Our approach to innovation follows in the footsteps of interpretative dimension of innovation which questions if there is a missing dimension in innovation research - they break new ground in the field of interpretation, based on cultural and communicational studies. Innovation is often studied only as a decision-making and problem-solving process. Innovation processes must also be affected with issues that cannot be ‘solved’ or unified in a logical, linear and analytical fashion. The interpretative view is not widely understood in the field of innovation, although it would provide the potential for new insights. The goal of interpretative innovation is to discover new definitions. This, participatory process of sense making, is understood to be a fragmented, ongoing, open-ended (and multi-voiced) process of dialogue which emphasizes interaction and communication. We assume that one of the vital tenets of the participatory innovation process has to be toleration of incompleteness and distance, as well as to withstand multiple viewpoints and a lack of universal truths – there cannot be a single ‘answer’, rather multiple suggestions and proposals.

BACK GROUND OF RESEARCH-BASED THEATRE
The method for analysis developed in our research is based on the idea of drama as an interrogative reading of meanings in real-life situations. In order to understand how employees in our study created an understanding out of customers’ narratives we lean on participatory action research ideas about representational knowledge. As a whole, the participatory theatre based process made people participate in order to accumulate different pieces of information and structure those into a meaningful pattern that could be put to practical use. Through narratives (written, told, drawn and performed), researchers, artist, customers and members of an organization made a description of the events, actions and emotions happening in the organization, while also trying to illuminate why those things happen. The research objective of research based theatre was to capture, describe and explain the logic of representation in an organization. The narrative approach was first used as a tool for structuring the interactions, interrelationships and habits of people in the workplace and work community, and, subsequently, it was used as a research method for organizational research as well. We named our theatrical approach ‘research based theatre (RBT)’ (Mienczakowski & Morgan 2001, Pässilä & Oikarinen 2009, forthcoming)

PARTICIPATORY THEATRE – THE RADICAL THEATRE OF BOAL
In participatory action research (PAR), people generate new knowing together. This type of knowing is tied to epistemology, which appreciates the value of human and emancipatory knowledge. Park (2001) broadens the horizon of epistemology to include such forms of knowledge as representational, relational and reflective as well. He claims that power and knowledge are related and that ordinary people’s involvement in the research process generates knowledge for solving social problems and emancipates people to be responsible members of the community. (Park 2001, 84) Gayá Wicks and Reason (2009) point out that it is important to be aware of how access is
Devising with critical adult education and research project. The radical theatre of Augusto Boal in the use of PAR as an employee-oriented practice-based learning process within a public organization in the early stages of action research project. The radical theatre of Boal facilitates the process of discursive exploration, release and political action (Clark 2008, 404).

NEW WAY OF EXPLORING “ORGANIZING PARTICIPATORY INNOVATION”

Boal’s concept is divided into ‘Image Theatre’, ‘Forum Theatre’, ‘Rainbow of Desire’ and ‘Legislative Theatre’. Since forum theatre is an interactive theatre in which the audience has the power to suggest and make changes to events on stage, the members of the audience are encouraged to join in the action on stage, becoming co-constructors and co-actors, which Boal terms ‘spect-actor’. Using the Greek terms ‘protagonist’ and ‘antagonist’, Forum Theatre seeks to show a person (the protagonist) who is faced with obstacles and resistance (the antagonists). In Forum Theatre, the facilitator of the action is referred to as the ‘Joker’. The Joker takes responsibility for the logistics of the process and functions as a neutral link between the actors and the audience, encouraging them to step into the role of a ‘spect-actor’. (Boal 1992, 1995) This type of theatre is associated with critical adult education and reflective learning processes (Asikainen 2003). Forum theatre is scripted by a professional artist, and in our case, by the research actors from the organisation (employees and their customers) and researchers from the university as well. In a performance situation, the audience in a role of ‘spect-actors’ is given the opportunity to intervene and to become self-directed performers (Clark 2008, 404). The core idea of intervention is to create a space for democratic dialogue as well as reflective thinking (Asikainen 2003). According to Clark, quoted from his private correspondence with Iain Mangham, ‘The nature of the performance emerges in consultation with audience members. Through the active participation of the audience a performance has the potential to change from the original intent. In this respect a script initially offers a set of possibilities that the audience is free to accept or reject. As the performance commences they are empowered to take on the roles of playwright and actor simultaneously and so create something that has meaning and emancipatory possibility for them’ (Clark 2008, 404).

We have been inspired by organizing participatory innovation and searched for communication and shared understanding in the context of forum theatre. In Forum Theatre we were interested in the dental care professional’s actions when working with a patient, and, more precisely, how the young people had experienced these encounters. It was shown from the material that there was a lack of communication between the young people and the dental care professionals. When writing a forum theatre scene, the phenomenon was taken to a somewhat exaggerated level. Therefore the question in the scene remained: What are the mistakes in interaction that can be made during an appointment?

The most interesting question was how to transform the material into forum theatre. In the scene, the young patient had the role of the protagonist and the dental care workers were seen as antagonists. This creates a different situation to the original concept of forum theatre, in which it is usually the protagonist whose story the participants are examining. We wanted the young patient to be seen as the main character but nevertheless explore the story from the workers’ point of view.

CASE

The case company is a health care unit in a public organisation in Southern Finland. The age of its employees ranges from 25 to 63 years. The employees’ work experience is 25 years on average. There are 36 employees who participate, of whom two are male and 34 female. The employees’ levels of education range from Graduate to upper secondary school education. They usually work in pairs and/or alone. We concentrated especially on one phase of RBT, the organizational theatre session (number 10 in Fig. 1). It lasted for four hours in total, and the forum theatre scene itself lasted for 20 minutes. Qualitative data from forum theatre was gathered via recorded videotape (4 hours) and participatory observation of five researchers.

The scene focused on how dental professionals deal with their teenage customers. The idea was to think together about what happens between dentists and their patients during the treatment process, and why. The following figure illustrates the process of action research via RBT.

The vivid element of RBT was an...
evocative process through storytell-
ing and the interpretation of stories. It
was felt that behind the stories, a new
knowing emerged and this common
knowing became a part of those who
were engaged in the interpretation. We
then decided to try to raise the level
of relational knowledge. For example,
at the start of the theatrical interac-
tions, the employees would reminisce
about their own teenage years by tell-
ing stories about their life, using their
own photos that they had been asked
to bring along. During this reminisc-
ing process one could easily sense the
intensity of the sharing. We thought
that this connection to the employees’
own teenage years was cornerstone in
gaining knowledge through the cus-
tomers’ experiences. It opened up the
employees’ perspective, and at the end
of the Forum Theatre phase, reflective
knowledge was in the air when the em-
ployees paid attention to their attitudes
and feelings about their customers like
when they were reflecting upon their
own youth.

Contextual and situated understand-
ing was vital in a practice-based learn-
ing process enriched by forum theatre.
Making meaning and awareness of
how meanings are constructed is one
key element of transformative learn-
ing. Phase on stage reflects to the situ-
ation in real life as well as participators
imagination and events on the stage.
Aesthetic space of the research-based
theatre was a bridge from real life ac-
tions and a reflection of it. Through
aesthetic space it was possible to dem-
strate the present situation of reality
as it was experienced and it also of-
fered a place for simulations of various
situations as if it might be happening.

WHAT CAN BE LEARNED FROM A
COMBINED PERSPECTIVE?
From the perspective of organizing
participatory innovation, our study
has the practical objective to raise
awareness among participants and
we also had an idealistic goal for the
people to empower themselves in a
context of encounters in an aesthetic
space during artistic interactions. We
understand the employees’ knowl-
edge gaining during interactions as
sense making and sense breaking. This
sense making and breaking is a path to
change actions, to find ideas as to how
to renew one’s own work practises and
attitudes behind actions. Thus, study
has a strong practise-based learning el-
ement woven into the question how to
create knowing together. We thought
that an artistic approach with a narra-
tive orientation offers a framed forum
for finding out how to learn from the
customers’ experiences and ideas.

We found that the process was as it-
terative and heuristic in which turns
were taken between 1) sense making
activities of the theatre actors, the de-
velopment method designer, and the
participants of the case company, 2) man-
gagement targets of organizational
development program, as well as 3) re-
fections upon research. Seen from
the perspective of the systems and
based on action research theory, this
is a question of social structures (roles
and rules) and the functioning of these
structures. The level of the system
operates through rational and instru-
mental actions and it seeks functional
rationality. On the other hand, the re-
search process stemmed from the dy-
namics of social order, individual and
collective professional identity, which
operates more or less through inter-
pretation.

Interpretation, linked to embodied
knowledge as well as given and con-
structed knowing, is woven into in-
strumental expectations during the
dynamic of the research process. We
found that it is crucial to be aware
of one’s own position and actions.
From this perspective, we formed
three lines of research process, based
on Gummesson’s (2000) thinking
as well as action research in learning
and change. These three lines describe
(see Figure 2) the different types of the
role of the researcher as well as differ-
ent research positions in a context of
organizing participatory innovation:
1) a writer of scientific research, 2) an
actor in the organizational develop-
ment project, and 3) a constructor of
a development method. These lines in-
fect each other and produce experi-
ential, presentational, propositional and
practical knowing. In our process, we
found several methods to gain know-
ning. In the following, we attempt to
clarify the course of our process with
the help of Heron and Reason’s defini-
tion of cooperative inquires. Accord-
ing to Heron and Reason, knowing
has several nature; experiential, pre-
sentational, propositional and practi-
cal knowing. In this quote, Heron and
Reason controvert that:

“Experiential knowing emerges
through direct face-to-face en-
counters with a person, place or
thing; it is knowing through the
immediacy of perceiving through
empathy and resonance. Presenta-
tional knowing emerges from expe-
riential knowing, and provides the
first forum of expressing meaning
and significance through drawing
on expressive forms of imagery
through movement, dance, sound,
music, drawing, painting, sculp-
ture, poetry, story, drama, and so
on. Propositional knowing ‘About’
something is knowing through
ideas and theories, expressed in
informative statements. Practical
knowing is knowing ‘how to’ do
something and is expressed in a
skill, knack or competence” (Heron
& Reason 2001, 149; originally in
Heron, 1992, 1996a).

Three lines of organizing participatory
innovation are formed out of various
questions:
1) The role of researcher includes
research-related questions: Where,
when and how do we collect data
and analyse it? How do we get feed-
back from organization and how do
we give feedback to them? Is feed-
back a monologue or a dialogue?
2) The role of facilitator consists of the
questions related to the develop-
ment project and the interactions in
it: How do we organize storytelling?
What stimulates storytelling? How
do we share experiences together?
How do we interpret stories?
3) The role of constructor comprises of
the questions concerning learning
and related practical actions: How
do we use narratives? How and what
do we learn from narratives? How
do we script the stories? How do we
dramatize scripts to performance?
How do we devise stories into the-
atre scenes?

The following picture (Fig.2) illustrates
the lines along which the researcher
moves in participatory research.
During the process, the researcher en-
gages in dialogue between theory and
praxis. The cycle forms a collective
learning process for the all the partici-
track 3: organising Participatory innovation

pants. Because of the sensitive nature of this type of research process, it is important to describe the richness of the process. This richness is related to how theory and practice are woven together. We are asking whether it is even possible to transform artful actions, that is to say, gestus or movement in a form of representational knowledge (Park 2001) into text. With this in mind, we have also made a research video in which we try to illustrate the interactions not only as an intellectual and rational process but affect-laden action. In the video we have dramatized events with our heads and hearts as well. As a conclusion we point out in our Tooth troll I – research video that aesthetic understanding happens besides language also through motions and emotions in acting and imagining. The aesthetic space is full of potential variations of different plots and narratives. Aesthetic understanding emerges in the encounters of different people in a shared aesthetic space, and this understanding could be seen as a polyvocal transformation in which knowing and understanding is constructed evocatively through reading the other person’s experience. In this kind of a process, learning and knowing are a constructionist action by all participators, even those who are not directly involved in the events on stage. An aesthetic learning action aims at bounding socio-cultural present and historical process of organization’s everyday life to reconstruct the identity of organization.
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