 1).

Peter Reason (1988) also considers the relationships of authentic collaboration and dialogue as central to co-operative inquiry.

Thus in co-operative inquiry we work with our co-researchers, establishing relationships of authentic collaboration and dialogue; ideally we care for each other, and approach each other with mutual love and concern. While not ignoring the necessity for direction and the role of expertise, we eschew unnecessary hierarchy and compulsive control (Reason 1988, pp. 10-11).

The co-operative inquiry method is itself a co-operative process. It was also a method I was experienced in as a participant. I was able to approach the method with confidence, while at the same time knowing that my knowledge about the method would be deepened and sharpened, as a result of subjecting the inquiry to rigorous
scrutiny, at the same time as participating in it. ‘Good co-operative inquiry is both wholeheartedly involved and intensely self-critical’ (Reason 1988, p. 13).

Stages of a co-operative Inquiry

The stages of a co-operative inquiry are well described by Reason (1988, 2001) and Heron (1996b). They are also described in ‘Co-operacy – A New Way of Being at Work’ (Hunter et al. 1997, pp. 136-138). This version was the one I used to introduce the inquiry to the participants.

Co-operative Inquiry

Traditional research distinguishes between the researcher who initiates, designs and implements the research and the research subjects, who are observed, manipulated and recorded as part of the research. The research subjects have no involvement in the research design and in some cases may not know they are being researched. In cases where they are willing subjects, they may not know the purpose of the research or the reasoning behind the methods used.

Co-operative inquiry is a type of research in which the researchers also become the researched. All the people who design and develop the research are also fully involved as the only subjects of the research. The design is collective and the people involved are likely to have a large degree of autonomy as to how they involve themselves and what techniques they individually use as part of the research. Co-operative inquiry is a developed and advanced form of action research.

Methodology

The methodology used in co-operative inquiry draws on aspects of the whole person including the use of intuitive, emotional, spiritual and imaginative aspects as well as conceptual.

Co-operative inquiry can be described as having a basic cycle with four phases, which move from reflection to action and back to reflection again.

Phase 1: Formulation

A group of co-researchers agrees on the area of inquiry and identifies some initial propositions to explore. They may choose to explore some aspect of their experience, agree to try out in practice some particular skills, or they may seek to change some aspect of their world. They also agree on a process by which they will record their
own and each others' experience. They may agree on recording involving a wide range of media from observation notes, free-flow reflection, poetry, drawing, music, movement – individually, in twos, threes, groups or the whole group. A variety of forms contributes to a rich inquiry.

Phase 2: Practice

The group applies the ideas and propositions in their everyday life and work. They observe and record the outcomes of their own and others' behaviour. They observe the obvious and the subtle and look to see in what ways their original ideas do and do not accord with experience.

Phase 3: Immersion

The co-researchers become fully immersed in the activity and experience. They will respond with any or all of the range of feelings from excited to bored, engaged to alienated. They may forget to record their findings and may stumble on unexpected insights. They may be able to set aside their previous belief systems to allow for new experiential knowings to emerge.

Phase 4: Review and planning

After an agreed period in Phase 2 and 3, the co-researchers re-assemble to share the experiential data from these phases and to consider their original ideas in the light of it. As a result they may develop or reframe these ideas, or reject them and pose new questions. They may choose, in planning the next cycle of action, to focus on the same or on different aspects of the overall inquiry. The group may also choose to amend or develop its inquiry procedures – forms of action, ways of gathering data – in the light of experience.

Repeat cycles

The four-phase cycle is then repeated several times. Ideas and discoveries tentatively reached in early phases can be checked and developed; investigation of one aspect of the inquiry can be related to exploration of other parts; new skills can be acquired and monitored. At the final reflection meeting, the findings of the research will be brought together and may be made available to others in some kind of written report and/or in some other kind of presentation.
Validity in co-operative inquiry

Co-operative inquiry claims to be a valid approach to research with people because it rests on a collaborative encounter with experience. The validity of this encounter with experience rests on the high-quality, critical, self-aware, discriminating and informed judgments of the co-researchers – a method known as critical subjectivity.

The method is open to all the ways that human beings fool themselves and each other in their perceptions of the world including cultural bias, character defence and political partisanship. In particular unaware projection and consensus collusion are problematic. Cycling and recycling between action and reflection, exploring the authenticity of participation in the group, and using self-development methods to look at unacknowledged anxiety are some of the ways of counteracting these validity issues (Hunter et al. 1997, pp. 136-138).

Launching an inquiry group

Heron (1996b) distinguishes between internally and externally initiated inquiries.

In an internally initiated inquiry the initiating researchers are internal to the inquiry focus of the group: they are personally engaged with the culture or practice which the research is about, and this means they can be full co-subjects (p. 40).

In an externally initiated inquiry the initiating researchers are external to the particular culture or practice that is the research focus of the group, and so cannot be full co-subjects (p. 41).

This inquiry was an internally initiated inquiry, in that the initiating researcher (myself) was also a professional facilitator, involved with implementing co-operative processes. All the participants were also involved in initiating and implementing co-operative processes in organisations, either as facilitators, managers, or in one case, a staff union president.

Inside and outside inquiry

Heron distinguishes between an inside inquiry, in which all the action phases occur in the same place within the whole group, and an outside inquiry, which is about what goes on in group members' working and/or personal lives, or in some special project outside the group meetings (Heron 1996b, pp. 42-43). Our inquiry began with an
'inside' cycle, so that people could learn the complete cycle process, and continued as an 'outside' inquiry, where the group came together for the reflection phases to share data, make sense of it, revise their thinking, and, in the light of this, plan the next action phase. Group members dispersed for each action phase, which was undertaken on an individual basis out in the world.

**Previous experience of initiating researcher**

It is relevant to cite my previous experience as a co-operative inquirer in relation to initiation, and also because I believe that this prior experience assisted me in initiating this inquiry.

I have taken part in three inquiries in New Zealand. The first, a co-operative inquiry into altered states, was a live-in inquiry, which involved 18 people over four days held at Scots Landing, north of Auckland, New Zealand, in 1993 and initiated by John Heron. This was an 'inside' inquiry. The first two days included training in the method. We lived and worked exclusively on site together, in combinations of individual, pairs, small groups, and the large group. This inquiry is reported by Heron in 'Sacred Science' (1998) under the heading 'Knacks in entering altered states' (pp. 161-167).

The second co-operative inquiry was also initiated by John Heron and others, and was held in Auckland in 1994. It involved a group of 22 people over a period of six weeks. The subject of this inquiry was the role of the transpersonal in everyday life. The group met at weekly intervals each Saturday, to share our experiences, reflect on them and plan the next phase. This was an 'outside' inquiry because our content was experiences in everyday life. It also included an intensive, four-day training in the method at the end of the inquiry. This inquiry is also reported in 'Sacred Science' (pp. 173-188).

The third co-operative inquiry I was involved in was conducted within my place of work. This co-operative inquiry, held from August to November 1994, was jointly initiated by four people within our company Zenergy Ltd. The initiating group included myself, with another person offering to facilitate. Three of us had been involved in both the previous Heron-initiated inquiries. The focus of the inquiry was: 'How are we creating Zenergy’s vision for co-operacy?' This inquiry, which included 19 weekly meetings, does not neatly fit the criteria of 'inside' or 'outside', because though we were not together all the time, we were in close contact, with three of us working in
the same office space, and interacting closely throughout the whole period. This inquiry is reported in Hunter et al. (1997, pp. 138-142).

Heron has referred to this type of inquiry as an outside inquiry involving elements of an inside inquiry:

... for example a group of people who work in some organization as a team, and who are inquiring into the work of the team within the organization. In this case the action phase would include a good deal of interaction between group members as they go about their teamwork on the job (Heron 1996b p. 44).

All the three above inquiries were internally initiated in that the initiators were able to be fully involved.

The inquiry plan

The co-operative inquiry that is the subject of this research was held in Auckland, New Zealand, over 14 weeks, August-December 2000. The purpose of the co-operative inquiry was to inquire into ‘sustainable co-operative processes in organisations’. The inquiry was initiated by myself and was part of the research for this Ph. D. thesis.

The inquiry involved five group meetings; an orientation evening, and four Saturday meetings four weeks apart. Four cycles were planned, one of which would be a mini cycle on the first Saturday meeting.

Four cycles was less than the range of five to eight recommended by Heron. The time commitment for the planning and reflection meetings of four Saturdays, plus an evening orientation meeting took into account the busy lives of the participants. The trade-off was that the inquiry was able to attract participants with extensive experience in introducing and facilitating co-operative processes in organisations.

Inquiry participants

The co-operative inquiry participants were drawn from the Auckland Facilitators Network (general invitation), the Zenergy network of facilitators (Invitation to diploma
graduates and senior participants), and the academic community in Auckland (personal invitations).

The people involved were Lis Gleed, Mark Allen, Lane West-Newman (Ph. D.), Raewyn Togalea-Cobb, Tanya Mogg, Tara Pradhan, Dave Macdonald, Hazel Hodgkin, Susan Byrne (Ph. D.), Sarah McGhee, Hamish Brown, and Dale Hunter (initiator).

There were 11 active inquirers because Tanya Mogg had to withdraw for family health reasons after attending the orientation meeting.

**Participant background information**

Hazel Hodgkin, Hamish Brown, Dale Hunter, Tara Pradhan, Lis Gleed, and Tanya Mogg are all members of the Auckland Facilitators Network. Lis Gleed, Raewyn Togalea-Cobb, Tanya Mogg, Tara Pradhan, Dave Macdonald, Sarah McGhee, Mark Allen, Hamish Brown and Dale Hunter have all participated in Zenergy activities as programme leaders (4), Diploma of Facilitation graduates (6), senior participants (2) and facilitators and coaches (3). Lane West-Newman and Susan Byrne are both Senior Lecturers at the University of Auckland with Ph. D.'s in Sociology and Chemistry respectively.

Mark Allen and Tara Pradhan are managers in local government (community development and events facilitation respectively). Dave Macdonald is a regional manager for the central government roading funding body. Hazel Hodgkin, Lis Gleed, Sarah McGhee, Hamish Brown and Dale Hunter work as external facilitators for the business, public and not-for-profit (community) sectors. Tanya Mogg was an internal coach and facilitator in a large business and more recently an independent coach and facilitator.

Susan Byrne and Dale Hunter had been involved in previous co-operative inquiries, including the two referred to above that were initiated by John Heron (1998).

**Diversity**

The inquiry group comprised nine women and three men. There were nine Europeans (seven women and two men), one Niuean woman, one Indian/European
woman and one European/Maori man. The age range was 25-58. The ratio of men to women is similar to that in the Auckland Facilitators Network and the Zenergy facilitators network. This reflects the generally higher level of interest in co-operative processes among women. The ethnicity within the participants is representative of the general population of New Zealand.

**Attendance at group sessions**

All attendees undertook to attend a minimum of four of the five group sessions, and to find ways to catch up if they had to miss a session. Hamish Brown, Dale Hunter, Lis Gleed, and Hazel Hodgkin attended all five sessions; Raewyn Togalea-Cobb, Lane West-Newman, Tara Pradhan, Dave Macdonald, and Sarah McGhee attended four sessions; Susan Byrne, three sessions; Mark Allen, two sessions; and Tanya Mogg, one session (withdrew). Reports on the group sessions are found in the next chapters of this report.

**Reporting co-operative inquiry processes has been described by Heron (1996b):**

> It is part of the underlying philosophy of co-operative inquiry that, since the researchers are also the subjects acquiring knowledge through their own experience and action, the most basic outcomes of the inquiry process are personally embodied ones:

- Transformations of personal being brought about by the inquiry.

- Practical knowledge, that is the personal skills involved in the domain of practice that is the focus of the inquiry.

The other two kinds of possible outcome, written reports, and presentations in imaginal form as in graphics, painting, movement etc., are ephemeral and secondary, however vital for the purposes of communicating information and symbolising significant patterns (p. 126).

**In terms of ‘personally embodied’ outcomes, this is exactly where we got to in our inquiry. We ‘discovered’ that the willingness and ability to become fully embodied whole persons was the essential key factor to being able to work co-operatively and to maintain sustainable co-operative processes in organisations. The other ‘discovery’ was that embodied whole personhood with its connection to self, others**
and the environment naturally engenders the energy of love and compassion which is essential for effective co-operative processes.

Towards the end of our inquiry, we had a group experience in which many of us experienced a shift of energy in our bodies, which we interpreted as becoming more 'embodied'. For me, this shift gave me access to compassion in a new way, and at a depth, that has transformed my relationships in my work and life.

How can I report such a shift in a way that has integrity, and meets the requirements of this academic discipline?

The written report that follows is primarily the experience of one inquirer. The group agreed that each of us could write up the inquiry, using both the group material and our own perceptions, as long as we stated clearly that this was what we were doing. This report includes comments from other participants, but it is essentially my personal report, and is not the report of the group.

As agreed between the inquirers, the names of the participants have not been used in the next chapter other than in a few agreed places such as referencing art work. Instead each inquirer is identified by a letter of the alphabet.
Note: The paintings and drawings that follow Fig. 19-21, were individual participant reflections on their inquiry questions as part of the co-operative inquiry process. For example, in Fig. 19 Tara Pradham is reflecting on the hierarchical organisation in which she works; a large local government entity (the large square) and the smaller co-operative groups (small circles) and hierarchies (small squares) some of which included community and business people from outside the organisation.
Fig. 19. Hierarchical (squares and triangles) and co-operative (circles) groupings in an organisation. Tara Pradhan 30/10/2000.
Fig. 20. Co-operative group flowing. Raewyn Togalea-Cobb 30/9/2000.
Fig. 21. The seeds of co-operacy. Dale Hunter. 11/2000.
3.6 Co-operative inquiry

Session 1, 30 August 2000 (9 present)

The Co-operative Inquiry commenced with an orientation evening held on 30 August, 2000 at my house in Mt. Eden, Auckland City, New Zealand. All participants introduced themselves, and then I introduced the research topic, and briefly explained the process of co-operative inquiry. Material on the inquiry process and the ethics consent form was handed out and explained. These were signed at the second meeting (see below).

We affirmed our interest in the method of co-operative inquiry and its compatibility with the facilitation work in which most of us were practitioners. We affirmed our commitment to working co-operatively and using active consensus decision-making throughout the inquiry in which we sought to enhance autonomy, full participation and collective alignment.

We discussed the kinds of propositions and questions that we could formulate and take into the action phases. We noted the breadth of the topic (sustainable co-operative processes in organisations) and the need for in-depth reflective thinking, inquiry and creativity in the action phases to generate useful data.

I shared a model from John Heron relating to Apollonian (rational, linear, systematic) and Dionysian (imaginal, expressive, diffuse) inquiry (Heron 1998, p. 124) and the ideas of informative and transformative inquiry (see p. 204 of this document). We explored the likely group process of divergence and convergence, and the various options of raising group questions, individual questions, and a combination of both.

We discussed the importance of the 'devil's advocate' role (a critical questioner looking for gaps and collusion) in helping to establish validity in an inquiry (De Bono 1985). I requested that one participant in particular, assist with this, as an experienced inquirer who was not the initiator.

We explored the use of intuitive, creative, and psychic facilities, as well as thinking and reflecting, and also the use of various presentational (communication) forms such as music, art, and poetry as ways of expressing our learnings. There was a lot of enthusiasm and a sense of freedom.
We discussed the gender and ethnic mix of the group, and talked about roles and power dynamics. I invited other participants to share the role of facilitator throughout the inquiry.

I was excited at the co-operative inquiry getting started after a long gestation period of one-and-a-half years from when I first planned to do it. The group of people was comprised of people I knew, and I had a lot of respect for each of them as facilitators and thinkers.

Participant A reflected on the beginning of the inquiry:

The drawing together of a range of people was exciting – different professions and experiences looked like it would provide a variety of contribution. The out-laying of the structure and commitment required was clear. Contributions could be made in many shapes and forms. This was useful for accessing insight, unknown, thinking outside the square, creativity and impulse as possible.

Participant B reflected:

During the initial meeting I was inspired by the idea that I could engage in the topic (in which I am very interested) in any way at all that served my learning and the group. Intellectually I found the proposed process liberating and felt my creativity and the many aspects of my emergent self engaging.

This anticipatory experience was borne out in the practice of the inquiry.

Participant C reflected on the co-operative inquiry process.

I loved the way we were given the choices as to how we expressed ourselves – artwork, poetry etc. I really appreciated the opportunity to use this methodology which I had heard about. I felt totally at home with it because it was co-operative – not rushed or forced to contribute verbally if I didn't want to. An empowering methodology. This will be a methodology I will use.

Session 2, first Saturday Meeting, 2 September (9 present)

This day-long session was held in Parnell, Auckland, at a conference room with expansive harbour views. We began at 9:30am. Three participants who had not
attended the orientation joined us (I had briefed them earlier) plus a dog Jack. Two participants were absent.

We 'checked in' - sharing one at a time with the group. Participant D shared about a meeting with a senior person in her organisation that she felt had degenerated into an abusive homily directed towards the union group she was representing. The emergence of the shadow was affirmed by other participants.

We then planned the day together. We agreed to:

- Develop the group agreement
- Explore the topic – ‘sustainable co-operative processes in organisations’
- Explore the co-operative inquiry process, and where we were up to in it
- Design the action phases

We developed a group agreement relating to confidentiality, documentation, group and individual ownership of material, and identification of individuals in any group reports.

We explored the research topic in depth. Participant E facilitated a process where we took each word and developed it as a brainstorm (Appendix J nos. 3-10). The connections between words were also explored – (sustainable-co-operative), (co-operative-processes), (processes-organisations), and the question: "What is missing?"

Under the heading of 'sustainability', people suggested the following qualifying words and phrases:

Life-enhancing, living vibrantly, wise use of resources, authentic, balance, renewal, generative, sustaining and survival of the whole.

For ‘co-operative’ the words and phrases included:

Self-reflective form of collective, power together, complexity, together and separate, confronting challenge, aiming for the same goal, time consuming.
'Processes' included:

Journey, ways we do things, understood steps of achievement of purpose, mysterious movement towards somewhere.

'Organisations' included:

Virtual – real, people, buildings, bosses, workers, for profit/not for profit, suppressive/oppressive, different size and scale of organisations, and the dark side – multi-national corporates raping the world's resources.

Under 'what is missing' and 'connections' included:

Can you work co-operatively as two or fifty people?
What about conditioned oppressive behaviours?
Why would we want to be this way?
How do we know it works?
Is it just a fantasy that belies human nature?
The importance of recognising and making explicit the shadow side.

This session took until lunchtime and was intensive. People signed their ethical consent forms after lunch. One participant expressed a concern about long workshops. We considered this and decided to stay with the arranged times – five hours on the second and third Saturdays and seven hours on the last Saturday. Questions were raised about the 'bottom line' expectations from the University (re Ph.D. requirements) as distinct from a co-operative inquiry undertaken by ourselves without this constraint. We discussed this and noted the requirement of keeping the originals of work agreed by the group to be the group record, and having the consent forms signed.

The question was raised about the expectations of inquirers: ‘What if nothing happens?’ and nothing is generated out of the inquiry. We agreed we didn't know what would happen and needed to trust the process.
Mini-cycle (Cycle 1)
We then undertook a mini-inquiry cycle (Cycle 1), which I facilitated. Each person chose a focus of inquiry related to the main topic, and inquired into this for 30 minutes. People worked individually, in pairs, and one group as a triad. Activities included reflecting while resting, talking and walking with the dog (tried), writing notes, drawing, and painting (individually and in a pair). We reconvened to share our individual insights and reflections, and reflected on these as a group.

Participant G drew a matrix involving inward, outward, formal, and informal behaviours, indicating levels of co-operativeness they experienced within organisations (Appendix K, no. 7). Participant E drew an intricate and colourful patchwork-quilt pattern of relationships in organisations (Appendix J, no. 1).

Planning Phase
Cycle 2
After a short break we designed the second cycle including arranging interim meetings, and establishing an email list. We decided to use individual strategic questions or specific focus areas within the more general inquiry question to engage with in the action phase. Each participant undertook to:

a) actively engage with an individual specific question or focus, and also a group question or focus if one emerged.

This approach was based on a practice within Zenergy (my co-operative workplace) of developing weekly themes as a means of alignment and focus. The themes are developed at our Monday morning creation meeting and name an agreed desired state of being for that week. Examples of themes chosen are 'in the fire', 'listening for emergence', 'pool together', 'feel', 'intentionality', 'action', 'depth and humanity'. These themes are posted on the wall and referred to during the week by Zenergy members privately and in conversation, to present the theme and influence our individual and collective being states. The assumption is that shifts in being states affect our behaviour, the behaviour of others we are in contact with, and our experience of the world (Hunter et al.1997, pp. 154 and 185).

b) create conversations with work colleagues and others using the question/focus as an impetus for generating or uncovering new knowledge.
This approach was based on the dynamic use of strategic questioning (Peavey 1993 and 1997). Peavey describes strategic questioning as a way of facilitating dynamic listening that creates new information and uncovers the deep desires of the heart rather than communicating information already known (p. 1). Peavey asserts that strategic questioning is political because it is a process that encourages people to find their own powerful way through the rapids of change.

Questioning is a basic tool for rebellion. It breaks open the stagnant hardened shells of the present, revealing ambiguity and opening up fresh options to be explored. Questioning reveals the profound uncertainty that is embedded in all reality beyond the facade of confidence and sureness. It takes this uncertainty towards growth and new possibilities.

Questioning can change your entire life. It can uncover hidden power and stifled dreams inside of you - things you may have denied for many years. Questioning can change institutions and entire cultures. It can empower people to create strategies for change (Peavey 1993, p. 2).

c) to look for opportunities to broaden the inquiry through further activities in the field.

This could include workshops, surveys and other activities initiated or facilitated by the inquiry participants and involving other groups of people.

Recording was to be an individual responsibility and use of a variety of presentational forms such as painting, poetry and music as well as writing was encouraged.

Questions / foci

Each participant developed an individual question or focus that had emerged from his or her inquiry in cycle 1, to take into the next cycle. These were:

- What is the impact of outsourcing (contracting out) on organisations? 
  (Participant G)

- How can people be encouraged to take risks in their organisation and start putting into practice their learnings (about co-operative work) from my workshops into their everyday work? 
  (Participant J)
• Exploring individual cycles. How can I maintain myself and re-engage with organisations? (Participant L)

• Exploring co-operative, interactive, tender process/community consultation within organisations perceived to be hierarchical, structured, non-co-operative, current culture. (Participant F)

• Exploring co-operative process and characterisation in any activity. (Participant E)

• Exploring cyclic, seasonal, organic cycles in organisations as an aspect of co-operative work. (Participant K)

• How can we consistently maintain empowering practice even when challenged to the maximum? (Participant C)

• How to balance intentionality with playfulness while training others to take responsibility with ease? (Participant B)

• What is the relationship between our conditioning and who we are at work? (Participant A)

• What is the relationship between co-operation and timing? (Participant D)

• Exploring how to work co-operatively within a hierarchical organisation or a project as a team. This includes considering transparency of process and the need for shared values – how to name this? (Participant H)

After the session, I reflected in my notes that participants tended to look to me, as the initiator, to lead, and some looked to me to take care of organisational details, such as morning teas and so on. One participant had provided the venue, and took responsibility for opening up and hosting the space. I wanted the group to have joint ownership. The variety of roles I had – initiator, expert, facilitator, key stakeholder, and student – contributed to this difficulty. Sharing the facilitation helped, and this was now happening.

**Action phases**

During the following four-week action phase inquiry participants worked with their focus questions and held conversations with colleagues and others to explore these. Participants A, J and K kept journals.

A four-day Zenergy facilitation training workshop for senior students (the Master Class) was held during this period. This was led by myself (Participant K) and
Participant J, and attended by Participant F among others. We involved the Master Class in the co-operative inquiry. For example: One Master Class participant was working with power issues and uncovered that he constantly projected his relationship with his father onto others and that this was so embedded that he had not previously distinguished this deeply, despite much personal development work including Co-Counselling. In the Master Class we worked with this dynamic and also reflected on how difficult it can be to uncover the full extent of these common patterns and mitigate their detrimental effect on people attempting to work co-operatively and maintain peer relationships over time.

Participant B wrote several poems during this four-week period and engaged his colleagues including Participant K, in frequent conversations around his inquiry question, sometimes on a daily basis.

**Reflection Phase**

**Session 3, second Saturday meeting, 30 September (8 present)**

The programme for the day was co-created by the members of the group:

- Check in
- Reflection on action phase (individual, pairs or triads)
- Group reflection
- Design cycle 3

We checked in individually to the group, and then had a period of reflection individually and in pairs on our progress with our strategic question and focus area. I suggested that participants seek to access unconscious, embedded knowledge, as well as sharing reflections from the action phase.

The individual and small group reflection process included production of poetry, paintings, diagrams, words, and thoughts and feelings. This was followed by sharing and reflection in the whole group. This was free-flowing and continued for most of the day.
Participant B reflected:

I used poetry as a form of expression a lot in the early stages of the inquiry and found that this both stimulated my own emerging questions and seemed to contribute to the group. Also, the content of various other people in the group added to my own exploration. This occurred particularly in the mornings of the days we meet as a whole group.

Using a variety of forms of expression both brought different insights and learnings into my awareness, and occurred as a liberating experience as I developed more faith in my many capacities. This was an important experience as it contradicted the conditioning I have received in my bachelors and masters degrees, where only the intellect is relevant.

Participant A produced two large sheets on her question, ‘What is the relationship between our conditioning and who we are at work?’ The first sheet, entitled Conditioned Behaviour at Work, addressed assumptions, expectations and preconceived roles; gender and power dynamics; conditioned patterns; roles and coping strategies (Appendix J, no. 11). She described her process of inquiring into conditioning at work and how it took her to considering how to generate creative, healthy, holistic environments, the kinds of energy which evoke sustainability in organisations, and what might be the source of this energy.

Participant G shared his reflections on the impact of outsourcing on sustainable co-operative organisational development. He illustrated his thinking with a colourful diagram made up of squares with arrows to show relationships and blank squares to indicate what he did not know (Appendix J, no. 12). He explained how outsourcing can de-stabilise organisations, and he recognised this happening at his workplace. He saw the need to change the way he worked with consultants and other outsourced work groupings to create alignment and relationship at a deeper level. He saw his organisation in continuous change, including continual change of people and the need for continuous rebuilding. He imagined the possibility of whole organisations relating to whole individuals, and the nurturing of partnerships and alliances whether they were inside or outside the organisation.
**Planning Phase**

**Cycle 3**

Cycle 3 questions and inquiry areas developed out of the above reflection process. Two participants not present (D & H) added their questions after the session. I have grouped the questions under three headings to indicate a degree of convergence.

Investigating polarities and the gap between:

- What is the gap between polarisation and synergy? (Participant F)
- What is the nature of the tension between sustainability and co-operacy? (Participant G)
- What is the relationship between extra surrender of individual autonomy (perceived) and sustainable co-operation? (Participant D)
- What is the gap that has communication be missing? (Participant B)

Investigating energy and cycles:

- Exploring energy levels and what supports and generates sustainability. (Participant J)
- What happens when the tide goes out (energy flags) in co-operative organisations? (Participant K)
- What is the structure of the primordial flaring forth (e.g., bursts of creativity)? (Participant A)
- Exploring a fascination with fractals. (Participant L)

Investigating empowerment and motivation:

- What needs to happen to maintain and balance between empowerment and disempowerment in organisations? (Participant C)
- What makes people want to or not want to work co-operatively? (Participant H)

Also, a number of the group were interested in exploring the following question that emerged during our discussion:

What is the relationship between organic emergence and intentional creation?
This question engaged some, but not the entire group. There was a lot of energy at
the meeting. People were much more freed up and 'in their bodies'. Imaginations
stretched and grew. There was a lot of laughter and deep sharing. Our two senior
lecturer participants were not present. I wondered if this was partly responsible for
the difference?

**Action phases**

Inquiry participants continued to explore, immerse themselves in and have
conversations about their strategic questions and focus areas.

During this action phase, Participant H, undertook a written survey of seven
colleagues at her workplace with the following questions to open up the discussion:

1) What does working co-operatively mean to you?
2) What are the drivers that make you want to work co-operatively?
3) What are the drivers that make you not want to work co-operatively?

A summary of the results is contained in Appendix H.

This action cycle also included a workshop at the Australasian Facilitators Network
(AFN) conference that was led by two of the participants (L and H). It was titled:
'Enabling people to work co-operatively in the workplace successfully and intuitively'
(see Appendix K, no. 1).

Participants A, J and K continued with their journals. I, (Participant K), also produced
some paintings (Appendix J, no. 16-18). I also met with another participant
(Participant D) fortnightly to share and develop our thinking. Sometimes, at my
request, she wrote down my thoughts into my journal as I spoke them.

Journal notes on my question, 'What happens when the tide goes out (energy flags)
in co-operative organisations?' included the following:

I am aware of the fragility of people. (My friend is in hospital after having a stroke). We
all need sustenance and time to regenerate. Full-time work doesn't seem to allow for
this. Co-operative organisations are people centered. People are not so replaceable
as they may be in hierarchies...
Co-operation is chain like. If someone drops the ball everyone suffers. We are dependent on one another's goodwill, which means people being their word. Two-way contracting is basic to co-operative work, and this doesn't rest on force or coercion. It requires knowing colleague's strengths and weaknesses and is a sophisticated way of working together consciously. It also involves everyone looking for the holes and gaps when the ball gets dropped and contracting breaks down. In co-operative work everyone needs to be proactive.

Power accumulates. It needs to be kept shifting. This includes knowledge power. There needs to be a conscious effort to prevent power coalescing in particular spots. But beware of the 'tall poppy' syndrome and no-one being able to stick out. It is not easy....

Participant D wrote a paper on time and cultural differences based on her experiences during the inquiry. She commented:

I didn't take the time to write every day in a notebook. I didn't write anything much at all until I sat down to do this. Instead I thought about the inquiry each day. I told my brain that I wanted it to reflect on all kinds of experiences and produce a report for me about what I now think now about time. And this is it (Appendix G).

Participant B and I also had almost daily conversations on the inquiry topics in our workplace.

Session 4, third Saturday meeting, 28 October (10 present)

A programme was co-created on the day.

- Check-in and attending to group process
- Individual and group reflection
- Generation of Cycle 4

In the check-in I addressed my concerns about attendance, lateness, and participants emailing me rather than the whole group. Later we addressed the internal process of our co-operative group. We discussed our process and our purposes for being there. Some participants said they were mainly there out of commitment to me. One participant shared that she did not know most people in the
group, and found it difficult to deeply trust people she didn’t know. Out of this conversation the group was able to shift to a deeper authenticity and relatedness.

We summarised the learning from the group process up to now: The following is a lightly edited version of the range of observations:

- Explore how the process will work at the beginning – explore collectively what processes will make it work for us & tease out these things
- Need more exploration with a group that hasn’t been pre-formed
- If you do it all you are directing it and it won’t work
  - process needs to be learnt experientially
  - you can only do so much at the beginning
- What stops me from communicating with the entire group?
- Anxiety is bad/has an impact – can be productive unease/motivators
- Fears, baggage, undervaluing, anxieties hold us back from sharing, communicating – important to share authentically
- I don’t like it when people don’t show up
- Declaring expertise and emerging, are at two ends of a spectrum
- Attend to our own group process
- Importance of how questions are asked: how vs. what. Does valid wisdom only come from experience? Do work titles get in the way? Where does working co-operatively come from? Get different answers if have/haven’t worked co-operatively
- I reflected on cultural differences after spending the weekend with a group of Maori elders. Awareness of people, activity around you is required for co-operative working. Emotional energy never wasted in getting things done. Time wasn’t a currency. They created open space where things could happen co-operatively
- Integrity + authentic = co-operative
- Working as a team where people have the same values
- Co-operacy is walking through the barriers to platform 9½ (from Harry Potter ‘s adventures)
- Get to the point where we don’t know, then we can generate new knowledge
- Respect for each other. If something is unnamed it doesn’t exist
- Issue of translation of ideas and experience to others who do not think co-operatively. This is very tiring
**Reflection phase**

**Individual and group reflection**

Each person shared his or her inquiry reflections and actions. Participant H shared the responses to her team survey, and reported on the workshop she initiated at the Auckland Facilitators Network (AFN) Conference called: ‘Enabling people to work co-operatively in the workplace successfully and intuitively’ (see Appendix K). Another participant, L, had also been involved in the same workshop as the socio-drama facilitator. This workshop had been initiated as part of the open space activities at the conference. The ten participants used socio-drama to explore elements that drive people towards co-operation and away from it. Reflections from participants included the need to maintain personal sustainability, have a clear purpose, clear boundaries, appreciate small gains - ‘the low hanging fruit and the little steps’ - and work with what is not what we think is. Our philosophy may not be the reality.

Participant D shared her reflections on time and sustainable co-operative processes (Appendix G). She noted that for her, reflections on time and its deployment included lots about feelings, and that this was rather counter to the more usual thought of time as a rational scientific measure.

Participant J talked about written feedback received from a client that related to her inquiry focus of exploring energy levels and generating sustainability in her client organisation. She believed that the tension between hierarchical and co-operative work was draining for her clients in the organisation.

Participant F reflected on the nature of polarisation and synergy and how to bridge the gap between them. He identified some of the things that might bridge the gap between fixed ideas, knowing best, power-based behaviour on the one hand and open minds, going with the flow and an inclusive approach on the other. These included communication, trust, learning, growing, aligning, and being willing to not know and be uncomfortable (Appendix K, no. 6).

Participant E used the devil’s advocate role of critical questioner a number of times to question what we were doing, what was really going on and to what we were giving meaning.
Planning phase
Cycle 4

A group question arose: What is the portal to co-operacy?

This question emerged from our discussion about the key factors for working co-operatively. We were exploring what really was at the essence of co-operative work. We wanted to go to a deeper level with considering the prerequisites without which co-operative work could not be sustained. The previous group question, ‘What is the relationship between organic emergence and intentional creation?’ was addressed a little, and remained in play.

Most participants also continued with their own questions, and Participant B advised by email that his individual inquiry had developed into:

How does patterned behaviour lead to, or result in hierarchical situations, and in what way do hierarchical organisations depend on, reinforce or support baggage or identity-based behaviour?

After the meeting my notes included the following observations:

This meeting addressed our own group process and as this involved some self-searching, it allowed the group to move to a deeper level (Peck 1990). This seemed to be possible because we were now more comfortable with one another, had established common values, and also the people who did not know others in the group beforehand had a chance to settle in over time. It was safe enough to be chaotic, to have some conflict, and to share more of ourselves.

We were moving into uncharted territory and not knowing. My notes from this meeting were chaotic compared with the other meetings, and this reflects how we were.

Action phases

During this action phase, I (Participant K) led a four-day residential workshop on co-operative work in another city. This was attended by experienced facilitators. We co-created our group purpose as, ‘Unleashing co-operacy, as a natural way of being’.
During the workshop we developed some mind maps related to the co-operative inquiry. Three of these, 'What is co-operacy?', 'Enablers to co-operacy' and 'Barriers to co-operacy', were presented to the co-operative inquiry group at our next meeting and are included in Appendix K (nos. 3-5). (Some of these insights were included in the FACTS meta-model Fig. 26, p. 218 and following).

During this period, Participant F was engaged in an interagency facilitation process and brought his inquiry focus into this. He later included co-operative inquiry reflections in a section of his Project Report (Macdonald 2001) as part of the Zenergy Diploma of Facilitation. His question was what is the gap between polarisation and synergy? His comments included the importance of the group facilitator being 'continuously aware of yourself and those around you'. The facilitator needs to work 'in balance' with a group, maintain their personal power, and avoiding becoming involved in the content (p. 11). He also commented on the deficiencies of bureaucratic and hierarchical organisations and noted his belief that change is evolutionary and involves increasing authentic personal power, creating personal support systems, and having the shared belief that there is a better way (p. 13).

Other inquiry participants continued to explore and immerse themselves in their inquiry questions and the group question.

**Reflection phase**

**Session 5, fourth Saturday meeting, 2 December (10 present)**

The co-created programme for the day was:

- Check-in and individual reports.
- Group reflection
- Group learnings
- Reflection on co-operative inquiry process

Right from the start, the group was very freed-up and authentic. The entire group was present, except Participant G whose wife had become ill. We were more playful than before. We allowed ourselves more freedom. We had met four times as a group, had clearly progressed to be able to acknowledge what we didn't know, and were willing now to move to a deeper level to make progress. There were still some vestiges of myself as the leader – and after a long wait I opened the meeting.
Participant J said she was aware of this, and resisting doing it herself. Certainly there was more sense of equality, ability to challenge, and safety to do that.

In the check-in, Participant H was very tired and grumpy. She had had a tough week and had enough of people contact. She wanted to rest, or stay home and clean the bathroom. We encouraged her to choose what she wanted to do, and she chose to rest. She lay on the floor and intervened when she was awake. This was always the perfect time.

We had a ‘brain-dump’ onto sheets of paper – everything we had to share about the group question, or anything else we had uncovered in the last action phase. We covered three big sheets of flip chart paper spread on the floor between us. Here are most of the contributions, which I have subsequently grouped under headings to make the material more accessible:

**Need for alignment**
- Behaviours aligned and open
- Being and doing alignment. Being in action
- Can’t make someone do something

**Whole personhood**
- Whole person, embodiment, empowerment, respect
- Whole personhood and ways of being
- Wholeness

**Time**
- Time for self
- Time for ‘me’.
- It takes as long as it takes to get to where it needs to go – experiencing it makes the difference
- Overnight process (allowing time for integration and dreaming)

**Safety**
- It must be safe enough to be honest. This leads to individual integrity, emotional competence, which lead to group integrity and co-operative being, which equal group co-operacy
- Trust
- Safety
• Not feel safe with these people

Learning
• Meaning making
• Don't know until after the experience
• How much needs to be experienced directly by each person – for learning?
• Evolution
• Layers of sophistication
• Importance of story/creativity to provide depth

Paradoxes and tensions
• There can be a mismatch between individual desires/rewards and organisation desires/rewards
• Yin/yang paradox
• The clash of belief systems is an unresolved dilemma
• Ideals and behaviour not matching = stuckness
• Another paradigm – what happens in the action (between)
• Different cultures impact
• Having high expectations of co-operacy is a strength and a weakness

Co-operacy is hard
• Can external resources assist/create co-operacy?
• Balance of co-operacy – getting stuff done if whole group/organisation does not have the same value base
• The oppressor, victim, rescuer triangle (Karpman 1968) is not experiencing co-operacy
• Covert power struggles kill co-operacy
• Disassociation, alienation doesn't work with co-operative processes and leads to hijacking of language and concepts and also oppression
• There is a hard edge between team and hierarchy. Hierarchical culture and assumptions belief systems and unconscious values are different from co-operacy
• Situation can be manipulated in a sophisticated way and people can pretend to be co-operative while furthering other agendas. This can be evil and collusive
• Co-operative philosophy is not sufficient if behaviour is not congruent. This can be crap
• People can pretend to be co-operative when unconsciously their values are not aligned with co-operacy. Collusion between people can lead to all sorts of problems. Very important to work on collusion.
• People may not know that they are not co-operating. Awareness of self. Awareness of source of resistance
• Pseudo co-operacy (mentioned twice)
• Limit point of my ability to influence towards co-operative engagement

Desired Behaviours

• Presence
• Modelling possibilities
• Need for listening
• Truly being truly responsible
• Respect
• Participation
• Acknowledge achievement
• Support is important
• The importance of sharing (debrief)
• It’s the little things …
• Little things make a difference – the toothpaste and the toilet seat

Questions, thoughts and fragments

• Who am I trying to please?
• Collusion: is it so because someone says it is so?
• Form and space – a portal needs an outline/edge – or does it?
• Assumptions. Why do it? – values
• Containing systems
• Even though life reeks with joy
• Energy vibrations … movement of … invisible man … silhouette left behind … setting the scene before it … happens – moving forward in space – leaving behind energy
• Invisibility – ‘not being’
• Data, questions – portal – time-warp, completion

The breakthrough

During the brain-dump, Participant A drew a powerful image - a large green oval with a vortex-like spiral towards the centre – in the middle sheet of paper at the centre of the room (see Fig. 22). During the brain-dump we had developed a degree of momentum and synergy, and the dialogue flowed naturally into addressing the group question.

"What is the portal to co-operacy?"

173
By this was meant, what is the way into working co-operatively – what has to be there as a given, for co-operative processes in organisations to be sustainable? This was the question we had developed in the previous Saturday session.

The answer came in a quirky fashion, via Participant A's drawing of what we thought was a portal or vortex. We were discussing this when Participant H, who was sleeping, woke up suddenly and exclaimed, 'That is not a portal. Why are we doing this?' I explained that we were addressing the question from the previous week. ‘That’s not what it is,’ she insisted. ‘It’s a paua.’
Fig. 22. What is the metamorphosis into Co-operacy? Full embodiment as a whole being.
We all looked again. The picture did indeed look like the native New Zealand shellfish, which has brilliant, iridescent blue and green colours on the inside of its shell. This shellfish, the paua, is similar to the abalone.

There was a pause – then a recognition by someone else that the drawing could indeed be the body of a paua. A paua is valued as a luscious, tasty food, and for its beautiful multicoloured shell that is used in jewellery and other ornamentation. The paua exists as an organism with a body. So do we. Suddenly the connection was made. We ourselves, in our bodies, in embodiment as whole persons, are the portals to co-operacy. There was not a portal to go through or get anywhere. We are it!

This is the only way in. No-one gets there but through the whole body — it is a whole body experience. When we disassociate, ‘get stuck in our heads’, or collude with others’ projections and distress, we have very limited access to co-operacy. The following question and answer summarises our insight:

**Question: What is the metamorphosis into co-operacy?**

**Answer: Full embodiment as a whole being.**

This was the moment of new knowledge that we created as a group. We had had a breakthrough in our thinking. A rush of individual and group insights came about the essential nature of embodied whole being (or whole personhood) for co-operative processes to be fully sustainable. We also realised that whole beingness is naturally expressed in love and compassion. We knew because we experienced it in the moment.

As we explored, several participants together drew the following model.
Fig. 23. Sustaining co-operative processes in organisations.

Fakalofa (Niuean)/aroha (Maori), also meaning love/compassion were also written on the model. This triangle represents what is needed to sustain co-operative processes in organisations. A participant at the same time drew a heart surrounded by two ellipses at right angles on the whiteboard.

Fig. 24. Whole personhood and ways of being
Fig. 25. Fakalofa = Love (Niuean) by Raewyn Togalea-Cobb. 2/12/2000
She also drew her representation of love as a collection of spirals and included a Maori song about spiritual love which we sang together.

Song:

    Te aroha
    Te whakapono
    Te rangimarie
    Tatou tatou e

(The love
The faith
The peace
Of everyone)

After a break we explored some more. We lay down and put our heads together and silently went on an imaginary journey through space and time, experiencing the spiral effect in the drawing (Fig. 25, p. 178). We then shared our experience of the journey and the sensations we had had (colours, energy shifts, merging in space, spinning and de-merging, exploring DNA shifts, vortexes, time-warps and time-wrinkles).

At the end of the final day we brainstormed our reflections on the process of the inquiry. These, in a sense, were our building blocks for further inquiry and development.

**Reflections on the Process of Co-operative Inquiry (abridged)**

- Connection between monthly meetings important
- Challenging
- Need to keep to commitment
- Need to attend the orientation meeting
- Involve/evolve the whole person
- Trusting the process worked again
- Very divergent at the start – some convergence in the end
- Attention to validity issues – not clear about that
- Hard to maintain momentum over four weeks
- Requires commitment. Demanding.
- Organic emergence (balanced with) intentional creation
- Little personal 'stuff' – maybe the topic doesn't generate the need as much as transpersonal topics
- Ebb and flow of energy – fluid
- Two groups – Zenergy trainers and others
- Resistance/flexibility
• Questioned, challenged, analysed, debated, felt, heard, spoke
• We covered a lot of territory
• Are three cycles of inquiry enough?
• Binaries, spirals
• Ethics, values
• Time-consuming
• It's a mystery
• Group sleep
• Great muffins, coffee, Xmas mince pies

At the end of the day we created a completion, and we drank a glass of wine to celebrate our co-operative inquiry. I undertook to get the group together when I had written up the inquiry.

My reflections after two weeks

Here are my personal reflections written two weeks after the inquiry ended.

Looking back on the inquiry two weeks on, I could see it more as a whole. It did have a beginning, a middle, and an end. The group went through the usual group process, i.e., forming, norming, storming, performing (Tuckman 1963) or pseudo community, chaos and conflict, emptiness, and authenticity (Peck 1987), and we did have a breakthrough into a deeper understanding of sustainable co-operative processes in organisations. The primacy of whole personhood in co-operative processes was reinforced and accented in a new way.

It seemed as though we need to keep coming back to this learning until we really get it and all its implications. Interestingly, when I looked back over the large sheets of paper generated during the inquiry, I found one I had painted at a Zenergy Master Class in September 2000 (Fig. 21). This painting looked somewhat similar to the paua drawing. Was the message about embodiment already trying to emerge? (Perhaps it takes a group). I later called this drawing, 'The Seeds of Co-operacy'.

I acknowledged that it was a group of people who had a lot of experience in and with groups. There was little interpersonal stuff. People didn't get defensive. Perhaps this was because a lot of the group knew and liked one another and had worked together well in different scenarios before.
I had entered the inquiry after having reached the limits of my own knowing after 10 years as a group facilitator of co-operative processes including a fair amount of conflict resolution work in organisations and intentional communities. I wanted and needed further answers to the question of what is needed for people to be together, work together, and play together in sustainable co-operative ways, work through the 'stuff' that emerges and come through it in a healthy life-enhancing way?

In a way the whole inquiry – the whole research project – is about this question. Perhaps the whole thing is a projection of mine – trying to find my personal answers through something out there. Well yes, and ... that's okay. I acknowledged this. To fully engage in the inquiry I have to look more deeply within myself. What gets in the way for me? I desire to be and live fully to my potential. My potential can emerge if I am present, respectful, and allowing. However, what I notice is that my emerging doesn't come distress-free. And it doesn't always elicit others' distress-free response.

On top of that, I haven't been trained for emergence. I've been trained for compliance – to be obedient, on (others') time etc. There is a tension between compliance and emergence. I have to stop complying and exercise my full autonomy sometimes to emerge as my essential self. This is personal. It is also collective. A group, team, or organisation is subject to the same tensions. It has a will, a desire to emerge. Can it? It will keep trying, and if it is frustrated, it will begin to self-destruct. Often this is a pattern repeated both in organisations and in relationships.

The behaviour of compliance in hierarchical organisations is not compatible with co-operative work. This is where the values of facilitation are helpful. Integrity, honesty, participation, respect, whole personhood, trust, consensus – these are people-first values, and tend to go by the board in dollar-driven, ego-driven, 'business is war' activities for which hierarchies are the dominant associated structures.

The inquiry was enjoyable for me because it brought together a wonderful group of people who liked and respected one another – and the inquiry got us thinking hard. I loved it, and it was heartful and soulful as well. We were co-operative. We also had distress -- including distress about conflicting commitments, and distress about hard situations we were confronted with at our workplaces and at home.

For example, it is a bit like – we want peace and harmony, not war – yet we found that we had to fight, or at least struggle, for it. We must alter our own conditioned behaviour, confront our incongruities and those of others, and seek to shift the world of behaviour at a very basic level. Or, are these imperatives illusory as well? Perhaps there are other ways as well – such as modeling, being saintly -- but this is beyond me at the moment. It is someone else's journey (or a later one).
And the questions arise, can it be done, why bother, is it worth it and is it sustainable?

The inquiry was concerned with sustainability as it affects co-operative processes. I explored the cyclic nature of the organic world and how this influences co-operative work – individual cycles (daily, monthly, seasonally) intersecting with process cycles, group cycles, and organisational cycles, which in turn are affected by planetary cycles. I pondered over all the intersecting cycles. I consulted the I Ching (the book of changes) and considered the difference between cycles and ‘pulling the plug’ – when the energy failed to come back.

I considered ‘kairos’ (charismatic time) and ‘chronos’ (clock time) – the ‘right’ time as opposed to the allotted time. This line of inquiry was complicated and I quickly got to the point of not knowing. This was okay, as I knew I had to get to not knowing for anything new to emerge.

The most interesting question for me in the inquiry was: ‘What is the portal to co-operacy?’ I really grappled with this one – like a koan. What is/are the key entry point/s? How does one get into co-operacy – can anyone go there. I liked the questions about the barriers and enablers to co-operacy. These came from two of the participants, and also from the Stage 3 Zennergy programme in Wellington (data I subsequently fed into the inquiry). There still seemed something missing though.

It wasn’t until we distinguished that we ourselves are the portals, that I got it. Yet I had known this all along. I needed to get it anew in a deeper way. I needed to get it in my body, and I did. Participant C talked about group experiences changing our DNA, and I kind of believe this – certainly something very deep changes fundamentally. It got ‘en-stamped’ in some way.

We are it – I am it. It is like calling home all my projections – a scary life-altering experience. I, as a fully embodied (not avoiding any part of myself) person, can bring forth co-operacy, or at least allow/support its emergence. To this end, I need to maintain myself, body, mind, and soul, and fully respect myself. This is damned hard.

Fortunately this is beautifully in accordance with the theory and practice of social ecology, so it is no accident that I chose to do this research through the School of Social Ecology at UWS-Hawkesbury [in 2001 this became the School of Social Ecology and Lifelong Learning].
Reflections – over the following two months

The inquiry ended just before Christmas and the New Zealand holiday period. In the new year (2001) some participants provided their reflections on the inquiry. Here are their comments. The comments are in two sections: content and process.

Content:

Participant C
That I need to be there as a whole person - difficult at times - that collective interconnectedness. Integrity has to be there - when everything is aligned in me - when everyone else is aligned with their levels then we are able to reach something special. Able to talk metaphorically to one another and powerful listening is present - we are able to reach consensus. The group can't move until there is that consensus, and that can only come from whole people in a whole group.

Participant B
I found the content presented by the participants generally interesting if not helpful to my own inquiry, and believe that my own inquiry contributed to the whole. My own inquiry centered mainly around questions regarding the value and importance of individuals' personal development in regards to the sustainability, or otherwise of co-operative processes in organisations.

What I came to through the process is that personal development is a key to the sustainability of co-operative processes in organisations. It is often the conditioning people receive as a part of growing up or as members of hierarchical organisations that sabotages co-operative initiatives (or makes them unlikely in the first place). If conditioning, personal beliefs and individual barriers cannot be addressed as part of the implementation of co-operative initiatives, they are unlikely to be sustainable.

I also recognised the place of personal development as a part of larger organisational social and global process. By the end of the inquiry my focus had shifted from the importance of personal development to seeing personal development in a larger context.

Also during this period my personal 'life focus' shifted from developing my analysis of different personal development techniques to seeing personal development as part of a larger process, my 'life focus' is currently around the social implication of various thought forms and how these impact on us as a people. This was a transformational experience and part of the inquiry, which I have only noticed on reflection.
I was part of the emergence of, and am aligned with, the recognition that co-operative processes also require whole person embodiment and love/compassion to be sustainable.

Participant A

My key content learnings were about awareness. For example, in my organisation I became much more aware of gender dynamics, covert power dynamics and polarities in what appeared to be an equal team.

Women were clobbered when they helped - passive aggressive behavior. For example, the men 'body guarded' their programmes, but were unclear. When the women engaged in getting clarity over a period of time the men said 'Butt out - we can do it without you'.

Through all the processing of the first question I got to working with energy. I got to an unknown. Is the structure of DNA a model for co-operative facilitation and co-operative processes? - a place to look for sustainability? I started looking at things more than two or three dimensionally - I was looking at geometry in space - the 'paua shell' moment - holding a vortex as a tunnel, and Participant H using that as an opportunity to step into open space - what if you stepped sideways? - it could become anything. It was like confused elation - something was up for discovery - not knowing what it was. I've carried that forward into everyday life, and am looking to notice patterns - not missing the moment - thinking outside the square - working with nature rhythms.

Participant L

Sustaining oneself personally is obviously a prerequisite for sustainable organisational processes, AND I was hoping that we would move on further into the collective/organisational possibilities. There seemed to me to be three group questions that emerged:

How do I sustain myself personally in an organisation?
What is the gateway/portal to co-operacy?
What is the relationship between organic emergence and intentional creation?
But we didn't seem really to address the last one. Perhaps that could be the starting point for the next one?

Participant J

The actual content of the inquiry was fascinating and has encouraged me to keep questioning and keep looking for what might work. Plus the realisation that all sorts of things work in all sorts of organisations, and there is no one process that can be
automatically applied to all companies. The key thing that came out for me is that people in teams/organisations need to feel they are empowered to make a difference and are acknowledged for that difference - then all sorts of processes can be applied.

Participant F
Co-operative processes are not like light switches, turn them on and they are there. Organisations are at different places in their cycles/thinking, and it really requires the CEO to embody/sponsor/champion the philosophy. The ice layer (somewhere below the CEO) may talk the theory, but it's different walking the talk.

The move to co-operative organisations is evolutionary, not revolutionary and requires buy-in by all and a collective move forward - a deep cultural shift within an organisation is the method of achievement.

To be successful in the long run, co-operative processes need to break down the autocracy/bureaucracy. This will take time, and if the CEO is not supportive it may be driven by the new entrants/young people within the company. It is more an organic process - sow a seed, nurture, feed and stimulate, water - changes through the seasons and eventually overcome the elements (organisation thumb print) to become strong, upright, healthy growth (like trees and other plants) - a good synergy.

The Process

Participant C
I got heaps out of it. To trust the process - theoretically I knew this, but I needed to use it in a real sense. The method is culturally appropriate for me as a Niuean woman, but I missed other brown faces. The culture was appropriate to Zenergy culture.

Participant B
The process has the ability to elicit, synthesize and grow large amounts of personal experience and divergent individual knowledge to produce (in our case) significant, useful, applicable and convergent, common knowledge.

I call it knowledge because I developed my understanding of the topic area in a way that has forwarded my understanding of and ability to impact the groups and organisations I work with, and I believe this was also the case with others in the group (they said things to this effect). The process of reflection and action ensured that ideas where developed and tried out as we went along.

I believe that the inquiry was benefited by the extensive knowledge, skills, and areas of work (related to the topic area) represented in the inquiry. Also, I would judge that the
participants collectively understood and had been exposed to a large proportion of the literature written on the topic. (We had academics, practicing facilitators, mediators and coaches and managers of organisations where co-operative processes could be applied).

Participant L
Overall I enjoyed the process of the inquiry, though it remained at a medium to low key level for me.

Only two people had been participants in a co-operative inquiry before. The rest of us were new to the process, and for myself I had a generalised feeling that I didn’t really know what was coming, and I was therefore reluctant to put myself forward. Knowing in my head that it would be a good learning experience was not quite enough to overcome the inertia/comfort of sitting back and participating in someone else’s process. I suppose that indicates a lack of ownership in me at one level – though I believe I participated fully as a group member.

What could have been different here? Some ideas:
Is there a short article/chapter on the process and cycles of an inquiry that would have been helpful to read? Maybe getting us to commit at the orientation evening to facilitating a session sometime during the inquiry, as part of acknowledging that it will be new, but we can learn by doing. And acknowledging the role pile-up for Dale Hunter that would be increased otherwise.

My question/focus was ‘fascinated by fractals’ and the implications organisationally (i.e., parallel process, things being repeated at different levels etc.).

With hindsight I think I was floundering around quite a lot during the inquiry. I seemed to warm up to several different topics during the inquiry, and wasn’t sure how to grab one and develop it further. Maybe I prefer a bit more structure and clarification about the process. I accept the value of exploring/going with the flow and dynamic spontaneity/creative disorder and so it was okay to flounder around and see what emerged, but I found it hard to tie the loose ends together. ‘Staying over several days in the don’t know’ has its challenges!

I learnt quite a bit about myself and my reactions – always good. And I enjoyed it as a new experience and the connection with a great group of people. Some lovely metaphors emerged – wild yeast, ring-barking in organisations, paua shell, etc.
Participant J
I found the co-operative inquiry method of learning and discovering a lot of fun and very interesting. It was a process that allowed for everyone's learning style and we were able to create whatever environment or process we needed to get the best of the learnings.

Participant A
Overall, I found the method of working together (i.e., co-operative inquiry) very satisfying and stimulating. My commitment to the process was strong, both during the sessions when we met as a whole group and also in between when I was active with my inquiries. I learnt to take responsibility for myself and not the group. By exploring my own questions in relation to my workplace I was able to gain perspectives that may otherwise have gone amiss. I would use co-operative inquiry - in the workplace. It is a useful process because it pertains to not having to know everything - being in the not knowing permanently.

Participant F
The co-operative inquiry was generally self-driven over the month between feedback/consultation sessions. I found these to be within a range from quite intense to not doing much. A month seemed too long between connecting with the other members. Potential to lose your commitment.

The framework seemed to be quite loose and really self (team) generated each time we got together. The overall requirements/time frame appeared to be not aligned. There needed to be tighter control over the team, the deliverables, and to maintain within the programmed timeframe to achieve.

My involvement was through support of Dale Hunter and her goal of completing her degree. I wonder how the result would have been if there had been more continuous/intense working on the issue as a team. Breaking out for a month to personally focus on an issue seemed to delay the outcome.

Reflections – six months later

Participant D and E added their comments after reading a draft of the co-operative inquiry.

Participant D
Session TWO  - First Full Day Session
I loved the word brainstorming process. This is what I do, and I got so into it that when some people indicated that it had become too intellectual and they were shutting down on the process I felt bereft, sort of rejected, an actual pain. And a little resentment. Suspect this is linked with a childhood of being called 'dictionary' and sometimes
mocked by adults and children getting excited about ideas (being different). If I can't do words then how can I participate and be creative at all?

Interesting to be in a situation that made me rediscover the connection between ideas and emotion. Have been working since in my research on the connection between the two, so this later turned out to be a really good discovery for me.

I still felt more like a spectator than a participant. Partly because rest of group knew each other and most had facilitation training. So I guess that in the sense of a chain of responsibility for what happened I felt like the end of the chain for taking responsibility. Everyone else had more reason, a better ground for doing so than me, and I thought I wanted to feel that way.

Session THREE
I missed this to go with a group of people to Great Barrier to do various Maori church things. It was very important for the stage I was at in joining that group of people and I still think I did the right thing. For the inquiry, the things I learned on the Barrier trip fed in well to the next session but I was unprepared for how emotionally difficult it was to rejoin the inquiry after missing one co-op session at this stage.

Reading the notes in which Dale wondered if not having me (and another senior lecturer) present might have freed up people for 'more laughter and sharing' seemed like a revisiting of rejection for being 'intellectual', 'too preoccupied with words and ideas'. It is a perfectly rational suggestion; nevertheless it hurt. As a teacher it didn't feel good to think that I may be shutting down creativity and enjoyment. Why do people whose natural mode is grounded in reason have to explain and justify themselves while feeling is always right, proper, normal, okay? [Resentful though shared in the form of a wild generalisation].

Imagine being able to write this much about a session I wasn't at!!!!
But this was the state of mind going into ...

Session FOUR
This is where I realised what a commitment in mental and physical energy had to be made to processes of this kind. And it wasn't helped by the fact that I had another commitment with the Maori church group which meant I had to leave the session about half an hour early. Anyway, I got exasperated enough (with myself and with the situation I'd put myself in) to voice some difficulties. And then it got better. I share Dale's interpretation/perception that there was a shift in-group relatedness – at least for me; I began to feel comfortable though still not particularly creative.
Session FIVE

Was fun. I began to really enjoy the process. Things made sense. If we'd kept on going in further sessions I think I would even have begun to think through drawing/painting and maybe poetry. I'd like to do these things but there's never the right time because of other IMPORTANT THINGS.

The things I learned from the inquiry aren't available to encapsulate into a few tidy conclusions. They are large, and sprawling and creative for me. I think they are informing what I do in the union, in teaching, and in writing/thinking in all kinds of subterranean ways. I've really enjoyed teaching large classes in this semester. I'm relating to them as co-operators in a shared project of learning that is about feeling good and having fun enjoying knowledge and thinking. And it seems to have worked because the student evaluations of my courses and teaching which are usually good have been considerably higher than that.

I think it is about me and other people being whole. Enough...

Participant E

For me the inquiry raised the question of whether it is possible/appropriate/realistic to establish stronger enduring co-operative processes working in standard western workplace, because of the risks of personal revelation, the presence of hierarchies, and the exercise of power through sharing/withholding information.

I felt some responsibility to engage in the devil's advocate role. I felt myself to be more concerned with the process of our inquiry than the actual content. I found myself questioning internally my sense of what was being said/going on before I spoke in the devil's advocate role. I wanted to avoid projection or barrow pushing.

There was high divergence on the topics/questions. It was more individual inquiries than multiple inquiring groups. Some pairing happened on an opportunistic basis. I wonder whether three full cycles was sufficient for full impact? Did it reduce the potential for interpersonal disturbance?

It was unusual for me not to attend all sessions of something. I had some sense of disjointedness.

Reflections - one year later

In reviewing this chapter after one year I am aware that the inquiry is still continuing for me. It is as though the actual exercise was a step (or a spiral) in a longer process of inquiry that began long before and will continue long after the actual event
of co-operative inquiry. I came together with others who had similar interests for a short period. We raised the stakes on our ongoing individual inquiries about sustainable co-operative processes by engaging together as a group. We brought ourselves closer to the fire of emerging consciousness. This co-operative inquiry is one of many learning experiences. And there is so much further to go.
3.7 Review of the Co-operative Inquiry

The co-operative inquiry was an important part of this research. I wanted a research experience in which I could grapple with the research question with others and come up with some shared findings beyond what I already knew. I enjoy co-operative experiential learning and believed that co-operative inquiry was an effective way to take new ground in a way which was aligned with the research topic.

The co-operative inquiry focused on the whole topic of the research project - sustainable co-operative processes in organisations. My definition of sustainability was broad and included the personal, social, ecological and 'spiritual' environments (Hill 1999), and the aligned purpose and values of the organisation or 'good company' (Pedler 1990).

Participants in the inquiry felt the need to focus on a specific aspect of the topic ('eat part of the elephant') within the larger topic. In retrospect, the topic was perhaps too large for the time allowed for the co-operative Inquiry. It was unrealistic to suppose that the topic would reveal all of its secrets in 14 weeks. We did, however, take some ground, and I believe that identifying the centrality of embodied whole personhood to co-operative work is an important contribution to the field and its literature.

Action phases

The choice to use focus questions and strategic questioning (Peavey 1993, 1997) in the action phases of the inquiry was largely intuitive. It seemed like a good idea to us, and even more an obvious way to proceed. As facilitators (in the main) we were always in action and at work with introducing and maintaining co-operative processes. We all agreed that the findings were likely to come from our own wrestling with pertinent questions, from conversations with peers and from our own inquiry group deliberations. After all we were the 'experts', the practitioners in the field of co-operative processes. I, and probably most of the other participants, believed that if we could get past knowing the answers already, and genuinely enter the space of not knowing, then we had a chance of finding something new.

This approach led to a somewhat idiosyncratic co-operative inquiry, that was not as originally envisaged by the founders of the method (Heron 1996b, Reason 1988).
co-operative inquiry usually contains agreed action steps with observations recorded by each participant or groups of participants in the action phases. Instead, participants in this co-operative inquiry individually designed questions and specific topic areas in each cycle, and wrestled with these in their own way, which included conversations with others, strategic questioning, and other actions (sometimes spontaneously) that took advantage of circumstances and opportunities in their work. Individual recording was encouraged, but not compulsory.

**Self-directing participants**

I also took the view that the other participants were self-directing, autonomous adults, and that we were working together as peers (Hunter et al. 1997). I expected participants would involve themselves responsibly with the co-operative inquiry method. Generally, I sought to limit the privileging of my reality as much as possible (Braud 1998), while recognising that as the initiator, my reality would already tend to have more weight than others. There was no pressure on individual participants to divulge their plans and actions, other than their questions/foci and share findings with the group at our group sessions. It could be argued that a more structured and managed approach, including monitoring the plans and actions of each participant in the action cycles, would have led to a more comprehensive inquiry. I failed to take this more authoritarian role. However, this approach would have been less congruent with my beliefs (reality), which led me to foster equality among peers.

**Recording**

Our group contract was to take the findings shared in the group as the group findings and to each be able to use these as we saw fit in our own research. We agreed that each member of the group could write up the co-operative inquiry using the group records and their own personal records, seeking agreement to any use of participant’s names. As one participant preferred their name not to be used, I decided to refer to all participants using a letter of the alphabet. There were a few exceptions to this, including the paintings and drawings that are sourced by name. Some participants shared their personal notes with me and others did not. We decided not to tape record group sessions as this could have become an inhibitor in our group process. In retrospect, it would have been helpful to record some of the stories told at the sessions.
Did we collude unawarely?

A factor that influenced the inquiry was the shared knowledge and approach to facilitation and co-operative work of the participants. It would be fair to say that all the participants shared a holistic, socially responsible approach to facilitation. Many of the 11 participants knew one another before the inquiry, and 9 of the 11 had participated in Zenergy facilitation training programmes at some time within the previous seven years. Six participants had completed the Zenergy Diploma of Facilitation and four participants including myself were trainers in this method. I was one of the Zenergy programme designers. Two of the inquirers, Hamish Brown and myself, worked together on a daily basis at the time of the inquiry. In this way the inquiry was partly an inside or internal co-operative inquiry. The co-operative inquiry mix of participants was, therefore, in contrast to the survey and the Internet dialogue, in which the participants were distributed geographically in a number of countries and mostly unknown to one another.

Did we collude unawarely in the process, content and outcomes of the co-operative inquiry? And how is collusion different from alignment? Was there some deep unconscious pattern(s) at work that we were not aware of? I can only answer those questions by admitting that I don't know. We did use the devil's advocate role throughout to uncover collusion and 'missings', and sought to be as conscious as possible about collusion.

The method of co-operative inquiry as a sustainable co-operative process

Is the co-operative inquiry method itself a sustainable process? Co-operative inquiry is personally liberating, allows for face-to-face alignment and group synergy to occur, and does not require much in the way of resources – a few sheets of paper, pens, paints and possibly a tape recorder is sufficient. The process is used within a clear time frame. It can be used to inquire into many areas and is unlikely to work effectively if people are constrained and oppressed.

Co-operative inquiry can also be considered in relation to the FACTS meta-model (Fig. 26) discussed later in the research findings (Section 4.2). Co-operative inquiry requires free choice, commitment and accountability from the participants who take part. It requires individual and group alignment to the purpose of the inquiry. It calls forth alignment between purpose, values and action. It encourages a whole person approach
(with love and compassion) to glean the collective wisdom of the group and benefits from clear intention, ongoing rigour and all available awareness.

**Validity critique using criteria developed by Heron (1992 and 1996b)**

The remainder of this chapter refers to the framework of the special inquiry skills and validity procedures suggested by John Heron (1992 and 1996b). Heron’s work in this area is recognised by some in the field, such as Peter Reason (1998), as being the most comprehensive in the area of validity procedures for co-operative inquiry. It was an interesting exercise to work through these criteria. However, the real usefulness of this co-operative inquiry will be for those people who resonate with it as the record of our experiences (Newman 1999). As Newman says:

> The issue of validity is, I think, a ‘red herring’ in our line of work. The point of a piece of action research isn’t to prove anything - the most any [action] research account can really do (no matter what the flavour) is to allow the reader to take a fresh look at his or her own work...if your inquiry raises questions that I think I might find useful to ask of myself, then that’s what I think this enterprise is about (Newman 1999, pp. 1-2).

The special inquiry skills and validity procedures identified by Heron are discussed in some detail below and it is hoped that this section will be provide a useful comparison for others using the co-operative inquiry method.

**Special inquiry skills**

Heron describes in detail some special skills associated with four interrelated forms of knowing (experiential, presentational, propositional, and practical) that are involved in the action phases of the Inquiry process. He believes that these skills start to develop by simply being involved in the cycle of inquiry. Heron divides these skills into two groups:

The first group relates to radical perception in informative inquiries where the purpose is to be descriptive and explanatory of the inquiry domain. These skills (being present, imaginal openness, bracketing, and reframing) relate to what is going on in a person when he or she is actually there engaged with the experience (Heron 1996b, pp. 58-59).
As a group of (mainly) facilitators trained in ‘being present’, we were able to listen deeply and actively to one another. This, I believe, gave us access to imaginal openness, once we had become relaxed in ourselves, and with one another. We then were able to allow the present context to expand, and provide the space to dream, stretch our reality boundaries, and act ‘as if’ more was possible.

Bracketing (used extensively in phenomenology) and reframing (also with a rich literature and the basis of all humour) are conceptual skills associated with propositional knowing. They involve an ability to hold a concept or judgment, yet refrain from applying it rigidly. This requires a ‘yes and’ rather than an ‘either/or’ or ‘yes but’ approach. Reframing allows for alternative constructs to be developed alongside those already known, without invalidating any of them. Inquirers in the present study probably had these skills to differing degrees.

The second group of skills, identified by Heron, relates to radical practice in transformative inquiries where the purpose is to engage in some action that seeks change within its domain. These skills (dynamic congruence, emotional competence, non-attachment, and self-transcending intentionality) relate to what is going on within a person when he or she is engaged with the action, and busy doing it (Heron 1996b, p. 59).

Dynamic congruence.

This is about practical knowing, knowing how to act. The skill goes way beyond ordinary competent action. It means being aware, while acting, of the bodily form of the behaviour, of its strategic form and guiding norms, of its purpose or end and underlying values, of its motives, of its external context and supporting beliefs, and of its actual outcomes. At the same time it means being aware of any lack of congruence between these different facets of the action and adjusting them accordingly (Heron, 1996b p. 59).

This eloquent description is close to that of Paulo Freire (1997) in his explanation of ethics as ‘one of the major struggles of every individual is to diminish the difference between what one says and does, between the discourse and the practice’ and the ‘daily delicious fight’ to achieve this. (Maheshananda, 1997).
Emotional competence

*Emotional competence.* This is the ability to identify and manage emotional states in various ways. These include keeping action free from distorted reactions to current events that are driven by the unprocessed distress of earlier years; and from the limiting influence of inappropriate conventions acquired by social conditioning (Heron, 1996b p. 59).

Emotional competence is a key area for facilitators and an ongoing journey of discovery for most of us. Most of the inquirers were trained in the skills of Co-Counselling, which I believe is a most effective, personal development method for developing in this area (Hunter et al. 1997). Emotional competence is also a key area in the development of whole personhood, which became part of the key finding in this co-operative inquiry.

Non-attachment and self-transcending Intentionality

*Non-attachment.* The ability here is to wear lightly and without fixation the purpose, strategy, form of behaviour and motive, which have been chosen as a form of action. This is the knack of non-attachment, not investing one's identity and emotional security in the action, while remaining fully intentional about and committed to it.

*Self-transcending intentionality.* This skill involves having in mind, while busy with one overall form of action, one or more alternative forms, and considering their possible relevance and applicability to the total situation (Heron, 1996b p. 59).

Both these skills described above are essential for effective facilitation.

Validity procedures

The procedures suggested by Heron (1996b pp. 59-61,131-157) to enhance validity in co-operative inquiry are: research cycling, balancing divergence and convergence, balancing reflection and action, types of presentation, challenging uncritical subjectivity, chaos and order, the management of unaware projections, sustaining authentic collaboration, open and closed boundaries, variegated replication, and concerted action.

Research cycling

This co-operative inquiry combined individual and collective research cycling, with individual inquiries being followed by collective reflection in which individual findings
were shared and discussed, and after which the content and method of the next individual cycles were planned collectively. There was also a degree of sharing and consultation between the group meetings. One participant, for example, initiated a workshop at the Australasian Facilitators Conference, which was facilitated by another participant. Two other participants met fortnightly for a peer-coaching contract, and often used part of the time to work on their inquiry question. Two participants worked together and discussed their questions on an almost daily basis.

**The balance of divergent and convergent processes**

This co-operative inquiry found its own balance between divergence and convergence. Group members developed their own individual inquiry focuses for the first two cycles, with the opportunity to alter the question with each new cycle. In the third cycle, there was a partial convergence on a question that carried on through the fourth cycle. This was joined by another question that also was taken up by most people, alongside their own individual foci. At the end, participants also were engaging, to some extent, in each other’s individual questions as well.

At the reflection phase of each cycle, each person shared their experience and how they had made sense of it. At this time they also received feedback from others. Individual ‘maps’ were shared and appreciated. There was no pressure to converge into a group map at any stage. The convergence, when it happened in the reflection phase of the last cycle, was spontaneous and quirky. It came from a group ‘aha’, and a challenge to the group’s perception of a ‘map’ – ‘It’s not a portal – it’s a paua’. – This came from a participant who was supported by a devil’s-advocate challenge by another participant, to consider a different way of seeing.

**The balance between reflection and action**

The balance of this inquiry was more towards reflection rather than action. The gaps between the second, third, and fourth phase was four weeks, so there was a wealth of experience to draw from and reflect upon at the group sessions. The time frame of the action phase was a judgment call by me as the initiator. It was not queried or challenged by the participants, and there was no expressed desire to change this timetable. Because of the foundational nature of the reflection, all action by all participants was subject to its influence.
Use of various presentation forms

A wide variety of presentational forms were used including paintings, drawings, diagrams, poetry, emails, written reports, mind-maps, and brainstormings. One participant undertook to give all their written input in poetry. He kept to this in the first, second, and third cycles. Other participants were highly expressive and used drawing extensively. Others combined painting with written material. The 'mental activities' of describing, evaluating, and applying what one had learnt in one cycle to the next, helped in developing the next question or focus.

Challenging uncritical subjectivity

This is a difficult area as subjectivity is just that, whether it is critical or uncritical. The mix of participants was determined by their positive response to the focus area, 'sustainable co-operative processes in organisations'. All participants were already working with this in some way, many as facilitators and co-operative process workers. Only the initiator and one participant had been involved in a co-operative inquiry before, and this meant that the others were all learning the process as well as engaging in it. They were, therefore, less critical of it as they had no grounds for comparison. The non-initiating experienced participant took on a conscious role of devil's advocate throughout the inquiry. This raised awareness of the importance of the role, and it was not experienced as locking, inappropriate or 'mischiefous boat rocking' (Heron 1996b, p. 147), but rather as very helpful. One or two other people took up the devil's advocate role towards the latter stages of the inquiry, but there might also have been an unaware tendency to leave this up to the nominated person, or the initiator.

The group processing session at the third Saturday meeting, did bring out some assumptions that were unhelpful, particularly the 'I am here for you (the initiator), rather than the inquiry', which was expressed by several people. On being challenged about this, only one said they would have taken part no matter what the subject. A number of the participants were there as much for the process as the content, as they hoped they could use the method in the future in their own inquiries.

This dependence on the initiator had been an issue in some earlier inquiries I had been part of, yet not in others. The Zenergy co-operative inquiry of August to November 1994 into 'How are we creating Zenergy's vision for co-operacy?' was the least problematic in these terms, as the inquiry was initiated by the group, and facilitated by one of the less-
involved associates of Zenergy. There was no sense of the facilitator having more knowledge, as three of the four inquirers involved had similar levels of experience – at least two previous inquiries.

**Chaos and order**

I have a high tolerance to process chaos, and I believe this was shared by most but not all of the participants, most of whom who gave themselves a lot of permission to respond freely. This was an aspect of the inquiry process that most enjoyed immensely, as it is so often not the environment in which we work. One participant (L) reflected a preference for 'a bit more structure and clarification about the process'. She noted also that she would have liked a short article or chapter on the process to read, yet had been given (or at least offered) this at the first orientation meeting together with other references.

At the first Saturday meeting, I was asked what were my needs, expectations, and assumptions about what would come out of the inquiry. I said that I had few needs, other than that the original inquiry material must be retained by my university, and that people turn up and engage fully in the method. I remember saying that perhaps I should be more worried about the content than I was. I genuinely trusted the process, while at the same time knowing from my own considerable experience, that this process was indeed 'risky and edgy'. Personally, I was not interested in 'pseudo-knowledge', as the subject was of such importance to me that it outweighed the possible limitations of Ph.D. requirements. I would have preferred no outcome, to a pseudo, or contrived, outcome. I knew experientially that chaos was a necessary precursor to new knowledge, and trusted this process (Peck 1987, p. 91).

I came to this inquiry from a genuine place of not knowing, coupled with a deep desire to know, and this was the agreed starting place of everyone in the inquiry. Standing in this place of not knowing, and allowing space for the new to emerge, was the group stance. We had to continually work on this, and stop ourselves from too quickly offering easy answers (from the past), or from settling for 'cheap closure' (Hunter et al.1999, p. 83).

The group meetings were free-flowing, while keeping the agreed agenda in mind. There were periods of some chaos. The whole second Saturday meeting was quite chaotic, and this is reflected in my notes. The ‘brain dump’, and subsequent dialogue
on the final Saturday morning, when everyone talked and wrote things down at once, was chaotic. This getting everything we knew down on paper, and out of the way, was important to allow space for something new to arise. This 'brain dump' session led seamlessly into the breakthrough session, in which we aligned on whole personhood, and full embodiment, as the key learnings.

The management of unaware projections

The group adopts some regular method for surfacing and processing templates of past emotional trauma, which may get unawaresely projected out, distorting thought, perception and action within the inquiry. The very process of researching the human condition may stir up these templates and trigger them into compulsive invasion of the inquiring mind. (Heron 1996b, p. 60).

Researchers who are aware of this kind of defensiveness, who have started to dismantle it through some personal growth process, will still need to watch for the distorting effect on the research. For even if the co-operative inquiry model is itself outside this effect, the application of it is likely to stir up disruption from all kinds of unfinished emotional business.

Some candidates for disruption are:
- The choice of content area
- The planning and management of the research cycles
- Lapses in recording
- Neglect of validity procedures
- Emotional and intellectual difficulty in noticing and reporting important experiences
- becoming disgruntled, resistant, bored, distracted, rebellious about the whole enterprise
- Interpersonal tensions and disruptions
- Consensus collusion of all kinds
- Messy peer decision-making, etc. (Heron 1996b, p. 151).

Inquirers did acknowledge their ongoing stress around attempting to work co-operatively in hierarchical and oppressive organisations, and this was heard, and validated deeply by others. A depth of sharing was reached that could well have led to the emergence of cathartic expression from those experienced in this way of working. Certainly, this would have been my expectation in an ongoing group held over several consecutive days. Perhaps the long gaps in between our meeting days mitigated against this happening in our inquiry group.
During the beginning ‘check in’ process on the third Saturday, one participant acknowledged the difficulty of sharing with people she did not know well. After this sharing she said that she felt more connected to the group. This contrasted with other participants, who did know others in the group well, and felt comfortable with them.

One participant expressed frustration at spending a sixth day of the week away from her partner, and to feeling ‘too much people contact and no time to be quiet and clean the loo’. She expressed this on the last Saturday, after a very busy week at work. This sharing could have allowed for emotional work to take place. The response of the group was to validate her feelings and encourage her to do what she needed to be self-expressed. She responded to this by staying with the group, lying down, and resting with her eyes closed. She contributed on occasions. The contributions she did make were, however, critically important ones in terms of the group breakthrough. Nine of the eleven group participants were co-counselling practitioners, so there was no shortage of skills in this area. Short co-counselling sessions could have been held in pairs or small groups. There were also three past or present co-counselling trainers, and an experienced psychodramatist, in the group, who could have worked with a participant in the big group, if requested.

**Sustaining authentic collaboration**

Heron draws attention to two main aspects of authentic collaboration. The first is the relationship between group members and the initiating researchers, and the second is the relationships among group members themselves.

**The relationship between group members and the initiating researcher**

I had had long-standing relationships with all of the inquirers, eight of them through their involvement in facilitation training with me as their trainer, over a number of years. Three of these group members are now fellow Zenergy trainers, who to some extent, consider me one of their mentors. I had been in training programmes as a participant with two of the other inquirers. One of these inquirers was also a Ph.D. and senior lecturer at a university. She was also the other experienced co-operative inquirer. The other participant, who is also a senior lecturer, was a friend from 20 years back, who I had first met when we both participated in a women’s consciousness-raising group. We now have a peer coaching relationship, and have renewed our friendship.
The presence of the two academics was an important foil to my perceived status, and expertise, as a facilitator. It also placed me as a learner, with much less experience in the academic world. Three of the inquirers are also senior managers in large organisations, and are accustomed to wielding authority. Others are consultants to organisations. All of the group was committed to working co-operatively, and was very self-directed. I was vulnerable in the group in that I explicitly wanted to use the inquiry as an important part of my doctoral research.

Although we were peers, in that we were all committed to a shared purpose, and to working co-operatively, the relationships within the group were complex and each person would have a different perception. We did not explore our relationships in the inquiry, other than to identify who knew who, and how. It would have been interesting to have developed this more. Limited time and priority were the key factors here.

There was a keenness to learn the co-operative inquiry process, and this was equal to, and related to, the subject of the inquiry. Many inquirers hoped to initiate their own co-operative inquiry processes in the future. There was some reluctance to facilitate, although many invitations were made, right from the first meeting. Most people did, however, facilitate one or more sessions during the inquiry. The reluctance may have come partly because inquiry members were professional facilitators wanting to be 'off duty', and there may have been a reluctance to put themselves on the line in front of other professional facilitators.

The degree of 'vigour', and 'making the inquiry their own', varied, both between people, and over time. A seemingly reluctant inquirer at the group meetings was very active in her workplace, initiating her own survey of staff, and also initiating a conference workshop on the inquiry theme. Another very vigorous inquirer was overtaken by work and family commitments, and found it difficult to attend the group meetings. Other inquirers maintained their vigour throughout, or became more engaged over time.

The relationships among the group members themselves

Most of the inquirers (nine) knew one another before the inquiry, some very well. Two inquirers knew some members. One person knew only one other – myself. Most members were already masterful in the content area and picked up the process quickly. There was already high awareness of co-operative decision-making. The group
facilitator role was taken on by all, except one participant (who did not consider herself as a facilitator), but with some reluctance.

Contribution rates were monitored, particularly by one group member, who drew awareness to this when she considered it useful. The same participant used the devil's advocate role effectively, and this role was taken up to some extent by others. The balance of divergence and convergence was noted, but people were relaxed about this aspect. The management of unaware projections was addressed above.

What was particularly notable was the profound listening to one another and empathy for others' experience in attempting to use co-operative processes in sustainable ways. Everyone agreed it was difficult, draining, and demanding, but all wanted to be more effective. The alignment on this was profound.

Closed or open boundaries

Our inquiry had open boundaries, in that inquirers freely generated data outside of the inquiry as they saw fit, and then brought the results of this to the group. One initiated an email survey of staff. She did advise them it was for her study purposes, and ensured that the staff information was set in the group record, without any reference to names. Conference workshop data was also included. This data was made public to all conference attendees. We did not consider enlarging the group to accommodate more feedback. This aspect of boundaries is somewhat of a logistical nightmare. In our case, participants were sharing their perception of large and small organisations, some involving many hundreds of people. It is nevertheless an important dilemma. As Heron says:

Subjects in an inquiry have a basic right to participate in all decisions about how knowledge based on their experience is gathered and used. (Heron 1996b, p. 156).

Variegated replication

So a co-operative inquiry needs to be replicable, not in any crude sense of literal repetition, but in the more imaginative sense of being available for creative metamorphosis. The original study will be done over again, but in a significantly different way. The initial perspective, research design and practical content will be recognisable and thoroughly reworked. Yet there will be enough overlap for the follow-up to be a legitimate development of the original (Heron 1996b, pp. 156-157).
This inquiry is replicable in the sense outlined above. The recording of it is obviously a key here, and how to record the content of a co-operative inquiry is an area that needs a lot more work. It was difficult to record many of our findings and insights, or even make sense of them afterwards, in a way that the general reader might be able to access them. It was experiential, embodied learning, among a group of practitioners and, as such, it is hard to get past 'you had to be there', and find the meaningful language that has been developed so well with conceptual learning.

**Apollonian or Dionysian**

Heron distinguishes between an Apollonian inquiry (rational, linear, systematic, controlling and with an explicit approach to the process of cycling between reflection and action) and a Dionysian inquiry (imaginal, expressive, diffuse, impromptu and tacit approach to the interplay between making sense and action).

In this domain of Apollonian and Dionysian, our inquiry was mixed. We did plan our action phase to some extent (through developing questions or foci), and each cycle informed the next. Our way of interacting together in our reflection and planning phases was, however, expressive, diffuse and impromptu and, particularly on the last day, imaginal. In particular, we took an imaginal space trip together, and then shared our experiences. Given the findings of full embodiment as a key to our inquiry, we received this learning as an embodied experience. We were always open to the spontaneous and expected the unexpected.

**Informative, transformative**

This is a fundamental distinction and picks out the primary poles of co-operative inquiry, its complementary supporting pillars. Will the inquiry be descriptive of some domain of experience, being informative and explanatory about it? Or will it be exploring practice within some domain, being transformative of it? (Heron 1996b, p. 48).

Participants reflected on their existing work with co-operative processes in the inquiry. The desire was for new knowledge, beyond what we already knew and were practising as transformational facilitators. The inquiry was, therefore, primarily informative, rather than transformative, but the two are interdependent in my view, and cannot be separated, as new embodied knowledge must by its nature be transformational, as it immediately impacts on its world.
Concerted action

There was no agreement by inquirers to act concertedly after the inquiry. Nor did we intend to do this. Participants reported change individually after the inquiry. Sarah McGhee reported greater awareness of gender power dynamics. Hamish Brown reported an ability to consider personal development in a larger organisational, social, and global context. Raewyn Togalea-Cobb reported greater awareness of the importance and integrity of whole personhood. Lane West-Newman reported having more fun with students during lectures and receiving higher evaluations than usual. I reported a sense of embodied learning, which now affects my relationships.

After the inquiry, Sarah McGhee joined the Zenergy team of facilitators, and reported that the inquiry was part of her deciding to do this.
Section 4 Findings

4.1 Reflections on the Research Process

This section provides some general reflections on my experience of this research project and the three methods used.

I found the whole process of researching very interesting and enjoyable. I had heard stories that undertaking a Ph.D. could be a grueling experience and that many worthy souls fall by the wayside or take many years to complete the project. Perhaps because I am a mature student with a wide work experience I was able to set up the project in a way that was both enjoyable and productive. I found it fun to conduct the survey at the IAF conference, intriguing to take part in the Internet dialogue and deeply satisfying and transformative to participate in the co-operative inquiry. It was also very interesting to experience three very different research methods and to compare, contrast and integrate them.

The general nature of the co-operative inquiry allowed for divergence and a rich diversity of inquiry within the broad inquiry question. The specific area selected for the survey and Internet dialogue - facilitator values and ethics - was chosen in the belief that the research could contribute both to the theory and the practice of facilitation.

Through the three research methods I sought to achieve both breadth and depth, and also to engage in the research area in both a general and a specific way. Breadth was achieved by canvassing internationally a group of professional facilitators through the survey and Internet dialogue. Depth was achieved through the deliberations of the co-operative inquiry and to some extent through the Internet dialogue.

Reflections on the survey

The survey was designed to reveal how facilitators from around the world perceive the relevance of values and ethics in the practice of their profession. Its limitations were that it was non-interactive and provided data at a specific point in time. The questions I asked in the survey were based on my worldview and experience as a
facilitator, mainly but not exclusively, in New Zealand. I discovered through the survey, and the Internet dialogue that my worldview differs from that of facilitators who come from other facilitation traditions, such as the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA). This led me to reflect that if I had conducted the survey after the Internet dialogue I would probably have asked different questions.

The values question in the survey requested qualitative data through an open-ended question. This did generate some interesting and usable information, particularly the uncovering of the diversity of facilitator key values.

The Internet dialogue

The Internet dialogue involved an international group of between 50 and 60 facilitators, and took place over one year, June 2000 - May 2001. This time span allowed significant in-depth dialogue to occur. It was also helpful that the purpose and desired outcome was clear. The Internet dialogue form is a co-operative process that is in an early stage of development and is likely to be used widely in the future. It is effective in enabling participants in different parts of the world to share and learn from one another.

The Internet dialogue form is a new opportunity for facilitation and facilitators are learning on the job how to do this well. An IAF member facilitated our Internet dialogue who had not facilitated an Internet dialogue before. At times I felt frustrated by this but also learnt a lot myself about effective online facilitation. Online facilitation has much potential and is already developing as more opportunities arise. There is also an opportunity here for further research.

The co-operative inquiry

The co-operative inquiry was a 'face to face' process involving eleven people and I found this method deeply satisfying. It was an experience of substance. The co-operative inquiry enabled me to think, experience, and act in new and creative ways, sparked by others shared experiences and reflections. The learning was profound and I experienced it as being anchored in my body. I now embody those learnings - I have become them. This kind of learning can be difficult to articulate. Also presenting
the often shorthand material from our discussions and the artwork in a form that is usable in this research was a challenge.

The method of co-operative inquiry was the most personally satisfying and inspiring of the three methods I used as it enabled the participants to engage on many levels. Although not quite as new a research method as the Internet dialogue, the co-operative inquiry is still a comparatively recent and unseasoned method and needs many more examples to become mature. It is an important co-operative method that can be used effectively in many contexts.

Advantages and disadvantages of the three research methods

Here are the advantages and disadvantages I noted in using the three research methods.

Survey

Advantages
- Provided detailed information
- Provided responses from a large number of people (126)
- Transportable - just 2 sheets of A4 paper x 126
- Quantifiable data produced
- Qualitative data produced
- International in scope

Disadvantages
- Exploratory only - not in depth
- Static snapshot
- Restricted by my understanding at the time
- Limited usefulness of information
- Required considerable management (at the conference in Toronto)
- Expensive travel costs from New Zealand to Canada

Internet dialogue

Advantages
- Able to engage internationally with others of same interests
- Able to involve oneself at own pace and in own time
Flexible time-span, which expanded to one year
Able to reflect and grow understanding between participants
Assisted by a clear purpose and task
Opportunity for online facilitation
Inexpensive - few $$ costs

Disadvantages
Unable to fully experience other participants - disembodied experience.
Interspersing the dialogue with many other activities over time meant that it was easy
to lose the thread
Needed paper copy as well to keep track of dialogue
Dialogue limited by expertise of facilitation
Dialogue threads not always followed - conversation became disjointed at times
Misunderstandings and emotional triggering occurred through different
understandings of written language
Difficult to achieve convergence
A new form requiring more development

Co-operative Inquiry

Advantages
Real time and real people - energetic engagement
In-depth experience
Embodied, whole person learning
Able to experience other participants' voices and body language, and engage all senses
Able to choose the individual participants
Inexpensive - few $$ costs
Cyclic nature of inquiry gave time to be together and also apart
Able to generate alignment and synergy

Disadvantages
Required people to meet physically
Hard to find common times and to have sufficient time
Needed to be aware of real-time issues such as emotional triggering
Difficult to present material in communicable form
Needed to get further comments from participants after the inquiry to clarify some of the learnings
Possibility of unaware collusion
A still developing method

**Links between the research methods**

The survey and the Internet dialogue were designed to interlink. The Internet dialogue followed on from the survey. Some of the participants (nine) were the same in both the survey and the dialogue, and I was also able to feed some of the survey findings into both the Internet dialogue and the co-operative inquiry. The only person common to all three research methods was myself.

This raises the question as to what extent I influenced the outcomes of the research. In the survey I influenced the outcome by how I distributed the survey and the questions I asked. These questions were a result of my knowledge and experience. The categorising of some of the responses was also a judgment call on my part.

In the Internet dialogue I sought to influence the discussion and did so by pushing for my contributions to be incorporated into the IAF Statement of Values and the Code of Ethics. My requests for process transparency also impacted the process. I chose not to involve myself in the small task force, because I did not want to unduly influence the outcome or be seen to do this in a less than fully transparent way.

In the co-operative inquiry I invited the participants from my own networks. I chose the venue, suggested the process and facilitated part of it. The other participants respected my process knowledge and this must be considered a factor in the outcome. I did seek to limit my influence by having another person skilled in co-operative inquiry involved and also including two academics.

Could the outcomes of this research been generated by any other person? Did I get these outcomes only because I did the research? These are fair questions to which I do not have clear answers.
The research and my world

The reading, researching and writing up of this dissertation took the major part of three and a half years of my life and involved me in the stimulating and inspiring life of the Social Ecology School at UWS-Hawkesbury, situated about an hour northwest of Sydney. I was fortunate to discover this academic oasis, where students can pursue their passions in an enlightened and supportive environment. I received marvellous guidance and support from my supervisor, Professor Stuart Hill, and formed heartful relationships with both faculty and many research students who attended the summer and winter residential schools held at the Hawkesbury campus.

The residential schools remind me strongly of the Heart Politics gatherings I participate in regularly in New Zealand and consider an important part of my life. Both gatherings are participant centred with large and small facilitated sessions, interesting guest speakers, ritual, celebration, and the opportunity to share in each other’s passions, ask questions, and give and receive feedback. I intend to stay involved in ‘Hawkesbury’ (as we refer to the Social Ecology school) in some way after I graduate. Professor Hill also attended the 2003 summer Heart Politics gathering in New Zealand as a guest speaker.

There was also considerable interaction between this research project and other parts of my world. At the same time as I worked on this research project, I was involved with the company Zenergy Ltd. of which I am a director and team member. Zenergy is a co-operative group of facilitators, mediators, coaches, and facilitation trainers based in different parts of New Zealand. The Auckland base for Zenergy is at my home - a large 1900s villa. Writing the thesis at my home led to ongoing dialogue with the other Zenergy practitioners. Benefits from this included an increase in our organisational knowledge, the knowledge of our facilitator communities and a flow-on to our clients.

Material from this project was made available to our Zenergy training programmes as it was written. Several of our senior facilitation training programmes contributed to the co-operative inquiry. The survey findings were posted on the Zenergy WebPages. The survey findings concerning values were posted on the Australasian Facilitators online group and generated some helpful discussion. Some of my survey findings were also posted on the Internet dialogue.
The co-operative inquiry led to enhanced relationships among the participants. One participant, partly as a result of the experience, subsequently joined the company as a full-time team member. I was invited to attend the weddings of two other participants. The co-operative inquiry findings affected the development of Zenergy, and a new vision statement emerged the following year that incorporated the term ‘whole people’.

At the May 2001 IAF Conference I co-facilitated two forums with Dr. Roger Schwarz and Dr. Sandor Schuman at which participants in the EVTT dialogue and others discussed the Statement of Values and Code of Ethics and planned further action. In October 2001 I was appointed the Australian & New Zealand representative on the IAF Board (ACT) and presented the Code to the Board on behalf of EVTT at the first Board meeting I attended in Texas, May 2002.

Discussions with Dr. Phil Carter at the Auckland University of Technology about Internet dialogue and facilitation led to the work placement of an Auckland University of Technology (AUT) Honours student with Zenergy, Stephen Thorpe came to Zenergy to gain work experience, further his facilitation training and conduct research into online facilitation methods. His placement, from February to July 2001, resulted in the preparation of a project report on online facilitation (Thorpe 2001). Stephen Thorpe extended his placement with Zenergy until December 2001 and has now enrolled as a Ph.D. candidate at AUT focusing on online collaboration methods. He is also employed by Zenergy part time to assist with our computing requirements.
4.2 Research Findings

This thesis has explored the issues involved in developing and maintaining sustainable facilitated co-operative processes within organisations. The flexibility and fluidity of organisational forms led me to concentrate on and the nature of co-operative processes and the key role of the facilitator and facilitator values and ethics. The survey and Internet dialogue were designed to focus on these aspects. The co-operative inquiry, however, allowed the participants to explore the whole research question.

Survey

The purpose of the survey was to explore the values and ethics that underpin the facilitation of co-operative processes. The survey established that 80% of the 126 facilitators who responded to the survey use consensus decision-making all or most of the time, particularly those facilitators whose primary work is facilitation. Although facilitators experience problems at the interface of co-operative processes and the organisation that hosts them, they are divided on which of these problems they regard as posing ethical issues.

Most (78%) agreed that confidentiality of individual group member’s behaviour is an ethical issue, and some (59%) agreed that consensus decisions revoked by some group members, or others outside the group (49%), are also ethical issues. Issues such as having group agreement to facilitate, and having time to complete a process, were regarded by most as problems (65% and 78%), but not necessarily ethical issues.

The survey showed that most facilitator contracts are by verbal agreement (58% always, 33% sometimes), and that fewer facilitators use a written contract (8% always, 50% sometimes), or a code of ethics (14% always, 23% sometimes). Although the values underpinning facilitator practice were not universal, they tended to favour participation (31)\(^1\), honesty (30), respect (30), integrity (26) and trust (24).

\(^1\) Number of responses.
Internet dialogue

The purpose of participating in, and monitoring, the Internet dialogue, was to add depth to the understanding of ethical issues raised in the survey and to identify and explore further issues that were not covered, but that emerged during the dialogue. The task of the Internet group was to develop a Statement of Values and a Code of Ethics for the International Association of Facilitators.

The Internet dialogue uncovered a wide range of views on ethical issues, with particular polarisation between group-centered facilitators, who regarded themselves as accountable to the group, and management-centered facilitators, who regarded themselves as accountable primarily to individual managers within an organisation.

Group-centered facilitators considered the group always to be the client and favoured the group defining its own purpose, making its own agreements and working together using consensus decision-making. They also felt that group members should manage their relationship with the person or agency paying the facilitator and not abrogate this important function to the facilitator. Management-centered facilitators favoured working with the project manager to clarify purpose and in some cases also the process used by the group. Such facilitators may regard themselves as acting as a liaison between the project manager and the group. Consensus may be used for reaching some decisions.

A draft Statement of Values and Code of Ethics was developed, and a second draft was prepared by the end of my data collection phase (June 2001). These drafts reflected both the differences among facilitators and the search for commonality and congruence. A number of the dialogue participants developed the document’s Statement of Values online and reached a consensus as follows:

As facilitators we believe in the inherent value of the individual and the collective wisdom of the group. We strive to help the group make the best use of the contributions of each of its members. We set aside our personal opinions, maintain neutrality, and support the group’s right to make its own choices. We believe that collaborative and cooperative interaction builds consensus and meaningful outcomes (EVTT message 364, 20 March 2001).
A final Draft Statement of Values and Code of Ethics for Facilitators was adopted by the International Association of Facilitators in May 2002 (Appendix L).

**Co-operative Inquiry**

The purpose of the co-operative inquiry was to inquire into the whole research topic of facilitated sustainable co-operative processes in organisations. The inquiry group of 11 facilitators, managers and academics, affirmed that there is a clash of belief systems, assumptions, values and behaviours between hierarchical and co-operative ways of working.

The co-operative inquirers described working co-operatively in hierarchical organisations as hard, requiring high maintenance, awareness, commitment, and ongoing peer support, both within and outside the organisation. Co-operative processes can be manipulated in sophisticated ways, and people can pretend to be co-operative while furthering other agendas, including covert power struggles. Conditioned, oppressive behaviour weakens co-operative processes, as does the deceptive co-option of co-operative language and concepts. Conscious and unconscious collusion in incongruent behaviors can lead to all sorts of problems.

Inquirers found that the doorway into 'co-operacy' was the ability to be fully embodied whole beings connecting to one another with love and compassion. When we disassociate, 'get stuck in our heads' or collude with others' projections and distress, we have very limited access to co-operacy. Being connected to self, others and the wider environment allows us to access and speak our own truth with love and compassion and this is an essential requirement for co-operative processes to be sustained (refer also Fig. 26, p. 218).

The fears associated with truth-speaking named by the inquirers included fear of not being good enough, expecting to be clobbered, shamed and undervalued by others, and other negative consequences. To achieve sustainable authentic co-operation, co-operators had to ask themselves: 'Do I trust myself and others sufficiently to authentically communicate my own truth?'
Integration and embodiment of the research findings

The survey and the Internet dialogue explored the roles of the facilitator in determining the ethical introduction of co-operative processes into organisations. The co-operative inquiry identified the difficulties of working at the 'hard edge' between co-operative work and hierarchical structures and identified ways to move forward with integrity.

After the data collection phase and the distilling of the findings from the three research projects, I reflected over a number of months on the research findings in total. I wanted to integrate the findings about embodied whole personhood, love and compassion from the co-operative inquiry; the learnings from the survey and the Internet dialogue, (particularly the Statement of Values from the draft facilitator Code of Ethics) and bring these together with existing facilitation knowledge and my own insights. I sought to embody these learnings and express them through a useful model or system that could be used in practical ways.

I experimented with different models and eventually designed a meta-model that can be used in conjunction with any group development model or co-operative process design to enable the process to remain life enhancing and therefore sustainable. In a sense this meta-model can be seen as an extension of my individual co-operative inquiry question which was about exploring cyclic, seasonal, organic cycles in organisations as an aspect of co-operative work. The meta-model reflects the spiral pattern in co-operative inquirer Raewyn Togalea-Cobb's drawing (Fig. 25 p. 178), and my process confirms that the co-operative inquiry did not end for me at the end of the formal process.

The meta-model may be used by facilitators to monitor the sustainability of the co-operative processes in organizations (see pp. 228-231). It is illustrated below in the form of a repeating cycle or spiral (Fig. 26). The first letters of the headings: freedom, alignment, congruence, truth and synergy create the acronym FACTS.
Fig. 26. FACTS meta-model for maintaining sustainable co-operative processes in organisations.
Meta-model for sustainable co-operative processes

This meta-model summarises the optimum environment for co-operative processes under five headings; freedom, alignment, congruence, truth and synergy (FACTS). Each of the FACTS is dynamic and fluid and needs ongoing attention to be maintained. Each of the FACTS is also essential for the development and maintenance of organisational environments within which co-operative processes can flourish. The meta-model can be used both sequentially and as a holograph.

Freedom

- Free and Informed choice
- Commitment
- Accountability

People who take part in co-operative processes must do so freely, without coercion or fear of reprisal. Relevant information is needed for participants to make informed choices, and these choices need to be accompanied by an internal commitment by each person. Internal commitment leads to responsibility, and willingness to be accountable for one's actions as a self-expression, rather than as a burden.

Effective facilitation uses processes that enhance free and informed choice, commitment, and accountability.

Alignment

- Individual
- Group
- Organisation/society/world
- Intention / purpose

All those involved need to be aligned with the intention or purpose of the co-operative process and how it fits within the organisation. Organisational intentions may be expressed as a shared vision, mission and goals or statement of intent. For sustainability to be achieved, the aligned intention of the organisation must extend to the environment and the health of the planet. Facilitation seeks and enhances alignment.
**Congruence**

- Purpose
- Values
- Actions

The intention of the group becomes potent when it is expressed as a clear concise purpose containing one main idea. Congruence is then needed between the purpose and the values or 'culture' of the group, and the actions of the people involved.

Values, beliefs and assumptions are both conscious and unconscious. Key group values may be expressed in ground rules, group agreements, charters, and codes of practice and also as images, such as logos. Actions include spoken and written words as well as other individual and group behaviours (e.g. punctuality).

Decreasing the distance between what we believe or think, what we say and what we do is the domain of ethics, and the arena of the daily fight to be congruent (Freire 1993). Facilitators must seek to be ethical and encourage congruence in others.

**Truth**

- Embodied whole personhood
- Love and compassion
- Collective wisdom

Personal development methods help to provide access to embodied whole personhood through dissolving and disempowering unhelpful conditioned, patterned behaviour. Access to experiencing our whole selves, including all our emotions, without fragmentation and dissociation, allows us to connect with love and compassion to self, other persons, groups, cultures, other species and the whole transplanetary field (Fig. 4, p. 75). Speaking individual truth and working through the conflicts that ensue, takes the group to a deeper, more potent level. This potency propels the group forward towards synergy and continues the spiral.

Sensitively facilitated co-operative processes can enhance individual access to personal truth and enable the expression of collective wisdom in the group.
Synergy

- Energy
- Presence
- Flow

When a group is aligned, congruent and truthful, more energy will become available. Energy will be released and enhanced. Participants will become more present, attentive and aware and the group will experience a sense of 'flow' - and 'flowing with' as distinct from struggling and striving. Synergy is the experience of collective energy and of the 'sum being greater than the parts'. This energy is readily available to an aligned and congruent group.

Spirit

Form follows spirit. Spirit can be experienced as spiritual, spirited, god or as a 'higher purpose' depending on one's belief system. Co-operative processes are the forms that follow the spirit of co-operative endeavour or 'co-operacy'. Noticing spirit at work requires awareness. Following spirit requires intention and rigour.

Often spirit is most easily perceived through its shadow, which highlights unhelpful, conditioned behaviour, distress from the past and fear of the future. Encountering the individual, group and collective shadow material is the work of everyone who seeks awareness and consciousness. The co-operative spirit moves through co-operative processes and is an expression of the desire to experience ways of being and doing that nourish the value of the individual and the collective wisdom of the group.

If freedom, alignment, congruence, and truth are present, synergy will become available, and spirit will continue to flow. The cycle of sustainability will continue and grow as a spiral. All the FACTS require ongoing attention and rigour. Embodied whole persons speaking their truth with love and compassion, is the prerequisite for the achievement of sustainability. The fear and 'pragmatism' within most organisations must be challenged if we are to generate a sustainable world.
FACTS meta-model and relationship with other models.

The use of the image in the meta-model of a repeating circle/spiral as an organic form is linked to Ritter (2001), Wheatley (1992), and Beck and Cowan (1995). Ritter explains the spiral as the basic universal tendency to attract, fuse and liberate. This can be life positive or life negative (p. 1). Fig. 25 of the Co-operative Inquiry also provides a link to the spiral symbol.

There are links between the FACTS meta-model and the ancient mythic heroic journey explored by Campbell (1988) and Houston (1993). The meta-model does not duplicate the sequence of events that are associated with the description of these mythic cycles, though there are resonances, which can be noted such as a development of consciousness or developing maturity. Houston also refers to larger spiral starting with a 'second maturity' through which we enter 'a new phase in human evolution and a new era of human consciousness, one that could be termed that of the post-individual or the era of ecological humanity' (p. 215).

The FACTS meta-model is also compatible with most group development models (Smith 2001). For example the Tuckman (1963) forming, norming, storming, performing, adjourning, model could correlate with the FACTS meta-model. The Peck (1987) model for community building (pseudo-community, conflict and chaos, emptiness and authentic community) can be also be used in conjunction with the FACTS meta-model. The FACTS meta-model (unlike group development models) is value laden and inclusive. It focuses on the co-operative process both within the group and within the larger context of a sustainable society and world.

Links with the FACTS meta-model

This section outlines the links involving the individual aspects of the FACTS meta-model.

Freedom
(Free and informed choice, commitment, accountability).

The FACTS meta-model has links with the International Association of Facilitators Draft Statement of Values and Code of Ethics for Facilitators (2002) (Appendix L), the subject of the Internet dialogue part of this research project. There are links
between the aspects of freedom and the Statement of Values (Appendix L, p. 2), which states that 'We...support the group's right to make its own choices'. Also Clause 3 of the Code reads:

3  Group Autonomy

We respect the culture, rights and autonomy of the group.
We seek the conscious agreement to the process and their commitment to participate. We do not impose anything that risks the welfare and dignity of the participants, the freedom of choice of the group, or the credibility of its work.

In the Co-operative Inquiry mind map, generated by a facilitators training group and called 'Barriers to Co-operacy', 'lack of commitment' and 'not taking personal responsibility' are included as barriers (Appendix K).

In reference to related literature, The Seven Rochdale Principles for co-operatives (ICA 1995) include in the 1st principle, 'persons able to ... accept the responsibility of membership'. The 4th principle is called 'Autonomy and Independence' and states that 'Co-operatives are autonomous, self-help organisations controlled by their members'.

Schwarz (1994) names 'free and informed choice', and 'internal commitment to these choices' as two of four key values guiding effective group and facilitator behaviour (p. 8). Spenser (1989) cites 'commitment' as one of the qualities necessary in organisations for transformation (p. 163).

Alignment
(Individual, group, organization/society/world, intention).

Use of consensus is an important means of developing alignment in groups. In the Survey for Facilitators it was shown that facilitators use consensus extensively (Fig. 5-8).

The IAF Draft Code of Ethics (2002), Statement of Values includes: 'We believe that collaborative and cooperative interaction builds consensus and produces meaningful outcomes' (Appendix L).
The 'brain dump' notes in the Co-operative Inquiry include a section entitled: ‘Need for alignment’ (Chapter 3.6, p. 171).

Hunter et al. (1997) in ‘Co-operacy – a New Way of Being at Work’ includes a chapter named Alignment (pp. 44-53).

To work together co-operatively it is necessary for groups of diverse people (any two or more) to develop ways to create and maintain alignment. By alignment we mean the bringing together of hearts and minds – and more – in a way that the energies and efforts of everyone will lead to coordinated and synergistic action (p. 44).

In the facilitation text, 'Winning Through Participation', Spenser (1989), cites alignment as one of the qualities necessary for transformation (p. 163). Management consultant, Lagan (2000) considers that there is a need to get values alignment between employees and the organisation (p. 80).

**Congruence**
(Purpose, values, actions).

Facilitator values (Fig. 18) are identified in the facilitator survey conducted as part of this thesis (p. 108). The Draft Code of Ethics (IAF 2002) refers to the importance of values in the Preamble:

> Our effectiveness is based on our personal integrity and the trust developed between ourselves and those with whom we work. Therefore, we recognize the importance of defining and making known the values and ethical principles that guide our actions (p. 2).

As part of the 'brain dump' in the Co-operative Inquiry in a section called 'Co-operacy is hard' a participant noted (p. 172 of this thesis).

> Co-operative philosophy is not sufficient if behaviour is not congruent. People can pretend to be co-operative when unconsciously their values are not aligned with co-operacy.

In related literature, Freire (Maheshananda 1997) explores the importance in his life and relationship of the daily fight to be congruent. Wheatley (1992) identifies the importance of uncovering our core vision and values.
We need to be able to trust that something as simple as a clear core or values and vision, kept in motion through continuing dialogue, can lead to order (pp. 146-7).

**Truth**
(Whole personhood, love and compassion, collective wisdom).

The IAF Draft Code of Ethics (2002), Statement of Values reads: ‘As group facilitators, we believe in the inherent value of the individual and the collective wisdom of the group’. Clause 5 in the Code supports speaking one’s own truth:

5. **Respect, Safety, Equity, and Trust**
We strive to engender an environment of respect and safety where all participants trust that they can speak freely and where individual boundaries are honored. We use our skills, knowledge, tools, and wisdom to elicit and honor the perspectives of all...

We work in ways that honour the wholeness and self-expression of others...

The Co-operative Inquiry findings (refer p. 215) include:

Inquirers found that the doorway into ‘co-operacy’ was the ability to be fully embodied whole beings connecting to one another with love and compassion (Fig. 23 and 24).

Reflecting on being involved in the Co-operative Inquiry, Participant C noted ‘That I need to be there as a whole person — difficult at times — that collective interconnectedness’ (p. 183). Enablers to Co-operacy (Appendix K) included ‘tapping into the whole person, bringing the shadow into the open, upholding innocence and goodness, and fundamental faith in the human condition’.

**Whole personhood**, part of the FACTS aspect of truth, is the subject of Chapter 2.5 of this thesis. In addition Milbrath’s (1996, p. 190) model for a sustainable society, (Fig. 2b) includes compassion as a key value. Schwarz (2002b) added compassion to his key values for facilitators in the most recent edition of his handbook for facilitators.

Rogers (1969, 1977) a pioneer of facilitation, explains that the facilitator needs to be genuinely free of the desire to impose ready-made truths or to control the outcome of a group. The facilitator helps people to engage in genuine dialogue which will enable long suppressed feeling to surface, be heard respectfully, leading to a strengthening

For Stanfield (2000) the task of a social pioneer is 'to love all human kind'.

The love we are talking about here is not making people feel good or buttressing their illusions. It is more like walking people up to their full possibilities, and recreating the structures of society so that every one is cared for (p. 200).

The Scott Peck (1987) group development model includes 'emptiness' and 'authenticity' as the third and fourth of four stages (p. 107). By working sensitively through conflict, exposing weaknesses, hurts and vulnerabilities, a deeper level of relating can be achieved.

Synergy
(Energy, presence, flow)

The Co-operative Inquiry includes a number of references to synergy. For example, the 'Gap between polarisation and synergy' was explored by a participant in the inquiry (Appendix K, p.6). This included the importance of everyone being equal and pulling together and being willing to 'not know'. In my journal notes, I noted that 'power accumulates. It needs to keep shifting' (refer p. 166). The Inquiry 'breakthrough' (refer p. 173) came after a 'degree of momentum and synergy' had developed on the last Saturday. In the reflections on the Co-operative Inquiry 'Ebb and flow of energy – fluid' was again noted (refer p. 179).

Spirit

In the Internet Dialogue in this thesis a discussion occurred about spirit.

(EVTT message 378, 28 March 2001):
Facilitation is about liberation of the human spirit through working with the group in such a way that people claim their own authority and move into a space of potent partnership and relationship with those around them.

(EVTT message 383, 2 April 20001):
We must stand for something, either forwarding the status quo OR liberating the human spirit – We cannot have it all ways!
The spiritual dimension of love is expressed in the waiata (song) – 'Te Aroha' (refer p. 179), part of the Co-operative Inquiry completion.

Freire (Ohara 1989), Handy (1998a and b), Heron (1996), Owen (1987, 1994) and Pedler (1990) are among many organisational commentators who refer to spirit in organisations. Owen (1987) has developed his 'open space technology' specifically to allow and encourage spirit to be expressed in organisations. He considers that spirit comes before and is expressed through form.

**Facilitators validation of the meta-model**

Validating the meta-model involved checking it with some other facilitators, in particular the participants in the co-operative inquiry. Some of these facilitators provided illuminating comments as they related the meta-model to their own practice.

A co-operative inquiry participant, Hamish Brown described using the meta-model in an organizational workshop to assist the forty participants to understand their conflicted organizational context. He considered that the model assisted the participants to identify their own areas of weakness. The aspects of the FACTS model identified as missing or weak in the organization were freedom and alignment. In relation to freedom, 'people were not able to choose given that they did not have the correct information about the management stance' regarding the issue in conflict (Brown 2002, p. 1). He also commented on finding the meta-model useful to both as a sequential cycle and as a means of identifying how to maintain synergy once achieved. 'Any particular issue may raise deeper issues regarding any of the elements on the FACTS model' (Brown 2002, p. 4).

Hazel Hodgkin (2003), also a co-operative inquiry participant, noticed while facilitating a policy meeting for a political party that there was not full alignment with the purpose of the day. Two people expressed early on their unhappiness with the pre-agreed group purpose and one of them became involved in a direct conflict with another participant later in the day. Hodgkin believed the two participants lack of alignment influenced their ability to participate fully and co-operatively in the meeting discussions (p. 1).
Hodgkin reflected that she could have worked more with *alignment* of the participants, particularly at the beginning of the day. She also believed that she might have usefully watched for opportunities to increase the level of honesty and emotions where appropriate. However, she believed that there was sufficient *freedom, alignment* and *congruence* for significant synergy to emerge at the end of the meeting. Reflecting on *synergy*, Hodgkin saw this as something for which she strived.

If it happens, it is almost always an indication of a successful facilitation. However, if it does not happen, it does not necessarily mean a lack of success. Lack of synergy may just mean that some other work was done by the group that still needs more processing before being fully worked through (Hodgkin 2003, p. 2).

Sarah McGhee (2003), a co-operative inquiry participant, facilitated a women's collective involved in health issues and noted that the key issues here were around *alignment* and *congruence*, particularly congruence between values and behaviours. McGhee's approach to moving the group forward included naming the incongruent behaviors and invoking the *spirit* of the organisation.

I stood for them being a collective of women with values (such as equity, empowerment, advocacy, love and safety) who were working on behalf of a multicultural community.

I confronted them when I saw their behaviours didn't match what they were up to' (p. 1).

The group was able to move into speaking their own *truth*, as there was plenty of trust built up prior to the confrontation and faith in the facilitator.

By the afternoon we had named the 'elephant' of unfinished business as issues around power, old systems that didn't work and history of personal attacks...

The relationship between *alignment* and *congruence* (what you say and what you do) is critical if you are serious about having integrity in the world...(p. 2).

Reflecting on the meta-model, McGhee supposes that there is a skill base involved in using it in terms of when to intervene and on what basis. She wondered how one
learnt to listen for the key issues rather than the 'ten little issues'. She then went on
to answer her own question by adding:

Once I tapped into the spirit of the organization as a community based service then I
was able to see what really mattered and needed to be attended to. I have learnt this
from being around Maori, Pacific Island, African and Maltese cultures. If the spirit is
missing then there is always a potential danger of the facilitator becoming oppressive
(p. 2).

Another co-operative inquiry member, who chose to remain anonymous, critiqued a
daylong organisational retreat she had attended as a participant. She considered it
an example of an event that was not able to achieve synergy and on reflection saw
that none of the FACTS were well represented. Her vignette included the following
(slightly amended to disguise the type of organisation):

1. Freedom. Most people did not want to be there. Commitment to achieve co-
operatve processes and collective outcomes were drastically lacking in some cases
and lukewarm in others – at least partly because of a history of failed meetings of this
kind.

2. Alignment. No alignment existed before the meeting and none was achieved. The
group decided to proceed directly to the task that the two (leaders) perceived had to
be done. The facilitator was explicitly prevented from doing anything in the way of a
warm up or check in because these are ‘touchy feely’ and not appropriate (for this
profession). Also the past history of tears, tantrums, and terrorizing do not allow these
people to want to expose themselves to each other.

3. Congruence. Each individual at the meeting had their own purposes, values, and
desires. In general each perceived that achieving their own goals and establishing
themselves as the most important person there could only be done by thwarting
everyone else, embarrassing, and even humiliating them if necessary in the process.
It might even be said that there was an active will present to prevent congruence.
Tears, accusations, complaints, dragging up past histories all contributed to the
atmosphere of isolated and frustrated human entities. People claimed what they
wanted. One person walked out. As the loudest complainers got what they wanted
others subsided into resentful silence. The facilitator's attempts to reframe problems
and processes were simply firmly opposed and suppressed by those who had not
wanted to have her there in the first place.
4. *Truth.* Was the victim on the day. In fact some people’s truths were spoken very loudly indeed but no collective or sustainable truth was allowed to emerge. Whole personhood, love and compassion, collective wisdom? Wash your mouth out.

5. *Synergy.* Well, no. Energy, presence, flow? Inertia, absence, lumpy resentment and fear. A list of who would be doing what (more or less unwillingly) in the year to come. And dread that it will have to happen all over again next January. This is the very particular hell of non-co-operative processes in a large organization (Anon 2003, pp. 3-4).

The above critique illustrates, perhaps even more graphically than the positive previous critiques, the importance of attending to the FACTS for effective co-operative processes.

**Embodying the research findings**

Since embarking on this research, I have become even more aware of the importance of my embodied – felt – sensed experience when working as a facilitator with groups and in my everyday life. I connect with all of my body consciously as fully as I am able and pay particular attention to remaining grounded and ‘in’ my belly. This is a very different experience to merely thinking about something – where the attention and energy remain mainly in the head.

I also accord more importance to consciously connecting with ‘heart’ energy of love and compassion, and engaging with both individual participants and the group as a whole in relation to this kind of energy. I have found that this simple and direct approach helps the participants to soften, become less defensive, listen with more empathy, and connect with one another.

In contrast to this, the focus of the literature of facilitation is mostly on technical expertise, conceptual modelling, and even on becoming a ‘multi-trick pony’ (Kisser 1998). There is little in this literature on values and ways of being for facilitators. I find myself uninterested in technical approaches and preplanned processes. Over the research period, particularly as a result of the co-operative inquiry, I have become more consciously committed to working with both intuitive and emergent processes and developing an embodied presence that allows for this. My preference now, is to minimise structure, to naming the emergent group purpose and desired
culture of the group (essentially as the group's ground rules), and then to 'go with the flow'.

For example, in a recent facilitation process, I helped the group to establish a purpose and then asked the group to suggest some group ground rules. One participant had written down 'humanity' and spoke passionately for the need for this in the group. When some members of the group later vented their feelings by blaming one another, the manager and the organisational structure, I initiated a discussion about what each person could do to address the group 'humanity' and move towards the group purpose of a more harmonious team. The participants were then able gradually to move past blame and suggest actions they could each take to meet the group purpose. The group participants gradually became energised and positive.

In another recent day-long meeting of a very defensive group (all together for the first time after a year of turmoil involving media scrutiny), there was little response to my request to disclose any feelings or to develop a conscious group culture. The group participants appeared afraid that any disclosure or 'breaking ranks' might lead to damage or attack. The new and sympathetic manager had attempted for six months to gain the group confidence and had experienced the team as a 'circular of the wagons' with no willingness to let him in. The group spent the first 1½ hours bemoaning the circumstances of their media criticism and blaming 'management'. Following my own intuition, I wrote the word 'proactive' for the group culture. The group quite suddenly became proactive and began working on practical issues. After several hours I sensed this was becoming a defence in itself from addressing underlying issues. As I was thinking this, the participant beside me voiced a range of group conflicts, and acknowledged that they were being avoided.

Following my intuition again, I wrote down 'kindness' on the culture sheet. (If they responded to the word proactive so strongly would they do the same for kindness?). At first the group members reluctantly agreed to acknowledge one another rather than address the particular issues. This led to a gradual relaxing and freeing up of the group's energy. This led on to the group acknowledging themselves and affirming the manager for his gentle style and efforts.
Group navigation

The image of 'going with the flow' resonated as I read a passage in which the travel writer Jonathon Raban (1999) describes the affinity between the Canadian West Coast indigenous people and water. The waterways were their roads, marketplace and their preferred environment, in contrast to the forest, which was inhabited by dangerous wild animals and malevolent spirits. Raban also mentions a New Zealand adventurer, David Lewis, who travelled with Polynesian navigators in the 1960s and noticed how the open sea can be as intimately known and as friendly to human habitation, to those seamen who lived on its surface, wave by wave, as a familiar stretch of land. Raban describes how in ancient times successful sailors made their way across the sea by reading the surface, shapes and colours of the water. The four winds shaped the wave swells with the interaction and movement of the different swells, and the land masses across thousands of miles allowed the sensitive pilot to 'feel' where the land was and move accurately towards it.

Sailing by swell entailed an intense concentration on the character of the sea itself. Wave shape was everything. A single wave is likely to be moulded by several forces: the local wind; a dominant underlying swell; and often, a weaker swell coming from a third direction. Early navigators had to be in communion with every lift of the bow as the sea swept under the hull in order to sense each component in the wave and deduce from them the existence of unseen masses of land (Raban 1999, p. 93).

Raban and Lewis both commented on the embodied nature of this sensing, with the testicles being the most reliable organ in these navigators for picking up the slight variations in the rhythm of a swell. The arrival of the magnetic compass caused a fundamental rift in the relationship between man and sea, and the ability to navigate in attunement with the sea was largely lost.

Rather than the ocean, groups are my natural environment(s). I experience facilitating groups as similar to attuned navigation. A craft or container is needed and a direction (the group culture and purpose). Processes may be used, (like the magnetic compass or a map), but the best work is done when I am attuned to the group, and I/we are subtly guiding them/ourselves towards the group purpose through reading the fluctuating energies or 'swells'. This is no conscious sense of 'I' and 'we'. We are attuned and moving together with facilitation providing a few subtle interventions as needed.
Integrating the research findings and my experiential process

I have been involved with implementing the findings of this research over the last two years (2001-3), endeavouring to integrate them and benefit from the ‘real’ (embodied) learnings. What I have found is that the written experience of others and the conceptual models in the literature are somewhat useful, in that they add to my bank of academic knowledge and can be drawn upon as needed to inform my work. However, my practical skills must be developed through experience.

I have come to realise that principled co-operative organisations and ethically facilitated co-operative processes are part but not all that is needed to work co-operatively. A very important part is concerned with one’s ways of being. It is these ways of being that underpin all the methods and processes and give them integrity. ‘Being’ co-operative is learnt through experience and interaction between persons. This is distinct from reading books, discussing or understanding the concepts. It is learnt through modelling and deep being-to-being relationships.

A facilitator Code of Ethics can serve as a framework and set of boundaries for co-operative work. A code can support ethical co-operation, but cannot compel people to be ethical or co-operative. Co-operation must be chosen.

I now consider that the safest way to work co-operatively in an organisational environment is by continually demonstrating and seeking to model, generate and support whole personhood, love and compassion, as best I/we can. Introducing co-operative methods, processes and decision-making is best accomplished by ethical facilitators working in and with principled people centred co-operative organisations. In organisations, however, without strong commitment to creating a life-enhancing environment for the people in them, co-operative processes are likely to remain vulnerable to circumstances.

The research journey

The following conceptual map (Fig. 27) illustrates the research journey and key findings. (See also Fig. 1, p. 8).
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Co-operative processes can be easily co-opted and misused. Conceptual maps and experiential practice will not guarantee that the ways of being will get transmitted. Each of our realities differs, the intention may not be strong or benign and the emotional competence and other intelligences may not be present. The transmission of the essence may not take place.
The Zen story reproduced in the preface to my first book, 'The Zen of Groups' (1992), illustrates this beautifully.

**What Are You Doing?**

**What Are You Saying?**

The Zen master Mu-nan had only one successor. His name was Shoju. After Shoju had completed the study of Zen, Mu-nan called him into his room.

'I am getting old,' Mu-nan said, 'and you are the only one who will carry on my teaching. As my successor, I am giving you a valuable book. It has been passed down from master to master for seven generations. I have also added many points according to my understanding.' 'If the book is such an important thing, you had better keep it,' Shoju replied. 'I received your Zen without writing and am satisfied with it as it is.'

'I know that,' said Mu-nan. 'Even so, this work has been carried from master to master for seven generations, so you may keep it as a symbol of receiving the teaching. Here it is.'

The two happened to be talking in front of a fire. The instant Shoju felt the book in his hands he threw it into the flames. He had no desire for possessions. Mu-nan, who had never been angry before, yelled, 'What are you doing?' Shoju shouted back, 'What are you saying?'
4.3 Questions for further research

There is a need for more research in the area of co-operative work and a growing of this body of knowledge in a similar way that management theory has been developed over the last 50 years. Some of the forms this research could take are:

1) A research project that focuses on co-operative decision-making in large co-operative organisations and compares this with decision-making in corporations.

2) The largest business entity in New Zealand is now a dairy co-operative, the Fonterra Group Ltd. It would be interesting to research the effectiveness of facilitated co-operative processes in this organisation, including all levels of the organisation and involving the producer shareholders.

3) A further co-operative inquiry exploring embodied whole personhood, how this occurs in action and its effect on a variety of co-operative processes. This inquiry could start at the point that ours ended.

4) What are the implications of embodied whole personhood for academic learning and research? If effective learning is a whole body experience, this has major implications for all learning institutions and needs to be further researched. Work on the role of the emotions in learning would be one aspect to be explored.

5) Internet dialogue is in a phase of rapid growth, and research on it would be very useful. Online facilitation is somewhat different from face-to-face facilitation. Research in this area is in its early stages, and more is needed.

6) Does a code of ethics make a difference in facilitation? Further research in the area of facilitator ethics could follow the development of a Code of Ethics and monitor its worldwide implementation.
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CODE OF ETHICS FOR MEDIATORS

PREAMBLE

The Arbitrators' and Mediators' Institute of New Zealand Inc has prescribed the following Code of Ethics for Mediators to be effective from the 1st day of August 1996.

This Code of Ethics provides a set of standards to serve as a guide for the conduct of mediators, to inform mediating parties, and to promote public confidence in mediation as a process for resolving disputes.

Mediators are often professionals who have obligations under the Code of Ethics of other professional bodies. All members of the Institute will be bound by the ethical requirements of this Code.
RULE ONE

A MEDIATOR SHOULD UPHOLD THE INTEGRITY AND FAIRNESS OF THE MEDIATION PROCESS

Commentary:
A mediator must observe high standards of conduct so that the integrity and fairness of the process will be preserved. A mediator should only accept appointment if the mediator believes there is time to conduct the mediation promptly.

RULE TWO

A MEDIATOR SHOULD RECOGNISE THAT MEDIATION IS BASED ON THE PRINCIPLE OF “SELF DETERMINATION BY THE PARTIES”

Commentary:
Self determination is the fundamental principle of mediation. It requires that the mediation process rely upon the ability of the parties to reach a voluntary, uncoerced agreement. Any party may withdraw from mediation at any time.

RULE THREE

A MEDIATOR SHOULD DISCLOSE ANY INTEREST OR RELATIONSHIP LIKELY TO AFFECT IMPARTIALITY OR WHICH MIGHT CREATE AN APPEARANCE OF PARTIALITY OR BIAS

Commentary:
The concept of mediator impartiality is central to the mediation process. A mediator should mediate only those matters in which the mediator can remain impartial and even-handed. If at any time the mediator is unable to conduct the process in an impartial manner, the mediator is obligated to withdraw. A person who is, in fact, biased or whose circumstances may give the impression of bias or impartiality should not accept appointment as mediator. Persons who are requested to served as mediators should therefore, before accepting, disclose:
1. any direct or indirect financial or personal interest in the outcome of the mediation;
2. any existing or past financial, business, professional, family or social relationships
which are likely to affect impartiality or which might reasonably create an appearance
of impartiality or bias.

The duty to disclose is a continuing duty.

RULE FOUR

A MEDIATOR SHOULD CONDUCT THE MEDIATION FAIRLY,
Diligently AND EXPEDITIOUSLY AND IN A MANNER CONSISTENT
WITH THE PRINCIPLE OF SELF DETERMINATION BY THE PARTIES

Commentary:
A mediator should work to ensure a quality process and to encourage mutual respect among the
parties. A quality process requires a commitment by the mediator to diligence and procedural
fairness. There should be adequate opportunity for each party in the mediation to participate in
the discussions. The parties decide when and under what conditions they will reach an
agreement or terminate the mediation.

RULE FIVE

A MEDIATOR SHALL MEDIATE ONLY WHEN THE MEDIATOR HAS THE
NECESSARY QUALIFICATIONS TO SATISFY THE REASONABLE
EXPECTATIONS OF THE PARTIES.

Commentary:
Any person may be selected as a mediator, provided that the parties are satisfied with the
mediator’s qualifications. Training and experience in mediation, however, are usually
necessary for effective mediation. Persons who offer themselves as available to serve as
mediator (or are assigned to the parties under any form of mandated mediation) give the parties
and the public the expectation that they have the competence to mediate effectively.
It is the responsibility of mediators to engage in continuing education to ensure that their mediation skills are both current and effective.

RULE SIX

A MEDIATOR SHOULD BE FAITHFUL TO THE EXPECTATION OF TRUST AND CONFIDENTIALITY INHERENT IN THAT POSITION

Commentary:
The parties' expectations of confidentiality depend on the circumstances of the mediation and any agreements they may make. A mediator should not disclose any matter that a party expects to be kept as confidential unless given permission by all parties or unless required by law or other public policy.

A mediator is in a relationship of trust to the parties and should not at any time use confidential information acquired during the mediation process to gain personal advantage or advantage for others or to affect adversely the interest of another.

RULE SEVEN

ADVERTISING OR PROMOTION BY A MEDIATOR MUST BE TRUTHFUL AND APPROPRIATE FOR THE PROFESSION

Commentary:
Professional standards in relation to advertising and promotion requires that the information not:
1. be inaccurate or likely to mislead;
2. be likely to diminish public confidence in the process of mediation;
3. make comparisons with other mediators;
4. indicate or imply any willingness to accept an appointment except in accordance with this Code.
No member should seek to imply that membership of the Institute (other than specific listing in a Panel of the Institute) indicates that the member is qualified as a mediator or recognised by the Institute as such.

RULE EIGHT

A MEDIATOR SHOULD FULLY DISCLOSE AND EXPLAIN THE BASIS OF FEES AND CHARGES BEFORE ACCEPTING APPOINTMENT

Commentary:

The parties should be provided with sufficient information about fees at the outset of a mediation to determine if they wish to retain the services of a mediator. If a mediator charges fees, the fees should be reasonable considering among other things the mediation service, the type and complexity of the matter, the expertise of the mediator and the time required. The best practice in reaching an understanding about fees is to record that arrangement as part of the written mediation agreement.

RULE NINE

A MEDIATOR FOUND TO BE IN BREACH OF THIS CODE SHALL BE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE INSTITUTE'S BY-LAWS DEALING WITH - "PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT AND DISCIPLINARY MATTERS"

Commentary:

A breach of this Code of Ethics may result in the breach being considered by the Institute's Investigation & Ethics Sub-Committee.
1 Introduction

The Code of Ethics of the New Zealand Association of Psychologists serves as a number of purposes. It provides a statement of what clients and the general public may expect from the Association and its members. It helps define professional autonomy in relation to employing institutions. It indicates the standards on which the commitment to maintain and improve services is based. It reinforces the cohesion of the Association and offers members a resource for understanding the nature of responsible practice. It also establishes procedures which allow complaints to be considered carefully and which give due protection to the rights and interests of members.

The Association affirms that in formulating and accepting this code it is applying the ethics of a wider community to the therapist-client relationship. It acknowledges that it incorporates a social as well as an individual ethic, because of the influence of institutional policies and practices and broader social factors on the welfare of clients.

The Association is committed to high professional standards. It expects its members to act responsibly and with integrity and to develop and maintain appropriate levels of competence (e.g. Constitution 3, Bylaw I).

The ethics of psychology are rooted in the principles of respect for persons and social justice. The latter implies the provision of a service characterized by self-giving, primarily for the sake of the other. This is a normal expectation of professional performance and accords priority to the interests and well-being of the client in the therapeutic relationship. The second recognizes that equal consideration and need are fundamental to the responsible provision of care, and that the Association and its members have obligations to seek fairness and social equity in the community at large. Such a stance springs from the therapist's commitment to the therapeutic relationship and the recognition that the mental health of the individual is intimately related to the social context in which the client exists.

The Code of Ethics defines the nature of the therapist's responsibilities in a number of different relationships. In addition it points to an order of priority in the general exercise of these responsibilities.

The first responsibility of the therapist is to his or her clients. Due regard should also be paid to the interests and self-respect of the therapist in this relationship.

Next comes responsibility to the wider community, to colleagues, the profession, and the therapist's responsibility to his or her employing institution.

The Association considers this ordering of responsibilities important for determining professional priorities and for guiding preference in the settling of disputes involving conflicting interests.

2 Responsibility to Clients

1. Therapists should respect the client's right to privacy and reserve the confidentiality of information obtained in the course of professional service. The keeping of confidences is a primary obligation in therapy, research and teaching. Confidential information should be shared only with the informed consent of the client, unless there is a clear danger to his or her life, to others, or to the public at large. Therapists should inform clients of the limits of confidentiality.

2. Therapists should deal truthfully with their clients, and provide adequate information about the nature of the therapeutic relationship and their ways of working.

3. Therapists should uphold the principle of free and informed consent for clients in therapy and in therapeutic and non-therapeutic research.

4. Therapists should foster maximum self-determination in clients. When clients are adjudged incompetent or are unable to exercise self-determination, their best interests, rights and well being should be protected by therapists in the course of their work.

5. Therapists should accord priority to the therapeutic aspects of their relationship with clients, and should participate in roles emphasizing social control, only where there is clear professional justification for doing so.

6. Therapists should not abuse their position by taking advantage of clients for purposes of personal, institutional, political, financial or sexual gain.

7. During the course of the therapeutic relationship the client should be free from the possibility of sexual exploitation or sexual harassment. Sexual intercourse between a therapist and a client is incompatible with the clinical aims and professional practices of the Association.

8. Therapists should recognize the dignity of the person and avoid discrimination against clients on the basis of their race, colour, sex, sexual orientation, social class, age, or religious or political beliefs.

9. Therapists should acknowledge the limits of their competence and refer clients to others when this proves necessary or desirable.

10. Therapists should terminate their service to clients in a suitably professional manner when either decide it is no longer required in the client's best interests.

11. When setting fees the therapist should ensure that they are fair, reasonable, commensurate with the service provided and give due regard to the client's ability to pay.

12. The therapist should acknowledge that there are limits to the service he or she can properly provide, and that respect for his or her own health in the therapeutic relationship and appropriate self-regard should be upheld.

III Responsibility to the Wider Community

1. Therapists should encourage public participation in the shaping of social policies and institutions.

2. Therapists should act to prevent and eliminate discrimination in the wider community against individuals and groups on the basis of race, colour, sex, sexual orientation, social class, age or religious or political belief.
Therapists should advocate policies and legislation that promote social justice, improved social conditions and a fairer sharing of the community's resources.

Therapists should seek to increase the range of choices and opportunities for all members of the community, with special regard for the disadvantaged.

Therapists should respect the law and act to change unjust laws that harm their clients and other members of the community.

Responsibility to Colleagues and the Profession

Therapists should treat colleagues with respect, courtesy, fairness and good faith.

Therapists should promote co-operation with colleagues to further professional interests and concerns.

Therapists should respect professional confidences about the clients of colleagues.

Therapists should not solicit the clients of other colleagues and should avoid assuming professional responsibility for them without appropriate communication with the therapists or agency concerned.

Therapists should seek mediation or arbitration when important conflicts with colleagues require to be resolved in the interests of clients or of their professional integrity.

Therapists should take action through appropriate channels against unethical conduct by other members of the profession, especially where it is harmful to clients.

Therapists should adhere to professional rather than commercial standards in making known the availability of their services.

Therapists should uphold and foster the values, integrity, knowledge and ethics of the profession.

V Responsibilities to Employing Institutions

1. Therapists should adhere to their commitments made to employing institutions.

2. Therapists should seek to maintain and improve the policies and quality of service in the organizations or agencies in which they work.

3. Therapists should shape the expectations of their employers to the roles of the therapist in fulfilling the ethics of the Association.

4. Therapists should adhere to and uphold high professional standards at all times and should avoid compromising them for reasons of institutional experience.

5. Therapists should act to prevent discrimination in the employment policies of their agencies and in access to the organization services where it is based on colour, race, sex, sexual orientation, social class, age or religion or political belief.

6. Therapists should use the resources of their employing organization responsibly and with due regard for their intended purpose.
Survey for Facilitators

This survey is about the use of co-operative processes in organizations. The purpose is to check what kinds of issues facilitator's experience at the interface between facilitated co-operative group processes and the host organization and how facilitators address these issues.

The survey questionnaire will take about 10 minutes of your time to complete. It is entirely voluntary. If you choose to complete the survey please return it to the box labelled Facilitators Survey before the end of the Conference. Your assistance is very much appreciated.

The survey is being carried out as part of her PhD research by Ms Dale Hunter a participant at this Conference. She is happy to answer any questions you may have about the project. You may also wish to contact Dale's Ph.D. supervisor Dr. Stuart Hill, Professor of Social Ecology, Hawkesbury University email <s.hill@uws.edu.au> tel +61-2-4570 1333.

Signed agreement.

I .................................. have read this information above and any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this activity, realising that I may withdraw at any time. I agree that research data gathered for the study may be published, provided my name is not used.

Please note: The University requires that all participants are informed that if they have any complaint concerning the manner in which this research project is conducted may be given to the researcher or if an independent is preferred, to the Executive Officer, Human Research Ethics Committee and Consultancy Unit, University of Western Sydney, Hawkesbury 2753, telephone +61-2- 45701688, fax +61-2- 45701686 or email s.falleiro@uws.edu.au.

.........................................................................................................................
Participant Date
.........................................................................................................................
Researcher Date

The survey is on the next page. PTO
Survey Questions

1. I work as a
   - self employed facilitator
   - member of a co-operative organization
   - an employee of an organization
   Other .................................................................

2. I work in the
   - business sector
   - community sector
   - education sector
   - health sector
   - government sector
   Other .................................................................

3. Facilitation is my primary work Yes / No

4. Experience as a facilitator ............ Years

5. Gender M / F

6. State / country I am based in .................................................................

7. States / countries I work in .................................................................

8. The facilitation school or method(s) of facilitation I identify with most are:
   ........................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................
   ........................................................................................................

9. I facilitate using consensus decision making processes
   Always / Mostly / Sometimes / Never

10. While working as a facilitator you may have experienced the following situations.
    (Please circle answers)

    a. You are hired to facilitate a work or community group without the group's agreement.
       I consider this a problem Yes / No / Not sure
       I consider this an ethical issue Yes / No / Not sure
       I have experienced this Yes / No
b. You are unable to negotiate sufficient time to complete the group process satisfactorily.

I consider this a problem  Yes / No / Not sure
I consider this an ethical issue  Yes / No / Not sure
I have experienced this  Yes / No

c. You are asked to report on the group's progress by another member of the organization (e.g., a more senior person or the person who hired you).

I consider this a problem  Yes / No / Not sure
I consider this an ethical issue  Yes / No / Not sure
I have experienced this  Yes / No

d. You are asked to report on individual group members' behavior in the group by another person not in the group.

I consider this a problem  Yes / No / Not sure
I consider this an ethical issue  Yes / No / Not sure
I have experienced this  Yes / No

e. Consensus decisions of the co-operative group are revoked by others in the organization outside the group.

I consider this a problem  Yes / No / Not sure
I consider this an ethical issue  Yes / No / Not sure
I have experienced this  Yes / No

f. Consensus decisions of the co-operative group are revoked by some group members without the agreement of the whole group.

I consider this a problem  Yes / No / Not sure
I consider this an ethical issue  Yes / No / Not sure
I have experienced this  Yes / No

g. The co-operative group is stopped from completing its work by others in the organization.

I consider this a problem  Yes / No / Not sure
I consider this an ethical issue  Yes / No / Not sure
I have experienced this  Yes / No
Your role as facilitator is terminated without the group's agreement.

I consider this a problem Yes / No / Not sure
I consider this an ethical issue Yes / No / Not sure
I have experienced this Yes / No

What strategies or practices do you use to avoid the above problems:

Verbal agreements Always / Sometimes / Never
Written contract Always / Sometimes / Never
Code of ethics Always / Sometimes / Never

Other

What central values guide your practice?

Can you identify any other questions I should have asked in this survey?

I would like to receive the results of this survey. Yes / No

If yes, please provide name and email address.

Name

Contact email

Mail address (if no email)
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Abstract

A draft "Statement of Values & Code of Ethics" was developed over the past year by the members of the International Association of Facilitators' Ethics and Values Think Tank. This -- the second draft produced by EVTT -- should serve as a basis for wider discussion resulting in revision and eventual adoption by the Association. The complete second draft is presented below, followed by the background and process of its development, and the criteria that were developed to evaluate it. A compilation of the comments pertaining to the second draft is available at http://www.albany.edu/cpr/gf/draft-2-comments.htm. Anyone wishing to comment on the draft is encouraged to attend the conference sessions noted above, join the online discussion of the Ethics and Values Think Tank at http://groups.yahoo.com/group/EVTT, or send email to sschuman@albany.edu.
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Statement of Values & Code of Ethics

Preamble

As members of the International Association of Facilitators (IAF), we recognise the importance of defining and making known the ethical principles and values that guide our actions. We believe our role is one of trust and that our profession gives us a unique opportunity to make a positive contribution to individuals and society.

Facilitators are called upon to fill an objective role in helping groups become more effective. We act as process guides to create a balance between participation and results. We understand our responsibilities have the potential to be in conflict: responsibilities to the client; to group participants; to ourselves; to society and to our profession.

Acknowledging the complexity of our roles, including the full spectrum of personal, professional, and cultural diversity in our membership and in the field of facilitation, this Code of Ethics reflects the values to which we are committed and embodies the ethical responsibilities of our profession. The principles of this Code are expressed in broad statements to guide ethical practice. These statements provide a framework and are not intended to dictate conduct for particular situations.

Statement of Values

As facilitators we believe in the inherent value of the individual and the collective wisdom of the group. We strive to help the group make the best use of the
contributions of each of its members. We set aside our personal opinions, maintain neutrality, and support the group's right to make its own choices. We believe that collaborative and co-operative interaction builds consensus and produces meaningful outcomes.

Code of Ethics

1. We are in service to the client and participants, using our competence to add value to their work through facilitation.

Our clients include those who engage us to support them in achieving the results they seek and the group participants who benefit from the processes that we design. We work closely with our clients to understand their expectations so that we provide the appropriate service, and that the group produces the desired outcomes. It is our responsibility to ensure that we are competent to handle the intervention.

2. We avoid conflict of interest.

Prior to reaching an agreement with the client, we discuss openly and honestly any possible conflict of interest, personal bias, prior knowledge of the organisation or any other matter which may be perceived as preventing us from maintaining our neutrality. We do this so that, together, we may make an informed decision about proceeding and to prevent misunderstanding that could detract from the success or credibility of the group, the client or ourselves. We refrain from using our position to secure unfair or inappropriate privilege, gain or benefit.

3. We respect the needs and culture of the group, designing interventions to take them from where they are to where they want to be.

Groups come together for a variety of reasons. How the group will work together is a conscious decision by the group and requires agreement and commitment by each individual group member. We assist the group to establish a clear, workable definition of the processes that will be effective in the culture within which they function. We design thinking frameworks that provide the group the opportunity to achieve sustainable results. If the group decides it needs to go in a different direction, our role is to help the group move forward, balancing the intent of the original goals with the needs of the participants.

4. We create an environment of respect and safety where all participants can speak freely.

We strive to engender a safe environment, within which individual boundaries are honoured, where all participants trust that they are able to express their views in a non-judgmental climate. We encourage generosity of spirit in dialogue, supporting full and frank discussion.

We ensure all relevant stakeholders have an opportunity to articulate their ideas, and that individuals or groups are not excluded or marginalised. We support individual and group reflection by creating opportunities for participants to examine and share their thoughts and feelings on what has happened, providing time for the group to reflect.

5. We use our skills, knowledge, tools and wisdom to elicit and honour the perspectives of all.

Facilitators use a variety of methods to enable the group to access the natural gifts, talents and life experiences of each member. We work in ways that honour the
wholeness and self-expression of others, designing sessions that respect different styles of interaction. We understand that any action we take is an intervention that may affect the process.

6. **We remain content neutral, bringing objectivity to the process.**

Generally, facilitators remain content neutral during a facilitated session. We practice stewardship of the process, while participants bring content knowledge and their expertise to the discourse. When our content knowledge could add clarity to the discussion, or prevent damage to the effectiveness of the process, or unblock the group’s progress, we share this knowledge in a responsible and objective manner, being clear with the group about what we are doing.

7. **We maintain confidentiality of information.**

Facilitators observe confidentiality of both client and group information. Therefore, we do not share information about a client within or outside of the client’s organisation, nor do we report on group content, or the individual opinions or behaviour of members of the group without consent.

8. **We are responsible for continuous improvement of our facilitation skills and knowledge.**

As facilitators, we continuously learn and grow. We seek opportunities to improve our knowledge and facilitation skills to better assist groups in their work. We remain current in the field of facilitation through our practical group experiences and ongoing personal development.

**Background: Why and How**

The International Association of Facilitators (IAF) has moved forward in adopting a set of competencies and a certification program for the same. An important complement to competencies is a coherent set of values and ethical standards that should guide the application of those competencies. A "statement of values" or "code of ethics" will further strengthen the credibility of group facilitation as a profession, enhance the professional identity of group facilitators, avoid misconceptions of group facilitation by existing and potential customers, and provide guidance in practical situations.

The formation of Ethics and Values Think Tank (EVTT) was an outgrowth of the IAF 2000 Conference session "Critical incidents: How do our values and principles guide us?" Formally chartered as a "Think Tank" by the IAF Board of Directors, the purpose of EVTT is to create a "code of ethics," "statement of values" or similar document that can be formally adopted by IAF and made available for adoption by individual members. Members may then indicate to existing and potential customers that they have agreed to adhere to the code and may provide the customer with a copy of it.

The EVTT was organized as a virtual group using electronic communications technology, specifically email and web-based technologies. In addition to people who expressed interest at the IAF 2000 Conference the invitation to participate was distributed via the IAF membership list ([IAF-L@listserv.albany.edu](mailto:IAF-L@listserv.albany.edu)) and the Electronic Discussion on Group Facilitation ([grp-fac@listserv.albany.edu](mailto:grp-fac@listserv.albany.edu)). EVTT members currently number 53. The group’s discussion archives and resource files are available to anyone who subscribes at [http://groups.yahoo.com/group/EVTT](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/EVTT).
The initial plan proposed for the group is shown below. Modifications to this plan may be made at the IAF 2001 Conference session, "Ethics and Values Think Tank: What are our Next Steps?"

1. Develop a two-year plan for creating and implementing a code.
2. Gather and examine similar documents from other professional organizations.
3. Develop among Think Tank members a draft document. Consult with professional ethicists and other professional societies as needed.
4. Draft a document for review by the Association Coordinating Team (Board of Directors).
5. Revise and make available a draft to all members.
6. Conduct a Think Tank session at IAF Conference 2001.
7. Revise and recirculate a draft to ACT and make available to all members.
8. Develop training materials.
9. At IAF 2002 present code to ACT (and perhaps to general membership) for formal adoption.
10. Test our training materials at Think Tank session at IAF 2002.
11. Finalize training materials and make available to IAF members.

As indicated in step 2 above, background materials -- mostly in the form of codes of ethics from other professional associations -- were made available on the EVTT web site. In addition, a compilation of the codes of ethics from various professions -- A Professional Ethics Compendium -- was completed and made available at http://www.albany.edu/cpr/gf/compendium.htm.

Tony Nash proposed a procedure for moving forward and volunteered to act as facilitator. After some discussion this was agreed. The first task was to establish a set of criteria by which the statement of values or code of ethics could be achieved.

**Criteria**

Following are the criteria adopted by EVTT.

- Must be clear, concise and credible - easily understood by facilitators, clients and others - expressed as succinct concepts and supported by additional information that enhances understanding

- Must include a preamble which incorporates:

  a) a clear definition of what "ethics" means;
  b) what the organization aspires to;
  c) why a code is essential for the organization; and
  d) the voluntary nature of adherence by members.
- Must state ethics in a positive manner, i.e. what we "will do" rather than what we "should not" do.

- Must provide guidance to facilitators in designing their business practices

- Must provide guidance to facilitators as they design process

- Must provide guidance in the case of ethical dilemmas

- Must be applicable across national borders, economic and cultural boundaries

- Must be applicable to facilitators working in the widest possible variety of circumstances and sub-disciplines

**Development of the Draft**

Facilitated by Tony Nash, EVTT members proposed and discussed statements for inclusion in the statement of values and code of ethics. A Mini-Task Force was convened to meet face-to-face to codify these suggestions. The first draft was posted to EVTT for comment. These comments formed the basis for a second meeting of the Mini-Task Force which resulted in a second draft, which is presented in this document. Comments were received on the second draft, although changes were postponed until the EVTT meets at IAF 2001 Conference. These comments are included in this report. Following is Tony's description of the methodical process used by the Mini-Task Force to create the second draft.

Members of the mini-task force that put together Draft #2 were: Grant Feltmate, Canada; Katy Jordan, US; Gordon Laing, Canada; Deborah Starzynski, Canada; Tony Nash, Canada.

Deborah Starzynski drove 250 miles from Toronto to Ottawa (once again in the snow!) to meet with Gord Laing and Tony Nash. Katy Jordan and Grant Feltmate were invited to provide their input prior to the meeting (which they did), which took place Thursday, March 15. Deb/Gord/Tony met from 8:30 am until 4:30 pm, taking a one-hour lunch break. We were all seeing double by the time the meeting ended. I had a giant headache.

The group followed the same format as they did with Draft #1. That is, prior to the meeting every single response to Draft #1 was printed off, numbered, and assembled in three binders. Gord went through Draft #1 and assigned the corresponding page number reference to either the preamble, statement of values or the ethical statements.

Because of the positive reaction to Dave Wilkinson's suggested changes (Feb 26), we decided to start with that, and included Rose Bednarz's comments (Feb 28) together with Marilyn Stecyk's (Mar 2).

With this as our base we followed Gord's numbering protocol to ensure that everyone's input was considered. Of course, we made some judgement calls and could not use everything.

The day we met was the day that Sandy and other EVTT members worked on wording for a draft statement pertaining to consensus. We liked the statement produced by Sandy with input from Dale, Wayne, Katy and Joan. As Sandy had observed earlier, we felt it was slightly "wordy" so we made
some modifications which we felt accommodated all sides of the "consensus" debate, without losing the intent. You'll have to be the judges.

Once we had put together Draft #2 we asked for feedback from both Grant and Katy. They suggested wording changes. We quickly realized amongst ourselves that even we could not agree on all the wording. Some of us felt (as Rose suggested on February 27) that the ethical statements and supporting text could be more direct and less wordy. However, we reached consensus in that we all agreed with Draft #2 as best representing what the majority of the EVTT has been saying for the past few months.

I'd like to thank each and every member of the mini-task force, Grant Feltmate, Katy Jordan, Gordon Laing and Deborah Starzynski, for their time, contribution, diligence and effort. Having completed what they volunteered to do, the mini-task force is now disbanded.

A compilation of the comments pertaining to the second draft is available at http://www.albany.edu/cpr/gt/draft-2-comments.htm. Anyone wishing to comment on the draft is encouraged to attend the conference sessions noted above, join the online discussion of the Ethics and Values Think Tank at http://groups.yahoo.com/group/EVTT, or send email to sschuman@albany.edu.
From: Zenergy <Zenergy@xtra.co.nz>
Date: Thu Aug 3, 2000 11:43 am
Subject: Re: [FacN]Co-operative Inquiry

Dale Hunter wrote:

I am writing to invite members of the Auckland Facilitators Network to join me in a co-operative inquiry into sustainable co-operative processes in organisations.

I am researching this area for my PhD research and am particularly interested in how the facilitator can manage in an ethical way the interface between consensus based cooperative processes (whether ongoing teams, project groups or one off processes) and the host organisations with its often hierarchical structure and autocratic decision making.

This is an area I have always found problematic in my work as a facilitator which is why I am interested in researching it. It seems to be an area where two paradigms meet and it can get quite tricky.

I envisage the co-operative inquiry involving:

An orientation meeting 7:30pm - 9:30pm 30 August to meet one another, describe the method and agree on a working protocol (culture).

4 co-operative inquiry days:

Saturday 2 September 9:00am - 4:00pm Begin
Saturday 30 September 9:30am - 2:30pm
Saturday 28 October 9:30am - 2:30pm
Saturday 1 December 9:00 - 4:00pm Complete

On the first inquiry day we would align on a strategic question which we would then take back into our work/life and observe and notice - take notes, draw, write poems and bring our observations back to the second inquiry day when we will share our observations and design a further question. This would be repeated on the third day and on the fourth we would share our final observations and agree on a way of documenting the project.

What you would get out of it would be:

* An experience of a co-operative inquiry (as pioneered by John Heron and Peter Reason)
* An opportunity to learn the method
* Learning and insights around sustainable co-operative processes in organisations
* An opportunity to work together with other experienced facilitators.

I want a group of 12 facilitators for the inquiry. We already have three so that is 9 more. There would be no cost involved other than a share of the room cost if we need to hire a room. I will try to get one free.

If you are interested but have difficulty with some of the dates please talk to me as there is some flexibility. Phone me on 021 639870 or 6387328 or email.

Warm regards Dale,
http://www.zenergyglobal.com
Participants in the Co-operative Inquiry

Mark Allen
Manager Leisure Services, Waitakere City Council
20 years in community development (including local government)
Facilitator
Volunteer fireman
Has built his own mud brick house in the bush and lives there with his wife and 2 children

Hamish Brown
Facilitator, mediator, coach
Facilitation and Co-counselling Trainer
Director, Zenergy Ltd.
Has worked for five years as a part of a co-operative organisation
BA (Philosophy),
Diploma in Facilitation (Zenergy)
Postgraduate Diploma in Dispute Resolution
Masters Degree in Business Studies (Dispute Resolution) currently completing
5 years training in psychodrama

Susan Byrne
Ph.D. in chemical engineering
BSc (Hons) in operations research
Senior lecturer in operations management (for BSc, BE, Bcom, Mcom, and post experience business diplomas and degrees) University of Auckland
Facilitator
Research interest in systemic inquiry and learning, organisational learning, services management
Participant in several co-operative inquiries (2 with John Heron)
Regular contributor to ANZSys Conferences
Peer partnership member (several groups)
Initiator of student directed learning
Patchwork quilting, embroidery, cook, cancer survivor

Lis Gleed
Coach and facilitator
Zenergy trainer in coaching and facilitation
Diploma of Facilitation (Zenergy)
Cert. Training & HR Development
Specialises in the area of business process improvement
Peer development group member
Horse owner and rider
Hazel Hodgkin

BA (Hons), Diploma of Business Administration - Human Resources
Management coach and facilitator
Working particularly with new team leaders and managers
in health and social service organisations
Co-counsellor and psychodramatist

Dave Macdonald

BE, MBA
Diploma of Facilitation (Zenergy)
Engineering background
20 years management experience
Regional Manager Transfund (crown entity responsible for funding transport in New Zealand)
Facilitator
Gentleman and golfer

Sarah McGhee

Facilitator, trainer, educator, artist and performer
Diploma of Facilitation (Zenergy)
Youthline Action Education
Playback Theatre
Zenergy team member and facilitation trainer
Tobacco, Alcohol and other Drugs Project, (Peer Education) Goodfellow Unit, University of Auckland
Man Alive (women’s perspective on violence presenter).
Soul worker

Tara Pradhan

MA (First Class Honours) in English / Education
Diploma of Facilitation (Zenergy)
Manager, Events Facilitation, Auckland City Council (7 years)
Facilitator, coach, mentor
Food and fun lover
Member of Amnesty International
Newly married

Raewyn Toglea-Cobb

Bachelor Social Practice (Community Development) (Unitech)
Diploma in Community and Social Work (Unitech)
Diploma of Facilitation (Zenergy)
Certificate in Clinical Supervision (CIT)
Business owner, social worker and artist
Facilitator, coach
Coach for Pacific Island Women’s Centre
Life long learner
Dragon boat racer

Lane West-Newman

Ph.D. on civil disobedience
Academic, social theorist
Qualified social worker
Staff union branch president – union boss!
Professional talker
Senior lecturer University of Auckland teaching law and identity and inequality
Also teachers women / deviance

Dale Hunter  (initiator)

BA, Dip Mus (Exec), Dip Mgt., LRSM
AMINZ (Arbitrators and Mediators Association NZ)
Diploma of Facilitation (Zenergy Hon)
Facilitator, coach, mediator
Director, Zenergy Ltd.
Regional Co-ordinator IAF (International Association of Facilitators) for Australia and New Zealand
Heart Politics Trustee
Author and student

Tanya Mogg  (withdrew)

MA
Diploma of Facilitation (Zenergy)
Facilitator, coach
Self employed consultant in business sector
Life line counsellor

Jack

Dog

Likes fetching ball, beach and walking.
CO-OPERATIVE INQUIRY

Thinking About the Relationship Between Time and Sustainable Co-Op Processes in ..... 

i. Three scenarios which are research sites. 
ii. Day to day experiences and reflections. 

Three scenarios 

The Vice Chancellorial Encounter 
This was before the inquiry began but has a place in it because it was the reason I chose to begin on this theme. 

AUS has a regularly scheduled meeting with VC. 
The regular scheduling is to sustain an ongoing communicative relationship between xxxxx (who neither respects nor trusts unions but who is vain about his management skills and therefore needs to believe his staff are happy, content, and well-managed) and AUS. Both sides therefore get some comfort/satisfaction from the ongoing arrangement and the fact that meetings are set up for the whole year (even though they often have to be changed because of xxxi's other commitments). 
Time is set aside (saved; insured) for each other. 

The meeting in question was totally negative, unproductive (except of some very unfavourable ideas by each side about the other) and deeply uncomfortable. It made me not want to have any more of them even though I know that is not an option for me as long as I am President and represent the members' interests. It is (overall) in their interests for these meetings to happen. 

xxxxl was in a vile temper because he had been engaged in irritating and unhelpful meetings with cabinet ministers in the hope of persuading them to improve university funding so that he could produce and expansive rather than a retrenching budget for next year. 

It was the wrong time to have this meeting. Only xxxx knew this. But he could not have postponed it without admitting to himself that he was in the wrong frame of mind to talk to the union. And he would have had to fabricate a reason if he was to avoid admitting to a weakness (his perception) in his professional persona. [I would regard self-knowledge of one's limitations as a strength rather than a weakness.] 

So...... 
This was about time and timing. The time of the meeting got fixed in concrete because there was no recognized reason for not having it. It was a finite
resource that had to be used at that moment – like a toasted cheese sandwich eaten when hot.

The Union Consultation Big Day Out

Thirty five people who were supposed to represent stored knowledge and wisdom of the organisation, or who happened to be free to travel to Wellington on the relevant day were managed through a process of consultation.

The interesting thing about this day was the good use of time. Psychologist national president used small group and reporting back techniques. Time was tightly managed but the kind of running out of time stress that you often find at conferences wasn’t there. And although people did tire toward the end of the long day there wasn’t that desperate mental and physical exhaustion that often ends such exercises.

I’m clear that there was as sense of time expanding to allow what needed to be done to happen but I’m not really clear how that sense was achieved. I think part of it was the movement between large and small groups – a sense of getting somewhere - was part of it. Because the different stages were framed as steps in a process which had a clearly established culmination (a set of proposals/recommendations/next steps) there was a feeling of linear progression rather than going in circles. So setting goals and processes in advance worked.

This seems to have contributed to people being able to work co-operatively together. There was a lot of contribution by almost everyone and much less arguing at cross purposes than often happens at these things. In particular I thought I saw less of the pushing of individual barrows and airing of personal bees in bonnets.

Time was used as a resource in this day. It didn’t feel like a scarce resource and therefore people were less stressed than usual. And so they behaved better and more productively. They worked together and produced a (more or less) shared outcome.
It didn’t feel like a waste of time.

The Great Barrier Journey into Being Maori

This had to be a good experience because it was bought at the expense of taking time away from Dale (the co-operative inquiry) and this was time I had already offered to her as a gift. So I felt badly about taking that gift back.
Dale managed this really well by suggesting that I take the weekend as part of my investigation into time. And that was a good idea.

I had a wonderful, emotionally satisfying weekend. We did a lot of things. I don’t think I was alone at all except when in the loo and bathroom. I was involved in a shared project that was about love (awhina) and supporting other people. A
group in the most communal sense of the word. A really interesting mixture of strong and quite vulnerable individuals combining their strengths and weaknesses in shared projects that were about achieving spiritual/human purposes. The care of people being done under spiritual guidance and support. But also being done very matter-of-factly with humour, plain speaking,

I thought time would be a very noticeable thing over this weekend because so much was to be done in a day and a half. But I didn’t actually notice time much at all.
Car, plane, minivan, church service, minivan, graveyard and unveilings, minivan, house blessing, crayfish lunch feast, minivan (long) Drama camp, setting in units and talking, communal dinner, talking, sleep (generator switched off at 10.00pm) talking, breakfast, minivan (long), church service, minivan, feast/lunch, plane, car.

Because we were the group with the minister nothing could really start without us and we seemed to be, astonishingly to me at least, at the right place at the appropriate moment for everything. Nothing felt hurried or stressed. This may be because I wasn’t (for a change) personally responsible for anything but I don’t think so. What I think was happening is that the purposes of the visit were central and they had been planned so that time could then not be a central issue. People knew what the project and plan was and within that they managed themselves individually so as to work together and achieve it. I had a strong sense of co-operative mode of being. These were mostly people who had a long history of working together. I got a sense that they know each other’s strengths and weaknesses and work within them. I think the respect for each other included the time issue without it having to be brought to the front and dominate everything in the way that it seems to in so much of my everyday life. And it was clear to me that these are all very busy people.

There was no sense of time as a personal possession. Most of the metaphors I’ve reflected on below didn’t apply. The thought that people might be wasting time (either their own or other people’s) seems really odd in this context. There were fixed constraints like plane times and those were met but not seen at all as problems or difficulties.

Perhaps where there is respect, affection, and a sense of common purpose then time facilitates rather than dominates and undermines.

Metaphors we use about time.
Waste, spend, use, create, make, need.
Time is a resource.
We give it to others if we are feeling generous. We withhold our time from others if we are feeling mean or even just self protective.
Chronophage is a person who eats other people’s time.
Giving time is often like giving love.
It always means giving respect for another's needs. In employment we are paid for our time. Set working hours. Feeling in jobs like mine that there is no time that really belongs to oneself while there are still tasks needing to be done. And so a more or less permanent feeling of guilt, incompleteness because the work never is finished. And so rebellion in the form of taking back time. But not feeling good about it. Tension. Resentment of things and people that take one's time but don't offer any kind of reward. Rewards come in many forms. Feelings of achievement. Feelings of having been heard and respected. Feelings even of being loved because someone has given you some of their precious time. But time given as a visibly grudging gift has a negative effect. People who make you feel you are wasting their time don't get the best of either you or the time they make available.

People who waste your time. Fail to recognise that time is a gift, is valuable, belongs to you alone. So time is something we feel possessive of. It is our own belonging. Other people try to take it away. I must hang on to my time lest it gets wasted, used up by other people.

There is a lot about feelings in this reflection on time. So time and its deployment are an emotional issue. Which is rather counter to the more usual thought of time as a rational, scientific measure. Columns in diaries with half-hour or hourly time slots.

Postlude
I didn't take the time to write every day in a notebook. I didn't write anything much at all until I sat down to do this. Instead I thought about the inquiry each day. I told my brain that I wanted it to reflect on all kinds of experiences and produce a report for me about what I think now about time. And this is it.

And now it is time for me to go to a meeting and I think I am about to be late and waste the time of two other people. Unless they are late — and then they will be wasting (eating up, using, appropriating) my time. Or will they? What else might be happening there?

**Relationship entre sujets de recherche: problèmes d'autonomie perçue et d'échange cooperatif. Contexte culturel.**
Sending this now love Tara

Tara Pradhan  
Events Facilitation Manager  
Auckland City  
Private Bag 92516 Wellesley St  
Auckland  
Phone 353 9592  
Fax 379 2031

-----Original Message-----
From: Pradhan, Tara  
Sent: Sunday, 29 October 2000 15:21  
To: 'Zenergy'; 'Mark Allen'; 'Lane West-Newman'; 'Lis Gleed'; 'Susan Syrne'; 'Hazel Hodgkin'; 'Dave Macdonald'; 'Raewyn Togaleza-Cobb'; 'Tanya Kog'  
Subject: RE: Co-operative Inquiry - sustainable processes in organisations.

Please find below the summary of my results as discussed yesterday at the meeting.

Also please note that we discussed the December 2nd meeting and agreed this would start at 9.30 am.

As its the start of the xmas season we thought we would conclude the day with some xmas spirit so if anyone would like to bring some bubbles or other beverages to celebrate anything we fancy then please do.

See you all on december 2nd

regards Tara

Results of surveying 7 colleagues and team members in my organisation.

1. What does working co-operatively mean to you?

Working co-operatively means two way communication, a commitment to working together, being supportive of one another, being flexible with one another, consideration.

Finding an efficient method to get the job done

Satisfy all parties involved

Sharing the load & working together to achieve the best result.

Working co-operatively means working toward a shared 'umbrella' goal using different strengths or expertise, but within an agreed format. Specific goals achieved under this umbrella goal may differ.

Working in a team with others who have the same goal, with the same agreed values in an environment of respect and trust.

Having a give and take relationship with colleagues where everyone's participation/contribution/special skills are noticed, valued and incorporated into their role to make a more efficient cohesive unit.

Words like team, support, understanding come to mind. Understanding others needs eg on a small scale in a team noticing when someone else is under pressure and helping them out by either taking their calls or letting them have space to work and generally being supportive. Also understanding what others needs are, what their behavioural patterns tend to be and working with them towards a common purpose.

2. What are the drivers that make you want to work co-operatively?

Wanting to work co-operatively - a supportive environment, unity, mutual understanding, really existence of the above.

Clear communication lines
Purpose in what you are doing
Good relationships with team
Focus
Challenging projects, responsibility & recognition.
Understanding that the contribution the other party can contribute to
faster, and better results.
Working in an environment that allows people to be who they are with
the freedom to do their job because there is respect for their abilities and
them as an individual.
A nonblaming environment.
One that supports and does not pull down.
One that doesn’t grow at the expense of those who help it achieve.
An environment of seeing one another develop and helping each other to move
into and use that development.
When the team achieves it’s goals and objectives through a co-operative
approach that has action and not just lip service.
Feeling that there is parity among members of a team - i.e.
responsibilities/pay etc again with importance placed on people being
encouraged to use/develop their particular skills (or interests). Being
able to have fun during/enjoy my work hours. Building relationships with
colleagues and customers.
Group purpose - to achieve a result that is understood and is in alignment
with the whole group/team
Well being - being looked after in a holistic way i.e knowing others have an
understanding of my culture and vice versa.
Fitness - physical fitness although not something I do now through work, but
would be a major driver for me if it was available, I realise that I can
actually change this my self.
Remuneration - being paid what you are worth
Training - having ongoing training

3. What are the drivers that make you not want to work co-operatively?

Not wanting to work co-operatively - inequality, lack of understanding, a
non-team player.
Team wastes time
There is no focus and purpose
Really bad communication
Work loads not distributed evenly & disempowerment.
The potential for misunderstandings as a result of competing priorities.
The only drivers that would make me not want to work co-operatively would be
when a team says all the right things about being a team but in reality do
not practice what they preach.
The other most important thing for me is to not work in a seemingly
co-operative environment that is in reality lead by control and
manipulation.
Work overload, having to deal with work with rude or unhelpful people, not
feeling my role is valued or appreciated. Not being able to develop
existing/new skills or take on new challenges.
I feel most situations can be worked at. External things like salary
conditions and air conditioning are external things which can be a concern
as you can’t do anything about them directly. You can only influence them.
Overload of work can also be a deterrent.

Tara Pradhan
Events Facilitation Manager
Auckland City
Private Bag 92516 Wellesley St
Auckland
Phone 353 9592
Fax 379 2031

-----Original Message-----
From: Pradhan, Tara
Sent: Thursday, 26 October 2000 11:52
To: 'Zenergy'; Mark Allen; Lane West-Newman; Lis Gleed; Susan Byrne;
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Brain dump on the final Saturday, situated on either side of Paula (see Co-operative Inquiry p. 175), Inquiry Group, 21/22/2000.
SESSION OUTCOME

October 7-8, 2000

TOPIC:
Enabling people to work co-operatively in the workplace successfully and intuitively.

The question became "what are the elements that drive people toward co-operation or away from it? What are these drivers?"

SESSION INITIATOR:
Tara Pradhan

PARTICIPANTS:
David Lane, Gwen Reekie, Hazel Hodgkin, Miriama Te Wano, Glenda Owen, Bridie Picot, Hilary Carlisle, Johanna Perfect, Gail.

ACTION OUTCOMES:
We participated in a sociodrama facilitated by Hazel to explore the elements that drive people toward co-operation or away from it, and demonstrated these through a range of roles. We identified the following points in the group discussion after the sociodrama exercise:

- Maintain a sustainable view for yourself. This is important for those who continue to raise issues or new ideas and get knocked back frequently.
- Get clear on the purpose of what you are trying to achieve.
- Remember boundaries are crucial, we need to value the contribution of others who come from a different philosophy, even when they are setting the boundaries.
- Keep the big vision in mind but value the small gains along the way, appreciate the low hanging fruit and the little steps.
- It is important to work with what is, not what we think is. Our philosophy may not be the reality.
- You can work co-operatively even when there is conflict.
- Young people make a valuable contribution.
- Have fun.
Strands/Schools of Facilitation

- Community Development
- Human Potential
- Personal Development
- Transpersonal
- Appreciative Enquiry
- Technology of Participation
- Psycho-Dramatic
- Open Space
- Action Research
- Process Psychology
- Action Learning

Informal Session: Kevin, Dale, Hamish, Anne, Noel 7/10/00

Australasian Facilitators Network Conference
What is co-ocracy?

- Requires individual & group responsibility
- Empowered community
- Comprises the individuals space to be who they can be
- Acknowledges the influence of others on ourselves, vice versa
- Requires things to be named
- Change
- Ongoing evolution
- Consequent
- Shared vision
- People engaged in a group, not by one or a few
- Don't allow for alignment of a group purposes

Zenergy Facilitation Training

Note: The diagram includes various terms and connections, but the full text is not clearly visible due to handwriting style and clarity.
Barriers to Co-operacy

- lack of commitment
- collusion
- exclusion
- not taking personal responsibility
- separate/alone
- dishonesty
- not taking action
- better-worse/different
- not speaking our truth
- not accessing passion
- not being whole bodies
- no I.D.
- compromising it
- not being present
- what's going on

Co-operacy: A New Way of Being at Work
Wellington, Nov 2000
Gap between Polarisation + Synergy

Polarisation
- Fixed ideas / default
- Know best
- Decline answer + consult
- Power based (Polarisation by fear)
- Divide

Synergy
- Open mind
- Grow together to solve
- Consult / Consensus
- Everyone equal
- Pull together to get
- Stronger together
- Working together
- Go with the flow

Confidential
- Trust
- Personal approach
- Prevent
- Exclusive
- Individual performance recognition
- Stormy / hurt

Fluid
- Inclusive
- Collaborative / co-creation
- Calm / happiness
IAF Statement of Values and Code of Ethics

The IAF Ethics and Values Think Tank (EVTT) has concluded its work in developing a Statement of Values and Ethics for Group Facilitators (the Code).

The work of EVTT has taken place over two years (June 2000 - May 2002) and has involved an estimated 150 people. An online group of 85 people exchanging more than 900 emails and engaged in thousands of thinking and discussion hours on the EVTT e-group. In addition 2 forums involving 40 people were held at IAF Conference 2001 at Minnesota. Workshops and discussions were also held at regional conferences and on regional e-groups.

The development of the Code has involved a wide diversity of views and the working through of different perspectives to achieve a consensus across regional and cultural boundaries. This has taken a considerable effort and is a major achievement.

The following Draft Statement of Values and Code of Ethics (the Code) was adopted by the Association Coordinating Team (ACT) on May 21, 2002 and will be formally reviewed in two years. During the two years the Ethics and Values Think Tank will solicit feedback from IAF members and other stakeholders, and continue to provide a forum for discussion of pertinent issues and potential revisions. The Code should be made widely available and copies distributed to all IAF members.

The International Association of Facilitators
Draft Statement of Values and Code of Ethics for Facilitators
Adopted May 21, 2002

Preamble

Facilitators are called upon to fill an impartial role in helping groups become more effective. We act as process guides to create a balance between participation and results.

We, the members of the International Association of Facilitators (IAF), believe that our profession gives us a unique opportunity to make a positive contribution to individuals, organizations, and society. Our effectiveness is based on our personal integrity and the trust developed between ourselves and those with whom we work. Therefore, we recognize the importance of defining and making known the values and ethical principles that guide our actions.

This Statement of Values and Code of Ethics recognizes the complexity of our roles, including the full spectrum of personal, professional and cultural diversity in the IAF membership and in the field of facilitation. Members of the International Association of Facilitators are committed to using these values and ethics to guide their professional practice. These principles are expressed in broad statements to guide ethical practice; they provide a framework and are not intended to dictate conduct for particular situations. Questions or advice about the application of these values and ethics may be addressed to the International Association of Facilitators.

Statement of Values

As group facilitators, we believe in the inherent value of the individual and the collective wisdom of the group. We strive to help the group make the best use of the contributions of each of its members. We set aside our personal opinions and support the group's right to make its own choices. We believe that collaborative and cooperative interaction builds consensus and produces meaningful outcomes. We value professional collaboration to improve our profession.

Code of Ethics

1. Client Service
We are in service to our clients, using our group facilitation competencies to add value to their work.

Our clients include the groups we facilitate and those who contract with us on their behalf. We work closely with our clients to understand their expectations so that we provide the appropriate service, and that the group produces the desired outcomes. It is our responsibility to ensure that we are competent to handle the intervention. If the group decides it needs to go in a direction other than that originally intended by either the group or its representatives, our role is to help the group move forward, reconciling the original intent with the emergent direction.

2. Conflict of Interest

We openly acknowledge any potential conflict of interest.

Prior to agreeing to work with our clients, we discuss openly and honestly any possible conflict of interest, personal bias, prior knowledge of the organisation or any other matter which may be perceived as preventing us from working effectively with the interests of all group members. We do this so that, together, we may make an informed decision about proceeding and to prevent misunderstanding that could detract from the success or credibility of the clients or ourselves. We refrain from using our position to secure unfair or inappropriate privilege, gain, or benefit.

3. Group Autonomy

We respect the culture, rights, and autonomy of the group.

We seek the group’s conscious agreement to the process and their commitment to participate. We do not impose anything that risks the welfare and dignity of the participants, the freedom of choice of the group, or the credibility of its work.

4. Processes, Methods, and Tools

We use processes, methods and tools responsibly.

In dialogue with the group or its representatives we design processes that will achieve the group’s goals, and select and adapt the most appropriate methods and tools. We avoid using processes, methods or tools with which we are insufficiently skilled, or which are poorly matched to the needs of the group.

5. Respect, Safety, Equity, and Trust

We strive to engender an environment of respect and safety where all participants trust that they can speak freely and where individual boundaries are honoured. We use our skills, knowledge, tools, and wisdom to elicit and honour the perspectives of all.

We seek to have all relevant stakeholders represented and involved. We promote equitable relationships among the participants and facilitator and ensure that all participants have an opportunity to examine and share their thoughts and feelings. We use a variety of methods to enable the group to access the natural gifts, talents and life experiences of each member. We work in ways that honour the wholeness and self-expression of others, designing sessions that respect different styles of interaction. We understand that any action we take is an intervention that may affect the process.

6. Stewardship of Process

We practice stewardship of process and impartiality toward content.

While participants bring knowledge and expertise concerning the substance of their situation, we bring knowledge and expertise concerning the group interaction process. We are vigilant to minimize our influence on group outcomes. When we have content knowledge not otherwise available to the group, and that the group must have to be effective, we offer it after explaining our change in role.

7. Confidentiality

We maintain confidentiality of information.

http://www.iaf-world.org/iafethics.htm

25/02/2003
We observe confidentiality of all client information. Therefore, we do not share information about a client within or outside of the client's organisation, nor do we report on group content, or the individual opinions or behaviour of members of the group without consent.

8. Professional Development

We are responsible for continuous improvement of our facilitation skills and knowledge.

We continuously learn and grow. We seek opportunities to improve our knowledge and facilitation skills to better assist groups in their work. We remain current in the field of facilitation through our practical group experiences and ongoing personal development. We offer our skills within a spirit of collaboration to develop our professional work practices.

Back to IAF Home
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