

"Cultivating Collaborators: Concepts and Questions Emerging Interactively From An Evolving, Interdisciplinary Workshop."

Peter J. Taylor, Programs in Science, Technology & Values and Critical & Creative Thinking,
University of Massachusetts, Boston, MA 02125, USA; peter.taylor@umb.edu; 617-287-7636

Steven J. Fifield, Education Research & Development Center, University of Delaware, Pearson
Hall, Newark, DE 19716; fifield@UDel.Edu; 302-831-4437

Christian C. Young, Biology Department, Alverno College, 3400 South 43rd Street, P.O. Box
343922, Milwaukee, WI 53234-3922; Chris.Young@alverno.edu; 414-382-6197

Abstract

The growing emphasis on collaboration in environmental planning and management and in environmental research invites consideration of how a person becomes skilled and effective in contributing to the desired outcomes of collaboration. This issue has been illuminated by a series of interaction-intensive, interdisciplinary workshops to foster collaboration among those who teach, study, and engage with the public about scientific developments and social change. Review of the workshop evaluations suggests that people are moved to develop themselves as collaborators when they see an experience or training as transformative. Four R's—respect, risk, revelation, and re-engagement—provide important conditions for interactions among researchers to be transformative.

In a nutshell

- A series of interdisciplinary workshops illuminate the question: how does a person become skilled and effective in contributing to the desired outcomes of collaboration?
- People are moved to develop themselves as collaborators when they see an experience or training as transformative.
- Four R's—respect, risk, revelation, and re-engagement—provide important conditions for interactions among researchers to be transformative.

* * *

Since the 1990s collaboration has become a dominant concern in environmental planning and management (Margerum 2008), but the need to organize collaborative environmental research can be traced back at least as far as the tropical rainforest ecosystem projects led by H.T. Odum in the 1950s and 60s (Odum and Pigeon 1970). This emphasis ran through the International Biological Program (1964-74) and the Long-Term Ecological Research projects that began in 1980. Yet what exactly is it about developing environmental knowledge that calls for collaboration? Thinking about this question led us to a more general question: What makes people develop their interest and skills in collaboration? This paper describes the shift to the second question and the lessons about cultivating collaboration drawn from a series of interdisciplinary workshops about science in its social context. At the very end we return to the question about collaboration in environmental inquiry and knowledge-making.

Initial Thinking: Why emphasize collaboration in environmental research?

Our first step was to identify a variety of things collaboration in environmental research can mean (Taylor 2001). Then we divided the items into two categories: the first reflecting the simple idea that collaboration aims for a sum of multiple parts; the second, the hope that something greater than the sum of those parts will emerge through their interaction (Panel 1).

Panel 1. Why emphasize collaboration in environmental research?

A. Sum of the Parts

Combining multiple perspectives

- When research is tied up with planning and management that involves meetings and networks of representatives of established and emerging stakeholder groups, research projects also need to integrate knowledge and questions from the different groups and kinds of research (Margerum 2008, Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000).
- When researchers are concerned about social justice, they can shape their inquiries through ongoing work with and empowerment of people whose lives stand to be most affected by some change in social policy or technological development, such as digging of deep wells for irrigation (Greenwood and Levin 1998).

- When the knowledge and research skills of more than one person/speciality are needed, multi-disciplinary research teams are established.
- When the labor of research, especially in data collection, is beyond any research group, amateurs—"citizen scientists"—can be sought as collaborators (Wikipedia n.d., Barrow 2000).
- Workshops and other organized multi-person collaborative processes in environmental research constitute a self-conscious example of what sociologists of science and technology have called "heterogeneous engineering" (i.e., the mobilization of heterogeneous resources by diverse agents spanning different realms of social action) (Taylor 2005, 93ff).

Extending over time

- The nature of environmental complexity means that ongoing assessment (as against a one-time analysis) is needed, so an ongoing organization or group is formed to conduct the assessment, as recognized in the field of Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management (Resilience Alliance n.d., Gunderson et al. 1995).

Spanning distance

- Researchers in separate projects and disparate locations use the tools of eco-informatics to link their data into a larger picture (Halpern et al. 2008).

B. Greater than the Sum of the Parts (i.e., outcomes over and above A.)

Generating new perspectives

- Knowledge and further research questions can be generated that the collaborators (individually or in sum) did not have when they came in (Olsen and Eoyang, 2001).

Durable

- Guided by skilful facilitators, collaborators can become invested in the plans, policy, and ongoing collaborations that emerge from the research (Stanfield 2002, 17ff).

Developing capacities

- Collaborators develop skills and dispositions for collaboration in various settings, as warranted by the rise of citizen participation and of new institutions of "civil society" (Burbidge 1997, Taylor 2005, 204ff).

Although we expressed the items in the second category in more generic terms, we saw them as grounded in one or more of the first category of more concrete objectives. At the same

time, we recognized that the "greater than the sum of the parts" objectives raised questions about the theory and practice of collaboration that need not be specific to environmental research: Why do well-facilitated group processes result in collaborators' investment in the product of the processes? How can collaborators (or facilitators of collaboration) ensure that knowledge generated is greater than any single collaborator or sum of collaborators came in with? How does a person become skilled and effective in contributing to such outcomes?

There was an obvious flip side to these questions. What could we learn from interdisciplinary workshops and collaborations that failed to generate new knowledge and investment in the product; that did not enhance participants' ability to contribute to effective collaborations in the future? Each of us had seen time, energy, funds (and associated carbon footprint) poured into workshops in which the parts competed more than added up to any sum. Where the pressure for product was allowed to squelch process so that participants perpetuated familiar patterns of defending territory and speaking cross purposes, and headed home without being enriched by perspectives and frameworks from other disciplines—and, in many cases, without any product emerging. Grouching about such frustrating experiences (which seem far from rare) is not productive; the question is how could we do better?

An opportunity to address this issue arose in 2004 not in the arena of environmental research but indirectly following a seed grant from NSF Science and Society directorate for an experimental, interaction-intensive, interdisciplinary workshop "to foster collaboration among those who teach, study, and engage with the public about scientific developments and social change." Since then the workshops have continued annually, organized under the umbrella of the New England Workshop on Science and Social Change ("NewSSC") (NewSSC 2008a). In this paper we draw some lessons about collaboration from the dynamics that have evolved over the five years of workshops.

New Direction: Becoming skilled and effective in contributing to collaborations

As a starting point for describing this new direction we took, let us take the last of the questions that flowed from the "greater than the sum of the parts" objectives, namely, how does a person become skilled and effective in contributing to collaborations? The default answer would be "just do it"—everyone can learn collaboration skills and dispositions through practice. This answer seems less than satisfactory given the number of unproductive meetings and

collaborations most of us have experienced. The obvious fallback answer—"take classes in it"—has merit (e.g., Senge et al. 1994, Stanfield 2002, and Schuman 2006 provide valuable resources for instructors). However, as the following experience of a colleague in forestry reminds us, the answer also is not sufficient. The colleague in question was recruited to run professional development programs and found his mid-career students very appreciative of learning about collaboration. It spoke to their day-to-day experience working with diverse stakeholders in the use of forests and public lands. Indeed, they asked "Why weren't we taught this as undergraduates?" The colleague began to introduce similar material to his undergraduates. They, however, resisted, wanting him to focus on the facts—the science—that they needed to know to qualify as professional foresters. Being told about the reactions of the mid-career foresters did not convince the undergraduates that it was worthwhile to learn about collaboration.

Teachers can, of course, insist that students study assigned topics, but, when the topic is collaboration, insistence cannot suffice. There is necessarily an experiential side to learning collaboration; any reluctance on the students' part to "collaborate" in being taught skills and processes of collaboration detracts from the group process in question, and the experience can fall well short of convincing students that collaboration is worthwhile. Resistance to learning about collaboration is not restricted to students. We encounter colleagues who want us to prove the value of group processes before they join in, watch more than engage when they do join in, or, worse still, try to derail the group process in question. So let us then refine our question about becoming skilled and effective in contributing to collaborations. To develop skills and dispositions of collaboration requires researchers (and researchers-in-training) to make opportunities for practicing what they have been introduced to and to persist even when they encounter resistance. What moves them to pursue such development? We consider this question after providing some background information about the NewSSC workshops.

"Materials and methods"

The NewSSC workshops have been small—eleven to fifteen participants—international (people from three to eight nationalities), of mixed "rank" (students, postdocs, professors, and independent scholars), and interdisciplinary (sociologists, historians, philosophers, and ethicists of science; science educators; and scientists interested in the preceding interdisciplinary fields; as well as an ecological artist, a labor educator, and a reference librarian). Under the overarching

theme of engaging with science and social change, each NewSSC workshop has its own specific theme: teaching and public engagement beyond disciplinary boundaries; social implications of ecological restoration; social shaping of the use of genetic knowledge; complexities of genes-environment-development; and—directly related to the topic of this paper—collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry (NewSSC 2007; see NewSSC 2008a for more details of all the workshops).

Although the themes changed each year, four specific objectives have run through the workshops (Panel 2). The workshops last for four days and move through four broad, overlapping phases (Panel 3). There is no delivery of papers; instead participants lead each other in activities, designed before or developed during the workshops, that can be adapted to college classrooms and other contexts (Panel 4) and participate in group processes that are regular features of the workshops (Panel 5). These group processes are also offered as models or tools to be adapted or adopted in other contexts. The informal and guided opportunities to reflect on hopes and experiences during the workshop produce feedback that shapes the days ahead as well as changes to the design of subsequent workshops. The ongoing evolution of the workshops is stimulated not only by the evaluations, but also by an extended debriefing immediately following each workshop and advisory group discussions, such as the one out of which the analysis in the next section emerged.

Panel 2. Objectives of NewSSC

1. To promote the social contextualization of science in education and other activities beyond the participants' current disciplinary and academic boundaries.
2. To use innovative workshop processes that facilitate participants connecting theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand in constructive ways.
3. To train novice and experienced scholars in process/participation skills valuable in activity-centered teaching, workshops, and collaboration.
4. To provide a workshop model that can be repeated, evolve in response to evaluations, and be adapted by participants.

Panel 3. Phases of the four-day workshop*

Phase 1. Exposing Diverse Points of Potential Interaction

Phase 2a. Focus on Detailed Case Study and b. Excursion for Informal Conversations

Phase 3. Activities to Engage each Other in our Projects. (Some activities prepared in advance of the workshop; some generated in small groups during the workshop)

Phase 4. Taking Stock of the Experience

* The phases correspond only approximately to the days, e.g., Day 1 also includes one activity (Phase 3), activities continue into Day 4, and "Taking Stock" occurs every day.

Panel 4. Examples of activities specific to a given workshop*

Scenarios for Teaching that Relates to Collaboration in Environmental Inquiry. An activity working on two levels: a) developing the ability of the activity leader(s) to coach/coax colleagues into adding new approaches in their teaching, namely, writing scenarios for problem-based learning (PBL); and b) creating a pool of scenarios that could be used in teaching (especially PBL) concerning the diverse dimensions of promoting collaborations in generating environmental knowledge and inquiry.

An introduction to Participatory or Forum Theater As A Resource For Education And

Outreach. Many participatory and educational activities involving science, technology, environmental or health issues are based on the assumption that “lay” persons suffer from a “deficit” of knowledge or information on the issues under debate. An alternative approach, Forum Theatre, begins with “a scene or a play that must necessarily show a situation of oppression that the Protagonist does not know how to fight against, and fails. The spect-actors are invited to replace this Protagonist, and act out... all possible solutions, ideas, strategies.”

* These activities are documented in links to the programs on the webpages for each workshop (NewSSC 2008a).

Panel 5. Examples of group processes common to most workshops*

Guided Freewriting (early on Day 1): 7-10 minutes non-stop writing on "issues that concern me, including ones that I haven't raised or addressed well in previous gatherings." This exercise is designed to clear mental and/or emotional space and to allow ideas about an issue to begin to come to the surface.

Autobiographical Introductions (Day 1): 15 minutes each for participant to describe their paths in narrative depth and provide background on their current and emerging work. Listeners are encouraged to take notes on points of intersection, interest, curiosity.

Structured discussion of an in-depth case study or key article (Day 2): After the author provides a brief introduction, other participants take time to reflect aloud on commonalities and differences with their own work. Author responds only after everyone else has spoken.

Go-arounds, e.g., at start of Day 3, "I didn't expect to be thinking about..."

Office Hours (Day 3): An hour divided into three time slots in which participants sign up to consult one-on-one with another participant.

Dialogue Process: An opportunity to listen to what participants say about their thinking, and, in response to what participants hear, to "listen" to their own thoughts and feelings that had been below the surface of their attention.

* Instructions for the group processes are linked to the programs on the webpages for each workshop (NewSSC 2008a).

"Results and Analysis"

"I feel I now know 13 other people I can go to for advice, encouragement, teaching help, ideas, collaboration, anything," one participant in the 2008 workshop wrote in her evaluation. Another emailed afterwards that: "Many of the strategies... employed to bring our little company together so deeply, so quickly, could well be applied in the classroom to build a community of trust and support from its earliest days." Such comments suggest that something about collaboration was going on at the workshops that is worth delving into. It is not easy, however, to convey how workshop dynamics produce desired outcomes. As the preceding participant commented in her evaluation: "the benefit of [the workshop] is to be discovered not in something one can express in a paragraph of evaluation... [T]he benefit is to be lived into reality, a PROCESS through which one must personally pass, to understand its method, function, benefits..." So, although we cannot create for readers the experience of participating in one of the workshops, we hope that our description and analysis conveys enough to stimulate others to explore and examine how they cultivate collaboration in their own workshops and collaborative projects.

Clearly, the NewSSC workshops' activities and group processes require active participation. The evaluations affirm that the activities and processes introduce a "broad and very effective repertoire" of "knowledge, tools, approaches, and contacts," and participants intend to make use of this repertoire in their teaching and other work. Such intentions are a positive step toward developing as a collaborator, yet the evaluations point to something deeper being involved. Consider, for example: "This workshop introduced me to a wonderful range of new techniques for facilitating deeply satisfying group processes, creating cohesion, mutual understanding, lasting bonds and transformative learning." This last phrase prompted us to conjecture that people who see an experience or training in collaboration as "transformative" are more likely to pursue further their development as a collaborator. With this idea in mind we reviewed the 2006-8 evaluations in the mode of "appreciative inquiry" (Preskill and Coghlan, 2003), that is, not looking at what is wrong and seeking to fix it, but at what is right and focusing on "success, the life-giving force, the incidence of joy" (Watkins and Cooperrider 2000, p. 6). We came up with "4R's" that seem to underlie "transformative exchanges" (Olson and Eoyang, 2000) and move participants to develop as collaborators. What follows is a stylized narrative of these 4R's, illustrated by quotes taken from the evaluations (Panel 6).

1. Respect. The small number and mixed composition of the workshop participants—mixed in terms of disciplines, rank, experience, and nationality—means that participants have repeated exchanges with those who differ from them in meaningful and generative ways. Autobiographical stories at the start of the workshop, the dialogue process, and frequent go-arounds not only promote listening to others, but also provide the experience of being listened to. Participants remark on being pleasantly surprised by who asks during the one-on-one "Office Hours" to hear their ideas. The structured discussion of a case study also requires attentive listening as commonalities and differences are brought to light. Participation in the activities, including small group work to generate and co-lead activities during the workshop, emphasizes that each participant, regardless of background or previous experience has something valuable to contribute to the process and outcomes. In these and other ways, respect is not simply stated as a ground rule, but is enacted.

2. Risk. Respect creates a space with enough safety for participants to take risks of various kinds, such as, speaking personally during the autobiographical introductions, taking an interest in points of view distant in terms of discipline and experience, participating—sometimes

quite playfully—during unfamiliar processes, and being open to surprises and spontaneous insights emerging from interactions among people who were strangers before the workshop. Most importantly, participants have to accept uncertainty and instability—"What exactly is going to happen? What should I be doing?"—as the workshop "self-organizes." In terms of Stacey's schema of management of organizations (Zimmerman 2001), the workshops are not unorganized; there is a roadmap (see Panel 3) and the group processes are led by facilitators. Yet, the workshops unfold without an explicit agreement on where they are headed and without certainty about how to achieve desired outcomes. So participants take risks in staying in there when the process seems rough—not stepping back into the role of critic. In all these aspects of risk-taking, recent workshops have benefited from the participation of "veterans" who have attended one or more previous NewSSC workshops.

3. Revelation. On the principle that "we know more than we are, at first, prepared to acknowledge" (Taylor 2008), a space is created by respect and risk in which participants bring thoughts and feelings to the surface that articulate, clarify and complicate their ideas, relationships, and aspirations—in short, their identities. Identities may be thought of as the ongoing, recursive relationships of how we understand ourselves, others, and the world, together with the understandings and expectations—some welcome, some not—that are pressed back upon us (Britzman, 1992, Danielewicz, 2001). Revelation is not just uncovering who we are, but about "re-marking" the various ways we might understand and perform our identities and what we know. The opportunity to reveal and remark upon oneself is explicit in some of the workshops' group processes, e.g., guided freewriting, dialogue process, and go-arounds on "I didn't expect to be thinking about..." (Panel 5). But the transformative potential of revelation for collaborative knowledge generation is greatest when we are actively implicated in one another's revelations. The first quote in Panel 6 suggests that our own self-understandings are extended when we are respectful partners with others in the risky business of self-exploration. Activities that bring people into revelatory relationships generate new possibilities for knowing and being. One repeated comment in the evaluations, namely, that participants needed more time to reflect on and digest their experiences, accentuates the importance of revelation in the workshop dynamics.

4. Re-engagement. Respect, risk, and revelation combine so that participants' "gears" engage allowing them to sustain quite a high level of energy during the workshop all day and

into the evenings. The participants clearly engage actively with others, and, equally importantly, are reminded of their aspirations to work in supportive communities. In this last sense, re-engagement goes beyond an individual's enhanced enthusiasm. It is a collective or emergent result of the activities that, in Olsen and Eoyang's (2001) terms, bring people who have generative differences into meaningful interactions that can catalyze transformations. With meaningful social engagement and opportunities for personal introspection, participants say they discover new possibilities for work with others on ideas they brought to the workshop. Of course, the end-of-workshop evaluations cannot show that participants followed through on intentions to stay connected or to make shifts in their own projects and work relations. (A need or desire for periodic re-charging is evident in the return of past participants to later workshops.)

Panel 6. Extracts from participant evaluations that illustrate the 4Rs

1. Respect.

"The primary strength of this workshop was in bringing together diverse people from diverse yet intersecting fields and allowing them to exchange expertise and to share inspiration and support for innovative educational/activist efforts."

"The workshop was special to me in that I saw 12 people put in time, effort, creativity to figure out how to work together."

The workshop was "special because it focused very intentionally on quality of interaction, and because the 'side trips' could be done as part of the workshop instead of surreptitiously."

"One immediate impact was to participate in a collective that was created from so many different experiences."

"This workshop... made me realize I have an academic community I never knew existed..."

2. Risk

"... successful in creating a space in which participants could take risks..."

"... people participated, questioned, revealed vulnerabilities..."

"...(most) academic markers are removed from consideration so all participants are expected to play all the time.... The workshop tries to employ multiple ways of knowing and learning about the world, so everyone is uncomfortable at least some of the time. As one participant noted, he was learning the most during the times he was most uncomfortable."

"... it enables one to develop in very different ways, depending on the group."

"The workshop format will benefit from an explicit model of leadership/facilitation skills showing how to alternate deftly between centralized control and focus, on the one hand, and distributed authority and unrestricted scope on the other."

"Participating the second time, I was able to concentrate more on specific details and was not as overwhelmed by the wealth of methods, processes, and group interactions."

3. Revelation.

"The various activities do not simply build connections with others, but they necessitate the discovery of the identity of others through their own self-articulations. But since those articulations follow their own path, one sees them not as simple reports of some static truth but as new explorations of self, in each case. Then one discovers this has happened to oneself as much as to others-one discovers oneself anew in the surprising revelations that emerge in the process of self-revelation."

"Ultimately, I believe we have all come to embrace, not only ourselves and each other, but the process! And I believe too that we all are in silent agreement that we depart better persons for the experience, refreshed from the supportive net of the community that has held us fast during this perilous self-discovery. Oh, and then!... one begins immediately to hatch plans for helping others to feel this same wonderful way."

4. Re-engagement.

"The energy level of all attendees was remarkable given our considerable duties as professors and researchers."

The workshop "engaged people in multiple ways... Fully engaged people can develop exciting ideas and insights."

"For those of us working in the spaces between disciplines, especially the spaces between science and other disciplines, this kind of intellectual community is invaluable... I can't say enough about this experience."

"This workshop model is something I would like to continue to engage in at various points throughout my academic career."

" [I]ts impact seems very difficult to evaluate fully and effectively, as it involves examining methodological shifts and perhaps subtle rearrangements in infrastructure or organizational relationships at multiple locations following the workshop itself. These "products" are not documented on paper."

* The full evaluations are linked to the webpages for each workshop (NewSSC 2008a).

"Conclusions"

What moves researchers to develop themselves as collaborators? We conjectured that people are so moved when they see an experience or training in collaboration as "transformative." Reviewing the evaluations from NewSSC workshops we concluded that the 4R's—respect, risk, revelation, and re-engagement—provide important conditions for interactions among researchers to be transformative. "Conclude" seems too definite; our discussion leaves open many questions about the theory and practice of collaboration. We acknowledge, especially, unresolved tensions between process and product.

Clearly, our description and analysis has emphasized process; indeed, process that stimulates more process (i.e., further engagement and development as a collaborator). Of course, collaboration is also meant to yield concrete outcomes, such as those for environmental research we arrived at in our initial thinking (Panel 1). Outcomes remain important to us, but we did not view evaluation of the products of the NewSSC workshops (NewSSC08b) as necessary to support the analysis we have presented here. In fact, we are prepared to push back a bit further against the conventional emphasis on "deliverables." If environmental researchers seriously want durable products to emerge from collaboration, they should not allow the more concrete, "sum of the parts" goals to eclipse the less tangible, "greater than the sum of the parts" objectives (Panel 1). Would-be collaborators, we propose, need to make opportunities to explore process and develop as collaborators. If the NewSSC workshops are any guide for collaborative environmental inquiry and knowledge-making, taking the time it takes to "connect theoretical, pedagogical, practical, political, and personal aspects of the issue at hand" represent time, energy, and funds well spent.

Acknowledgements: The collaboration among the authors and the workshops discussed in the paper have been supported by the National Science Foundation under grant SES–0551843. Participants' detailed end-of-workshop evaluations have been invaluable in developing our analysis.

References

- Barrow MV. 2000. *A Passion for Birds: American Ornithology after Audubon*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Britzman D. 1992. The Terrible Problem of Knowing thyself: Toward a Poststructural Account of Teacher Identity. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 9(3): 23-46.
- Burbidge J (Ed.) 1997. *Beyond Prince and Merchant: Citizen Participation and the Rise of Civil Society*. New York: Pact Publications.
- Danielewicz J. 2001. *Teaching Selves: Identity, Pedagogy, and Teacher Education*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Greenwood DJ and Levin M. 1998. *Introduction To Action Research: Social Research For Social Change*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gunderson LH, Holling CS and Light SS (Eds). 1995. *Barriers and Bridges to the Renewal of Ecosystems and Institutions*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Halpern BS, Walbridge S, Selkoe KA, Kappel CV, Micheli F, D'Agrosa C, Bruno JF, Casey KS, Ebert C, Fox HE, Fujita R, Heinemann D, Lenihan HS, Madin EMP, Perry MT, Selig ER, Spalding M, Steneck R and Watson R. 2008. A Global Map of Human Impact on Marine Ecosystems. *Science* 319(5865): 948-952.
- Margerum RD. 2008. A Typology of Collaboration Efforts in Environmental Management *Environmental Management* 41: 487–500.
- NewSSC (New England Workshop on Science and Social Change). 2007. Collaborative generation of environmental knowledge and inquiry.
<http://www.stv.umb.edu/newssc07.html>. Viewed 29 Jul 2008.
- . 2008. Links to webpages and associated materials for all workshops.
<http://www.stv.umb.edu/newssc.html>. Viewed 29 Jul 2008.
- . 2008. Online Resources for Science in Society Education and Outreach.
<http://sicw.wikispaces.com/ORSSEOdev>. Viewed 29 Jul 2008.
- Odum HT. 1970. Summary: An Emerging View of the Ecological System at El Verde. In: Odum HT and Pigeon RF (Eds). *A Tropical Rain Forest: A Study of Irradiation and Ecology at El Verde, Puerto Rico*. Oak Ridge, Tenn.: U.S. Atomic Energy Commission: I-191-I-289.
- Olson EE and Eoyang GH. 2001. *Facilitating organization change: lessons from complexity*

- science. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Preskill H and Coghlan AT. 2003. Using Appreciative Inquiry in Evaluation (New Direction for Evaluation, No. 100). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Resilience Alliance. n.d. <http://www.resalliance.org> Viewed 2 Oct 2003.
- Schuman S (Ed.) 2006. Creating a Culture of Collaboration: The International Association of Facilitators Handbook. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Senge P, Kleiner A, Roberts C, Ross R and Smith B. 1994. The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook. New York: Currency.
- Stanfield RB. 2002. The Workshop Book: From Individual Creativity to Group Action. Toronto: Canadian Institute of Cultural Affairs.
- Taylor PJ. 2001. Generating environmental knowledge and inquiry through workshop processes. http://www.faculty.umb.edu/peter_taylor/ECOS.html. Viewed 21 August 2008.
- 2005. Unruly Complexity: Ecology, Interpretation, Engagement. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 2008. Developing Critical Thinking is Like a Journey. In: Ollington GF (Eds). Teachers and Teaching Strategies, Problems and Innovations. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Watkins JM and Cooperrider D. 2000. Appreciative Inquiry: A Transformative Paradigm. OD Practitioner: Journal of the National Organization Development Network 32(1): 6-12.
- Wikipedia. n.d. Citizen science. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Citizen_science. Viewed 29 Jul 2008.
- Wondolleck JM and Yaffee SL. 2000. Making Collaboration Work: Lessons from Innovation in Natural Resource Management. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Zimmerman B. 2001. Ralph Stacey's Agreement & Certainty Matrix. http://www.plexusinstitute.org/edgeware/archive/think/main_aides3.html. Viewed 27 Jul 2008.