

Self-analysis of professional activity as a tool for personal and organisational change

Towards more effective attitudinal, behavioural and mental change?

Part 2

Workshop "The Impact Assessment Study on Research Partnership"
KFPE, Cairo (Egypt), 15-16/01/2003

Philippe De Leener¹
January 2003

1. Introductory remark

This short draft paper has been written following a working session in Berne in December 2002. Its main purpose was to share in a few words an approach implemented by the author in several West African countries in the field of participatory research for social, economic and agricultural development. This paper must be seen as an addendum to the first paper written in view of the workshop to be held in Cairo in January 2003 (De Leener *et al.*, 2003). This draft must also be regarded as our initial short contribution with a view to possible further collaboration in the wake of activities carried out by ENDA InterMondes (Belgium), supported by IFAD (Rome) and realized, inter alia, with the PAIIP/CT/PIIP in Aguié (Niger). Remember that we are dealing principally with impacts of new partnerships². In our opinion, *working with* entails deeply changing one's way of working and, subsequently, may actually mean doing another sort of job. In this short paper, we merely focus on some methodological features with regards to self-reflexivity.

2. Some basic assumptions

In order to understand the scope of the methodology, some premises introduced here in the form of postulates must be put forward since we do not have enough room to develop our argumentation.

1.1- Working and especially carrying out research or development activities *with* people or communities corresponds to a deep professional change. It is not a simple methodological shift (doing otherwise), it turns out to be a radical disruption in the structure of work as, in the particular case of participation, doing one's job otherwise (meaning genuinely *working with*)

1- Private consultant, Lecturer at the University of Louvain (UCL, Belgium) and Liège (Ulg, Belgium), Associate researcher in the Laboratory of Labor Psychology, Centre National des Arts et Métiers, (CNAM, Paris, France). Also president of ENDA InterMondes (Belgium) and representative of ENDA TM in Europe. Contact: 6B rue de la Fontaine, 1340 Ottignies, Belgium, Tel./fax: ++32-10451034 , Email: deleener@opes.ucl.ac.be.

2- Basically, a partner is someone you work with. Consequently a partnership mainly refers to a situation where several persons are involved in a same joint work or activity.

leads the player to behave, feel and think otherwise in addition to concretely practising his/her professional art in a different manner. In other words, *working with* is another kind of job related to the same field of activities.

1.2- *Knowing* does not necessarily trigger off change. In fact, it is the reverse: change processes generate knowledge processes – knowledge at several levels about situations, people, mechanisms at work and society at large. At best, knowledge proves to be a resource for action. This is probably why so many wise recommendations fuelled by a large number of in-depth studies or evaluations are so typically never applied: people know what to do and how to do it in an entirely different way but do not operate any change. Yet, the vast majority of these studies are valuable, sometimes even of a high scientific value.

1.3- Professional change at a crucial level such as the rationale of work can neither be implemented nor enforced through an administrative act such as an internal decree. Change is an "unbuilding- rebuilding" process which becomes effective, that is, penetrates reality in the form of a new active structure, when carved out by the professionals directly concerned. This assumption has important implications. In practice, it means that if you want to make researchers or developers work in a participatory way with farmers or civil associations, you must at the same time identify the best way of implicating the researchers themselves. Any participatory approach is always a two-fold process: external and internal. The *external* process raises the question of how to involve farmers in the course of the activity, this is the people participation, for example at village level, *out of the office*. The *internal* process is related to the participation of the professionals in the conception of the participatory process, this is the *in-house* participatory change process connected with the issue of what and how to change from within both work organization and personal attitude or behaviour.

1.4- So it appears that this internal change process is also double-faceted: it concerns on the one hand the professionals as persons, be they researchers or developers and, on the other hand, their organisational niche or structure. This is our fourth premise: attitudinal and behavioural change always occurs as a function of organisational change and vice versa. In other words, personal change at work and organisational change are two facets of the same overall phenomenon of change. They are closely intertwined.

1.5- As a matter of fact, there is a third level: the activity as such. We mean that personal and organisational change does not occur independently of change in the very nature or structure of the professional activity. Change in the professional activity is at the core of the change processes, activity is the go-between, a sort of strap which in practical terms shapes the landscape of change. This fifth premise is of prime importance as it justifies our inclination to probe the details of the professional activity. The professional activity is the entry point. At the same time, it is the best way to objectify personal change processes which are typically subjective and, consequently, difficult to address.

Table 1
Transformational self-reflexivity at a glance

<p style="text-align: center;">Basic assumptions</p> <p>People rarely say what they actually do and they never actually do what they say. In other words, people do not know what they actually do, at least as far as they talk about their work.</p> <p>Change precisely begins when you say what you actually do and when you do what you say, that is when words meet (mirror, overlap) gestures, practices and thoughts.</p> <p>This is why knowledge does not easily generate changes. In fact, it is the reverse: change generates knowledge processes. In our view, knowledge is a by-product of change processes.</p> <p>Change cannot easily be implemented by administrative procedures nor vicariously. Change is an "unbuilding-rebuilding" process which becomes effective when carved out (elaborated) by the people (workers, operators, managers) directly concerned.</p> <p>In a professional environment, activity is at the heart of any change process: both personal and organisational changes do not occur independently of changes in the essence, content and structure of the professional activity. This is partly why attitudinal, behavioural, mental change are so closely linked to organisational change, and vice versa.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Ultimate purpose of the approach</p> <p>Making professionals analyze their own real-life activities, what they actually do in real-life professional situations, not what they say or pretend they are doing. This is the way to have access to behaviours, attitudes and unconscious but nonetheless active concerns.</p> <p>Helping workers see themselves from unexpected and innovative angles, making them "re-live" professional lived-through experiences and allows them to live a new transformational experience.</p> <p>Making conscious what is unconscious in the "course" of the work and in their professional life in general. In other words, making accessible, unconscious aspects of professional activity, i.e. gestures, practices, personal theories, beliefs, so that these are likely to be transformed.</p>

2. Tentative schematisation of the change process

What happens when we genuinely adopt a participatory approach, not only the words but also the corresponding gestures and practices? From our researches in Burkina Faso and Niger, it appears that personal change sequentially occurs at three levels, relational, operational and mental. We want to highlight these changes in a few words.

2.1. First, something changes in the way researchers or developers *relate to* the other parties. Precisely, change occurs in three areas: the way they see the others (farmers or developers) in particular, the way they see themselves among others and the way they see the others seeing them. Relation is at the very heart of the *self-identity building process*. To put it in a nutshell, people feel they are someone else, both when they look at others and when others look inwards at themselves.

This crucial identity shift can be characterised as a progressive *unmasking process*: persons arise from personae. In society we all are personae as we play several roles. Personae deal with normative or conventional positions. For example, I am a researcher, you are a farmer. The farmer's relationship with the researcher is conditioned by the particular way he represents the researcher in general, as a particular category of people endowed with attributes, qualities or weaknesses. According to his/her biography, any farmer has his/her personal theory of what it *should* mean to be a researcher ("*Yes, I know this kind of guy, they are like that*"). The mechanism is similar for the researcher who holds in mind a specific definition of what a farmer should be. So, when reduced to personae, people are deciphered through the lens of normative preconceptions about statuses, roles, skills, and so on. People are first and foremost images of what they should be, they do not see themselves as they are in reality. This first shift, when completed, leads to reshaping the otherness in terms of more symmetric relationships.

2.2. Second, when working with farmers, something changes in the way researchers carry out their research work in practice. In particular the way they plan their activities is affected, to put it bluntly. Concretely, their experimental protocols change. Time or research cycle management is given a completely different pattern. Collaborating otherwise turns out to mean making decisions, organising, sharing tasks, assessing risks differently. The work becomes more and more interactive and is thus exposed to many more influences. One of the major shifts lies in the particular way to validate the outcomes of research (De Leener *et al.*, 2003). Disciplinary criteria directly derived from the scientific tradition are not the only reference any longer, they fall into the basket of what is to be negotiated among all the other elements involved.

2.3. Under the umbrella of this operational change, one can detect another subtle disruption, in fact a true *mental change*. In order to put it as simply as possible, just consider that thinking is no more than talking to others within oneself³. Consequently, a thought-producing process here may be seen as an inner dialogue. At any time, when thinking of something, in fact we talk things over with the many people who inhabit our mind. So our mind is a sort of polyphony made of the voices of all the significant people we are used to talking with about such and such issues. When a researcher establishes a genuine relationship with some farmers, their voices penetrate his mind, just like new inhabitants colonize a newly cleared area. Not only the sound of their voices penetrates the mind, but also their opinions, their arguments, their words, and thus implicitly their particular way to construe the world around them for we know that putting reality into words inevitably ends up circumscribing it. While internally discussing with farmers, researchers are forced to think otherwise, thus to rationalise, even conceptualise in a different manner.

2.4- All these changes – a new relational behavior, a new way of managing research and a new manner of thinking – end up by completely reshaping the research activity; this now becomes so different that the researcher is forced to initiate a side activity which increasingly proves to be crucial: an activity on research activity. The research activity progressively becomes an object of research and, in the same way, helps to rejuvenate both the research activity as a whole and the researcher himself, not to mention the outcome of the research

3- We know for a long time that the picture is more complicated. For example, Vygotsky (1997) distinguishes verbal thoughts from instrumental or technical thoughts (p.177).

itself. In other words, the true meaning of research activity, i.e. the sense of carrying out research is affected at the same time as the meaning of the research object itself.

2.5- How can such a complex process be triggered off? By which forces can it be steered? It is impossible to explain here in detail what usually occurs. Let's just say a few words about the mechanism most probably concerned. First remember that personal transformations are closely linked to organisational change. At work, people never change alone, unlike electrons free of any magnetic influence. Staff are active workings of a human system. They change precisely because they are part of an organisation. It is because they are components of living organisational systems that they can change. Hence our contention that personal and organisational changes are both facets of the same transformational process. In a professional context, when we talk about organisational change, we allude to the net of implicit rules and norms that support or frame the realisation of activities. These implicit rules of the game altogether generate the *professional genre* (Clot, 1998). Working people are quite often deeply if unconsciously affected by this normative corset. These rules exert a strong influence not only on how activities should be carried out, but also on how workers should think or feel when carrying them out. Inter alia, they introduce in the crevices of the activity a strong need for internal and external coherence: people feel they must be consistent with themselves and, at the same time, with the activities they conduct and with the other persons involved in their activities. This pressure for consistency plays a central role in transformational processes.

In this short paper, we have neither time nor space to describe these mechanisms which are rather complex and conceptually difficult to express succinctly. But the methodology we describe below is totally permeated by this theoretical background.

3. Analysis of one's own activity as a tool of change at personal and organisational level

The key to one's evolution lies in self-reflexivity, that is the analysis by oneself of one's own activity as an object of research itself. This is not all that easy for we contend that one has no direct access to one's activity, not even to one's own subjectivity. Yes, we live our activity as we carry it out, but nonetheless we do not know exactly *how* we actually do what we do. We do not even know *what* we exactly do when we do something. In practice, what we say about what we do is not exactly what we do and, inversely, what we do is quite often different from what we actually say. That is why introspection and other direct approaches such as interviewing regularly turn out to be disappointing, sometimes hopeless: in such circumstances, what people say about their activity, for example when researchers or developers work with farmers in a supposedly participatory way, can prove to be clearly different from what they actually do. It is part of the reality, but not the *whole* reality, only part of a represented-to-ourselves, and therefore constructed-by-ourselves reality, sometimes it is just a rhetoric *on* reality. Yes, rhetoric probably plays a role in change processes, but not directly nor immediately as a driving force. Declaring that one wants to change something is at best an indication of something that could occur but has not yet occurred in reality.

3.1- The approach we adopt therefore tries to circumvent these obstacles as much as possible. It is a combination of action research as conceptualised and operated by ENDA GRAF Dakar⁴

4- See, for an introduction, De Leener P., Ndione E., Perrier JP., Jacolin P. and Ndiaye M., 1996, The future of

and of a method developed by a French team of work psychologists in Paris⁵. Several steps can be highlighted (table 2, see the appendix). The first step is made up of two parts. The process begins by a clarification with the staff and the management: what is the purpose of the intervention, who has requested what, what are the rules of the games, what are the goals, what will be the main steps and the like. This introductory phase is important: everything must be clear for everybody from the beginning. It is followed by another phase which basically aims at outlining the main features of the context in which change is expected: what is the work environment, what are the activities, the tasks, who does what for what reason, what is the declared mission of the institution, what is at stake and, of course, what change is targeted, why and what for. The developers or the researchers members of a working team, let's say a project team, usually live this first phase as an opportunity to reflect on their work and even to rediscover their activities, possibly through the eyes of an intervening outsider. Two major outputs are expected at the end of this stage: a mental representation of what one's job is or what one usually does and a mental representation of the kind of change one wants to generate, for example through deeper participatory methods. In some cases, these representations can be elaborated in a rather sophisticated form. For example, in Aguié (Niger), the project team has been thoroughly involved in writing several technical notes or reports, aimed at finely describing and documenting the approach and also aimed at analysing the change process in the field of methodology. This form of elaboration is transformational as such because workers are subjectively if not emotionally involved in what they write. The mechanism is well known: if you write something about how you should do a job, you will feel compelled to follow that path. Self-elaboration of methodology is to some extent self-constricting.

3.2- The second step consists in sessions of self-analysis and it is called *single self-confrontation*. The worker scrutinises their own professional activity. The team concerned chooses one activity of particular interest from among the whole set of activities carried out professionally. Then two members of the team are chosen to carry out the self-analysis in the name of their colleagues. The next step consists in video-recording the activity. We shoot the chosen workers in real-life working situations, for example a supposedly participatory planning session in a village. Armed with a video camera, we follow the two representative workers, –researchers or developers, – at work separately in their own usual work environment. Each one then separately reviews the film of his own activity and discovers himself on the screen at work in real-life circumstances. Both of them discover what they really do, and it may not necessarily turn out to be everything they thought they had done. The players themselves work the clicker like a wireless operator): they decide when to stop the playback picture, what comments to make and for how long. The role of the intervening facilitator is to help the professionals relive their working experience in order to make a new and, if possible, highly self-revelatory one. One of the purposes of this session is to help the worker initiate a dialogue with himself *and* with the work itself taken as a super addressee, preferably a controversial dialogue in order to make their habits vibrate upwards to

community land, Human Resource, London: Intermediate Technology Publications, 236p. See also Reason P., 1988, *"Human inquiry in action"*, London, Sage, 242p. or John Heron, 1996, *Co-operative inquiry, Research into the human condition*, London: Sage, 226p.

5- For further information, refer to the special issue of the French journal "Education Permanente" (n°146), more specifically Clot, Y., Faïta D., Fernandez, G., Scheller, L., 2001, Les entretiens en auto-confrontation croisée: une méthode en clinique de l'activité. *Education permanente*, 146, 17-25. Also see Clot, Y., 2001, Psychopathologie du travail et clinique de l'activité. *Éducation permanente*, 146, 35-51.

liberate their potential for change. This self-confrontation session is also video-recorded and consequently becomes a resource both for the workers and for the team. Usually, the comments and dialogues between the subject and the facilitator are decrypted later on and printed so that the worker has the text of the session at his disposal. Again the re-reading of the session afterwards is an opportunity given to the worker to live again, feel again and broach past work experiences from a new angle. Both the video-recorded sequences and the decrypted texts remain confidential. The staff decide to what extent any particular sequence can be used and presented to others, and for what purpose.

3.3- The third step is called *crossed self-confrontation*⁶. The two workers who have experienced self-confrontation review the picture of their own activity but now through the eyes of their fellow-worker. The first worker comments on the activity of the second and vice versa. Again a dialogical activity is initiated about the activity, but this time the players principally confront their experiences. The discussions and exchanges of points of view about the same activity give them an opportunity to re-examine their respective real-life activity and to reveal what is not necessarily self-obvious. So workers, be they researchers or developers, are in a better position to talk about what they have *actually* lived or about what they *actually* live when working in a participatory way. The gap between words (what they say about what they do) and real gestures or practices (what they have actually done) is narrowed. Filling in this gap, that is to say, staff doing what they say and saying what they do, is part of the change process. The distance between the representation of what is done and what is actually being done is precisely the subject matter of the exchanges, the target of change and, at the same time, the field of self-research (Why do we not do what we say? How can we actually do what we want to do? What do we want to do at the end of the day?). The trajectory of the peer comments is not over yet. The colleague's ideas, opinions, positions help workers to feed back their inner dialogic activity with new raw materials. This is how profession, methods and practices are reshaped through a process of internal self-reflection. Next, the outcome of all this change process is shared with the other professionals, provided the staff agree, and it then becomes a resource for the whole team as regards the development of the approach.

A collective self-confrontation is sometimes implemented as a variant in the case of a small team so that the other team members are directly involved in the dialogues around the video sequences. The purpose is the same. However, the film helps staff to relive their own activity in all its facets⁷. Again, these sessions are video recorded, letting them become a reflection resource for the team.

3.4- The workers are researchers on their own work environment and activities. Their work becomes an object of research itself. This is precisely why change may be so significant. Change does not come from outside as an institutional constraint in the form of injunctions or instructions. The pressure for change is a very intimate process, coming from inside as a stimulating self-reflexive process. Staff "revisit" themselves at work, they elaborate a new perspective on themselves. But, as has been suggested, the pressure also comes from the team

6- Clot, Y., Faïta D., Fernandez, G., Scheller, L., 2001, Les entretiens en auto-confrontation croisée : une méthode en clinique de l'activité. *Education permanente*, 146, 17-25.

7- Here we should distinguish between the *performed activity* (what is actually and visibly done) and the *actual* or *real activity* (all the other activities carried out at the same time when conducting one's activity, notably what should have been done and has not been done, what has not been done but should have been done,...). See Clot and De Leener (2003) for further explanations.

for it is a collectively driven process. Change is shared among colleagues, change becomes a collective feature of the team's development.

4. Change processes: an intricate picture

The change process itself is rather complex as mentioned under Section 2. It concerns not only activities as such but also their organisational framework. As already stated, it is also a matter of changing one's tune, not only within the team but also at village level in the case of participatory on-farm researches as was the case in Aguié. Although we cannot detail the whole picture here, it is important to stress that when changes occur at village level, precisely at the interface between the researchers and the farmers, these changes are "repatriated" into the project's organisational sphere and subsequently generate their own transformations. The same occurs the other way round. This is what we have observed in Aguié (Niger). That clearly means that the apparently separate spheres –village and office – are very much interconnected through and by the players' daily activities. Activities prove to be a link and, at the same time, a bridge between both worlds. This is how *working with* turns out to be a twofold transforming process. The mechanism at work has already been analysed in paper n°1 (De Leener, 2003).

4.1. *How self-reflexivity makes words signify and assume different meanings*

We must still explain why precisely the simple fact of seeing oneself at work on a screen potentially generates some, even many, internal change processes. How and why can the fact of making oneself and one's activity an object of observation or questioning triggers such deep internally driven reactions? The process involved here is one of awareness: self-observing subjects become aware of what they actually do, which makes them thoroughly self-reflexive, that is *able to think that they think about themselves*. Deliberately observing oneself at work actually means literally "redoing" what one was doing, deliberately and knowingly in the same way but in a different framework, a framework where one is pressed to think about everything one was thinking. For example, when the staff consider themselves to be facilitating a village negotiation, let's say about a cereal bank, they become conscious of the whole situation and, in particular, of the words they have used possibly unintentionally: *"Yes, I did say that, it's on the screen, but this is not what I meant, not exactly"*. The same words sound differently in the ear, consequently they mean something else. Yes, of course, they still have a similar meaning and yet this turns out to be different, precisely because of the change of context. The first effect of the self-reflexive process forces us to reconsider the meaning of the words, thus leading us to bridge otherwise the area between what words *signify* and what one actually *means* when using them in particular circumstances. The same analysis initiated with gestures, behaviours or work situations will lead to the same outcome: filling them with another meaning, ascribing to them another scope, setting up another background. Words, gestures, behaviours, situations end up being deliberately decontextualised, thus "deroutinised", so as to become an object of subsequent development, in other words both their meaning and function expand by setting new horizons.

4.2. *How awareness and meta-consciousness work in tandem*

Here we see how self-reflexivity becomes a means of professional development. But it is not the end of the story. Self-observation also forces us to understand why one did this or that in a particular way. We did it undoubtedly, it is on the screen, but why? In particular, why this way? This is where the self-observing subject fully realises and quite often finds out how far their own way is guided by implicit rules and instructions, precisely those rules that indicate the proper manner of doing what has to be done. We have identified this implicit set of norms by the concept of genre⁸. Self-analysis allows us to revisit the rules of the games formulated by the genre in force. In other words, the genre at work on the screen is now consciousness-accessible⁹. This is how self-reflexive approaches pave the way for professional changes or development. What was done unconsciously and unintentionally now turns out to be conscious in the form of an object that can be reshaped, that is unlocked and unloaded to be reloaded and locked again but deliberately otherwise. As Vygotsky has stated (1997), consciousness is the experience of the experience. Now we better understand the extent to which this is true. What is at stake in the self-reflexive process can perhaps be explained as follows:

- First, the subject deliberately becomes aware of and analyses what she/he actually does at work (awareness raising),
- Second, awareness itself ends up being transformed into a true object of analysis by the subject (meta-consciousness, that is the awareness of one's consciousness).

Consequently, the subject has two objects of direct analysis at hand: on the one hand, his/her own professional activity as tangibly displayed on the screen contrasting with what she/he thought he/she was doing and, on the other hand, his/her own consciousness of this display (meta-consciousness). We know how professional activity becomes an object of analysis: we simply mean that the subject raises questions such as "Why did I proceed this way?", "How could I have done that when I did not want to behave like that?", "Why do I *think* I behaved in this way since I actually do something else?" and the like. Our last question shows how one's own consciousness may progressively become itself an object of self-analysis. This potentially brings about profound changes in the structure of consciousness, that is the way the subject becomes aware both of what is occurring around him/herself and the outcomes he/she actually generates in carrying out his/her everyday activities in a particular way. We contend that the key of any professional development resides precisely in these intertwined mechanisms:

- Awareness, that is realising what one actually does and, at the same time, becoming aware of the gap between what one says about one's actions and what one really does,
- Meta-consciousness, that is realising to what extent and how one actually realises it or, in other words, to what extent one actualises one's awareness¹⁰.

Working in tandem, they both trigger upward-led developmental processes, making accessible, and thus likely to be transformed, what was mainly unwillingly and unknowingly

8- As explained in the first Cairo paper (De Leener, 2003). See also Clot 1998.

9- In the sense of Block (1995) cited by Myin and O'Regan (2002).

10- At both levels, content of awareness (what one is actually becoming aware of) and process (how one is really becoming aware of, in which way).

done, felt or thought in the core of professional activity. The first process, that of becoming aware, is the stepping stone to the second one (becoming aware both, that one is becoming aware of something and of the way one is becoming aware of the specific situations in hand). This second step is of prime importance and, to our mind, explains why changes may subsequently take the form of modifications in behaviours, attitudes, gestures and practices at large.

Such a complex process does not occur at the drop of a hat. The role of the facilitator is crucial at this point: in fact, his/her intervention as facilitator precisely consists in helping the subject carry out successfully these two self-centred activities. The facilitator empowers both the awareness raising related to the actual course of the subject's activity and the becoming aware of that awareness-raising. This is why the facilitator is forced to concentrate, not on the subject matter of the video, but on the activity of the self-observing subject in order to make him effectively self-reflexive in the two fields of reality, the actual activity¹¹ and the actual becoming aware of this activity. This activity of the facilitator is the tool by which he really facilitates a change process.

References

- CLOT Yves, 1998, *La fonction psychologique du travail*, Paris: PUF / Presses Universitaires de France, 238p.
- CLOT, Y., FAÏTA D., FERNANDEZ, G., SCHELLER, L., 2001, Les entretiens en auto-confrontation croisée: une méthode en clinique de l'activité. *Education permanente*, 146, pp.17-25.
- CLOT, Y., 2001, Psychopathologie du travail et clinique de l'activité. *Éducation permanente*, 146, pp.35-51.
- CLOT Yves and DE LEENER Philippe, 2003, Activity analysis and instruction to the double, *Travail Humain* (to be published in 2003).
- DE LEENER P., NDIONE E., PERRIER JP., JACOLIN P. and NDIAYE M., 1996, The future of community land, Human Resource, London: Intermediate Technology Publications, 236p.
- DE LEENER Philippe, 2003, How changes generate impacts? Towards attitudinal, behavioral and mental changes in the footsteps of research partnerships (ENDA / IFAD / NIGER), Part 1, Workshop "The Impact Assessment Study on Research Partnership", KFPE-GDN, Cairo (Egypt), 15-16/01/2003, 30p.
- DE LEENER Philippe and GUERO C., HASSANE A., TRAORÉ H., ISSA H., SAKY R, SALEY K., 2003, La validation des résultats, in *Dix années de changement local à Aguié*, Rome: IFAD, Ottignies: ENDA InterMondes, Note de Recherche Collective N°9, pp.1-12.
- HERON John, 1996, *Co-operative inquiry, Research into the human condition*, London: Sage, 226p.

11-Just remember that the actual activity is not just the performed activity, what is effectively done and visible on the screen, but also all that could have been done but failed, all that has effectively been done and was expected in this way, all one thought had been done but overtly was not executed eventually. This crucial distinction between "actual activity" (or real activity) and "performed activity" has been analysed in depth elsewhere (Clot 1998, Clot & De Leener 2003). The facilitator plays a central role in allowing the subject to relive the activity so as to become conscious all those facets of the real activity under the umbrella of the changes performed.

- MYIN Erik, O'REGAN Kevin, 2002, Perceptual consciousness, access to modality and skill theories. A way to naturalize phenomenology?, *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 9, n°1, 2002, pp.27-45.
- REASON P., 1988, *Human inquiry in action*, London, Sage, 242p.
- VYGOTSKY Lev, 1997, *Pensée et langage*, Paris: La Dispute, 536p.

Table 2
A four step procedure

Step 1: Preparatory phase	
What the staff do	What the facilitator does
<p>A contract is signed between the staff, the management and the consultant Staff explore the main features and context of work environment, tasks, activities, missions and so on.</p> <p>Two outcomes are expected from this first “appraisal”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A mental representation of what the job is (current situation as it is voiced), - A mental representation of what it should be (desired changes). 	<p>Make the situation clear by helping establish the rules of the games, by clarifying the goals and the demand, by explaining the approach and process, Collect or help collect information, Facilitate exchanges and discussions, Document the process, “Unpartitioning” or help establish relationships among possible stakeholders, Give voice to marginal standpoints, “Give change a chance”.</p>
Step 2: Single self-confrontation	
What the staff do	What the facilitator does
<p>The team chooses one typical activity, for example a planning or negotiation session.</p> <p>Two team members (sometimes more) chosen by the project team analyze their own real activity from video recorded real life situations.</p> <p>Then each worker analyzes separately his/her own working session. She/he has been given the clicker (wireless controller) so that they decide what pictures or sequence must be analyzed.</p>	<p>Help the worker relive what he/she has experienced and express (voice) what he/she analyzes,</p> <p>Help the worker raise questions to support the re-elaboration process (questions like “how did you do that?”, “I do not understand what you mean?”, “Why did you do it in this way?”, “You say this, but on the screen I've seen something else”, and so on),</p> <p>Make the worker dialogue (converse) with himself/herself (catalyze the inner dialogical activity), help him/her become aware of what he/she really does,</p> <p>Help worker bring about controversy about what he/she actually does (visible on the screen).</p>

Table 2 (continued)

Step 3: Crossed self-confrontation	
What the staff do	What the facilitator does
<p>Each of the two team members involved in the self-confrontation analyzes an excerpt (a scratch) of the video proposed by his/her colleague (A comments on the activity of B, then B comments on the activity of A).</p> <p>They have been given the clicker so that they decide what picture or sequence should be analyzed.</p>	<p>Help workers exchange/discuss effectively from the excerpt they have chosen,</p> <p>Help workers raise questions,</p> <p>Help workers make sense, disclose meaning or elaborate new meaning through helping them become aware,</p> <p>Help workers bring about a productive controversy about their job (again, from what they actually do as can be seen on the screen).</p>
Step 4: Collective self-confrontation	
What the staff do	What the facilitator does
<p>The team members involved in the confrontations launch the discussion with the whole team. They continue the discussions about their activity, but now in team on the basis of the video. They address aspects that have been disclosed by the self-reflexive process.</p> <p>Again they are given the clicker so that they decide which picture or sequence to analyze.</p>	<p>Help workers exchange/discuss effectively (purposefully, sharply) from the excerpt they have chosen,</p> <p>Help workers effectively express what they have disclosed, all those unconscious (hidden, never said) mechanisms, beliefs, rules hampering their activity and affecting their productivity in terms of impact generation.</p> <p>Help workers bring about a productive controversy about their job (again, from what they actually do as visible on the screen, not from what they believe they do).</p> <p>Help team collectively elaborate and ascribe new meanings to their professional activities, help them build changes (why change, what change, what for, and so on).</p>