Revista Brasileira da Pesquisa Sócio-Histórico-Cultural e da Atividade

Brazilian Journal of Socio-Historical-Cultural Theory and Activity Research

Volume 1 | Número 1 | Ano 2019

ISSN 2596-268X

BROADENING THE EXECUTIVE PLANNING OF INTERVENTIONIST METHODS: THE BACKSTAGE AND ITS EMPIRICAL EVIDENCES

Ampliando o planejamento executivo de metodologias intervencionistas: os bastidores de experiências empíricas

- Carine Maria Senger[1]
- Marcio Pascoal Cassandre[2]
- Viviane Teodoro dos Santos[3]

Abstract

In this study, we propose to broaden the description of the stages indicated by Virkkunen and Newnham (2015) concerning interventions. We take into consideration the several theoretical, conceptual and methodological challenges from studies on organizational learning. For this purpose, we recovered concepts about interventionist methods through a bibliographical, descriptive, documental and comparative study of experiences carried out with the Change Laboratory (CL) and the Trans/formative Intervention. As a result, we suggest an executive planning containing the detailed stages and levels used in a specific intervention. We consider that the executive planning is successful when the sensitivity of the interventionists — concerning appropriate and dynamic decisions made between sessions/conversations — are aligned with the specific demands of each activity that is the object of the methods. Therefore, the anticipated planning and the backstage work focusing on the learning process of both interventionists and participants are considered part of the task of the ones who organize, plan and execute an intervention.

- **Palavras-Chave:** Interventionist methods; Change laboratory; Trans/formative intervention; Executive planning.

[1] Universidade Estadual do Paraná – UNESPAR. Email: carine.senger@gmail.com
[2] Universidade Estadual de Maringá – UEM. Email: mcassandre@hotmail.com
[3] Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Paraná – UFTPR. Email: viviani.teodoro.santos@gmail.com

Resumo

Considerando os diversos desafios de caráter teórico, conceitual e metodológico das pesquisas em aprendizagem organizacional propomos ampliar a descrição das etapas indicadas por Virkkunen e Newnham (2015) para intervenções. Para isso, recuperamos conceitos sobre metodologias intervencionistas por meio de um estudo bibliográfico, descritivo, documental e comparativo de experiências realizadas com o Laboratório de Mudança e a Intervenção Trans/formativa. Como resultado, sugerimos um planejamento executivo contendo detalhamento das etapas e dos níveis utilizados numa intervenção. Ponderamos que, o planejamento executivo será exitoso quando a sensibilidade dos intervencionistas na tomada decisões oportunas e dinâmicas entre as sessões/conversas estiver em sintonia com as demandas singulares e individuais de cada atividade que recebe qualquer uma das metodologias. Portanto, valorizar o planejamento antecipado, acompanhado de um trabalho de bastidores em atenção ao processo de aprendizagem de ambos, intervencionistas e participantes, é parte da tarefa de quem organiza, planeja e executa uma intervenção.

Keywords: Curricular Adaptations; Inclusion; Deaf Students; Critical Collaborative Research; Sociocultural-historical Theory.

1. Introduction

The discourse that time is constantly changing is presented within both academic and organizational contexts (Grey, 2004). Changes affect the daily organizational context and they considerably influence certain environments. In order to reformulate methods and/or to adapt the administrative processes to possible changes, managers need to develop abilities such as innovation, flexibility, resilience, agility, and reevaluation of strategies.

Correspondingly, Bitencourt and Azevedo (2006) recognize that the the learning processes in the organization management are of great value. Moreover, the scholars emphasize the complexity of the learning processes in such environment due to the amount of literature available and, consequently, due to the different interpretations about it.

Moreover, Virkkunen and Newnham (2015) provide researchers with an informative content about methodology, method and techniques to perform interventions for organizational learning. This set of theoretical-methodological tools is based on the Cultural-Historical Activity Theory (Engeström, 1987). Virkkunen and Newnham (2015) also mention the challenge of finding efficient

methods that assist the conceptual change in organizational levels. In this sense, the authors posit that it is necessary to define a methodological proposal in which a human agent is supposed to provide assistance with the redirection of the activities. Such redirection might be understood as an intervention, i.e., a "purposeful action" that aims at creating a change (Midgley, 2000, p. 113).

According to Virkkunen and Newnham (2015), there are several intervention methods that were created in order to produce a change. However, as of the studies published hitherto (Engeström, Virkkunen, Helle, Pihlaja and Poikela, 1996; Helle, 2000; Engeström, 2002; Pihlaja, 2005; Gutiérrez and Vossoughi, 2010; Kerosuo, Kajamaa and Engeström, 2010; Morselli, Costa and Margiott, 2014; Haapasaari, Engeström and Kerosuo, 2016; Kajamaa and Schulz, 2017), we understand that the results from these articles inform, in a limited way, the necessary effort, discipline and engagement for interventionists to have. Because of that, each of the intervention stages, named here "backstage", might differ according to the method applied.

The study presented in this article is based on the perspective by Virkkunen and Newnham (2015). These scholars provide examples of the stages of one of the interventionist methods, the Change Laboratory (CL). They propose three levels of planning, according to the specificities of decisions made in such processes: i) Communicating and negotiating with the organization's representatives the development of the project structure about the initial idea of the intervention's object; ii) Implementing the intervention based on the collection of the activity's mirror-data and the definition of its sessions; and iii) Planning the tasks that are supposed to stimulate the participants.

Although we value the relevance of such work, as researchers and interventionists we also understand that there is a gap in this study, since there is not a specific designation for each of the stages and levels. Moreover, the experience that we gained when planning, implementing and monitoring two interventionist methods — the CL, held at a university hospital, and the Trans/formative Intervention, held with caretakers in a public education institution.

Specifically, this article proposes to broaden the description of the intervention stages indicated by Virkkunen and Newnham (2015), by organizing the levels of planning according to the backstage experience from the interventions made. For this purpose, a bibliographical, descriptive, and documental study was conducted as a methodological approach. The research was developed from the examination of the records, which were documented during the planning meetings of the experience of the CL, and from the Trans/formative Intervention.

In order to facilitate the reader's understanding, we present this introduction followed by section 2, in which concepts related to intervention and its methods are developed. Section 3 highlights the data that underlies this work. Session 4brings backstage to our empirical experiences with CL and IT. Section 5 compares experiences. In the 6th section we propose an executive planning. Ultimately, in the last section, we highlight the arguments presented in this paper with final considerations.

2. Interventionist methods

When approaching interventionist methods it is important to define the concept of intervention. As mentioned before, Midgley (2000, p. 113) defines intervention as a "purposeful action" that aims at creating a change. Virkkunen and Newnham (2013, p. 47) expand this concept by saying that the most appropriate definition of intervention would be that of a "purposeful action, conducted by a human agent in order to provide assistance with the redirecting of the ongoing change". In sum, these authors refer to intervention as in relation to its the use of methods and planned ways.

To Virkkunen and Newnham (2013), the use of a method involves a set of consecutive steps that are previously planned and directed towards a given task. In this perspective, an interventionist method can be the result of empiric experiences or theories that provide analysis according to their nature and use. Thus, an interventionist method aims at delineating and understanding the intervention object, i.e., how and why the method achieves specific outcomes, as well as how the generalization of the results can be done and through which notions this can possibly occur.

Given the variety of existent interventionist methods to be applied to activities, Virkkunen and Newnham (2013) differentiate two categories of intervention: the change and the formative. The element that differentiates one from another is the result of the process. The outcome of the change intervention is the achievement of the pre-established objectives, and which solution can be applied to other contexts. Thus, the formative intervention concentrates on new concepts used as instruments for analysis and solution of problems. Therefore, this type of intervention allows agency to be formative, as well as the participants to be engaged in a collaborative learning, taking into consideration historical and cultural aspects.

However, in order to achieve these results, it is necessary to prepare the intervention. Virkkunen and Newnham (2013) propose three levels of planning to be applied in the formative intervention of the CL.

According to Cassandre (2012), the Change Laboratory is a simplified version of the Developmental Work Research (DWR) method. The DWR was created by the end of the 1970s, in Finland, with the objective of developing a pedagogy that focused on providing training to workers, allowing a cooperative relation between researchers and professionals. Because the DWR had been demanding a considerable amount of people and resources to the collection and analysis of data, in 1990 the Change Laboratory was conceived, as a simplified proposal, which shortened both the time spent on a research and the amount of resources necessary to its execution (Engeström et al., 1996; Virkkunen et al., 1997; Engeström, 2011).

Other variations of the Change Laboratory are: a) Culture Laboratory (Teräs, 2007): it was created aiming at understanding how foreigners used to adapt to the local society in relation to the opportunity to meet and know different culture, language, norms and mores at the same time that they preserved these aspects from their native country; b) Competence Laboratory (Ahonen, 2008): it comprehends the analysis through the CL process, aiming at the proactive development of the competencies of collaborators and staff of a telecommunicational organization; c) Boundary Crossing Laboratory (Engeström, 2001): a specific type of laboratory involving representatives from different activity systems of the Finnish public health system, who are engaged in helping children who have multiple diseases to overcome parallel chronic diseases; d) Implementation Laboratory (Kerosuo, 2006): analysis of a CL with participation of adult patients who suffer from multiple chronic diseases.

3. Data resources

This article is not only based on concepts presented. We also emphasize the data sources of the interventionist experiences that were fundamental to elaborate our proposal of executive planning, considering that each of these experiences generated an expressive amount of records that subsidized the present study.

Based on the theoretical framework aforementioned, we will focus on reporting the empirical evidences of the interventionist methods of the Change Laboratory and the Trans/formative Intervention from our perspective. This reflection will be considered an *a posteriori* movement from the one that had already been developed in organizational contexts. This is because we will emphasize the backstage of the preparation for these interventions that were implemented in public organizations.

The Change Laboratory was developed between 2013 and 2016 at a university hospital. The action proposed was a result from the demand of the Solid Waste Management Group, that needed to solve an initial conflict. This conflict assumed that employees, patients and their companions were wrongly discarding solid waste (organic, recyclable and hazardous ones) that were originated by the activity, which resulted in exceeding costs for the management of such waste. The high costs are due to the fact that part of the recyclable waste, along with the hazardous ones, was being sent to final discard in industrial landfill (Cassandre et al., 2016).

Morais and Senger (2016) point out that the data collected in the CL intervention were divided into: i) mirror data collected before the beginning of CL - mapping of the current situation with images, interviews and quantitative and qualitative data; ii) data collected during the CL process - historical data, minutes, present situation data and data to plan the future sought in other institutions; and iii) other types of data - videos / footage, audio recordings, images, subjective data, the activity system and the expansive learning cycle. Thus, approximately four hundred (400) images were collected; recorded thirty-six (36) hours of content. From these filming were transcribed, around twenty-two (22) hours of content on the CL sessions; architected twelve (12) video clips with the summary of each session; and recorded audios that generated, around twenty-seven (27) hours of content. These data were collected in the course of twelve (12) sessions, lasting two hours each.

The TI was subsidized by two moments of research held in 2015 and 2016, the TI was implemented throughout 2017 at an educational institution, within an action focused on the transformation of the activity as well as on the fortification of the learning participants. The participants of this intervention were caretakers of the third sector engaged with the campus cleaning activity. This intervention aimed at the transformation of the cleaning activity into a more economical and ecological one, as well as the subjective empowerment of participants through the recovery of historical memory, popular virtues and the “de-ideologising” [4] of daily experiences (Santos, 2017).

According to Santos and Cassandre (2018), the IT work field consisted of three research moments: i) collection of historical mirror data with focus on the activity - semi-structured interviews and focus groups with simple self-confront (Clot, 2007) ; ii) collection of historical mirror data focusing on the subject, identity profile - individual narrative interviews, focus group and participant observation;

[4] Term used by Martín-Baró (1998), in the work *Psicología de la liberación*, which means the deconstruction of dominant discourses that deny essential aspects of reality by maintaining the structures of exploratory and conformist attitudes.

and iii) conversations - fifteen (15) group sessions lasting one hour each. This experiment involved forty-seven (47) field trips, totaling approximately one hundred and six (106) contact hours, thirty (30) hours of audio recording, and three hundred and twenty (320) pages between audio and diary transcripts of field. The treatment of the generated material was an interpretative type analysis (Gil Flores, 1994; Gil Flores, Jiménez and Gómez, 1994).

4. Backstage: from the viewpoint of our experiences

In this section, we will turn our attention to reporting the empirical experiences of the interventionist methodologies of the Change Laboratory and Transformative Intervention that we experienced. Although we are dealing with two different experiences, we will begin sequentially describing the steps implemented in both, and later, we will highlight the characteristics that differentiate them.

We will treat this reflection as a posterior movement to those already developed in organizational contexts, since we will emphasize the preparation of these interventions aimed at the learning of the participants, both implemented in public organizations.

Thus, in order to reach the objectives proposed by each of the interventions, although we had as a starting point the work of Virkkunen and Newnham (2013) and the steps mentioned by these authors, our experiences with CL and TI made us see here nominate them for planning, implementation and follow-up. We emphasize that each of these stages had its execution amplified through discussions, which we are treating here as backstage.

4.1 Plan

The first step required several meetings between the team members, and between the team and the organization's representatives, to define the details understood as essential for the next step. This stage was divided into three levels: dialogues, preparation and stimuli, detailed below.

4.2 Dialogues

For the first stage, several meetings were scheduled with the staff members as participants, and others with the staff members and the representatives of the organization. Then, we could decide the seminal details to

be considered for the following stage. At the first level of this stage, several conversations were held. Initially, a meeting was scheduled with only the interventionist researchers as participants, in order to deliberate how the the university hospital and the education institution representatives should be contacted. In addition, we (the interventionists) were supposed to decide the needed explanations to be given about the work to be done. Having proceeded to the meetings, we elaborated a project containing the objective of the intervention, how the intervention would be done, what infrastructure would be needed, who the participants would be and how they should be chosen, as well as the importance of the engagement of everyone involved, so that the objectives proposed could lead to the very best results.

After the project had been elaborated, and still in the planning stage, within the dialogues level, we scheduled meetings with the representatives of the organization, in order to present our interventionist proposal. The idea was negotiated in a collaborative way, with the intent to explain aspects that had not been completely understood. Due to the fact that these were public institutions that depend on approval and budgets, for example, several meetings were necessary until the intervention could start.

4.3 Preparation

This level involved the necessary planning to undergo with the sessions and conversations. At this moment, we defined a) the object for each session/conversation, b) the needed time to develop each activity, as well as c) what the second stimulus and tools would be necessary. The main challenge we faced was to find, among several approaches, the one that was in line with the primal theoretical elements of each one of the experiences, namely, the object of the activity that was the focus of the intervention and the participants' profile. The discussions among the interventionists were characterized by proposals and counterproposals, held in a dialectical process about different aspects that composed this preparatory stage. It is relevant to mention that this planning worked as a basis, since predictions are limited. Therefore, we were not prevented from reformulating the planning and improvising in a weekly basis, due to the fact that we were dealing with such collective construction that was gradually happening in the group and because of the group. This occurred because we are concerned with agency, participation and creation. Consequently, it is necessary to understand the intervention, even in this preparatory stage, as something alive, dynamic, dialectical and therefore challenging.

4.4 Stimulus

The stage stimulus required from us the definition about the instruments to be used as triggers throughout the following stage, that is, the implementation. As stimuli, we used: a) posters in exhibitions; b) video and photo screening, c) comics, banners collectively constructed, d) forms for data collection (observation, image records and interviews) and e) artifacts registering the expansive learning cycle (disturbances diary, historical analysis diary, future vision, implementation plan and informative guide for the study on the external community). Moreover, a timeline was developed in order to register the historical data collected by the participants. All of those instruments were defined in group, after long discussions among the interventionist researchers.

Hence, we finished the planning stage by registering in a proper form how each of the meetings (sessions and conversations) would be. This form contains the following information: number of the meeting, list of the necessary items, main objective, start and end time, the theme, the intended time to be spent with each theme, tools (mirror and second stimulus), the participants' task for the next meeting and aspects to which the interventionist should give more attention.

4.5 Implementation

The implementation stage was held according to what had been planned in the previous stage, which was also registered in a specific form. The implementation of each session/conversation followed the script established in the planning stage, with due exceptions, that demanded flexibility and improvisation from the interventionists.

In addition to the preliminary dialogues of the planning stage, it is important to stress here, behind the scenes, that before each section / conversation meetings were held with the presence of the interventionist researchers, with the purpose of reviewing what would be applied in the next session / conversation. In the same way, after each session / conversation, meetings were also held, with evaluation character, with interventionist researchers together with some representatives of the organization, to ponder what happened, with emphasis on the positive and negative aspects of each session / conversation.

In TI, between conversations and other meetings, there were also other visits, which we call extra visits here. These were carried out between the conversations during the implementation phase, and aimed at the individual contact with the participants. They served both to better understand situations

during conversations and to make the necessary adaptations in planning (stimuli, tasks, time distribution). In CL, the extra visits were made by the participants themselves in other organizations, and served to collect information to plan the new activity model in other spaces, but with the same characteristics of the object of change.

Another aspect that contributed to the implementation stage was the weekly transcription of the sessions/conversations. This moment of re-listening the group's discussions was important to better understand the reports and debates, especially the most "heated" ones, wherein the interventionists could see and hear themselves, being aware of what should be maintained, and/or improved. Thus, the gradual transcription of the intervention helped considerably with the understanding of the group's learning movement and the adaptations in the initial planning. In this sense, in our planning meetings (interventionist researchers only) we tried to review what had been approached in the previous session/conversation and define what would be approached in the following one.

4.6 Follow-up

Finally, the follow-up stage, which took place only in the Change Laboratory experience, was held based on a posterior session with some interventionists and participants. It aimed at addressing the outcomes of the implementation. This session was a moment for the participants to report what had happened after the end of the intervention sessions, so we could together consider different aspects that contributed to these results.

5. Comparing the two experiences

We observe that the difference between these applied interventionist methodologies is not only in the way they are named, Laboratory of Change (Engeström, 1987) and Trans / Formative Intervention (Santos, 2017); or the transformation to which they are proposed. In addition to the information presented previously that made it possible to characterize each of these experiences, there are other aspects that are particular to each of them, as described in the comparative table below.

Table 1: Characteristics of the interventionist methods (Change Laboratory and Trans/formative Intervention).

Aspects		Interventionist method	
		CL	TI
Theoretical framework		Engeström (1987)	Engeström (1987) and Martín-Baró (1998)
Transformation focus		Activity	Activity and Participant
Intervention	Name	Sessions	Conversation
	Duration	2 hours	1 hour
	Amount	12	15
	Support	Participants visit other organizations	Interventionist researchers visit the place under study
Participants		Heterogeneous group (position/duties)	Homogeneous group (position/duties)
Intervention stages		Planning, Implementing and monitoring	Planning and Implementing
Stages of the expansive learning cycle		Mapping of the situation, analysis of the situation, creation of a new model, concretization and test of the new model, amplification of the new model activity, and diffusion and consolidation.	Mapping of the situation, Analysis of the situation and Creation of a new model.
Mirror-data collection		Ethnography, Observation, Interviews, “Pursuing the object” technique.	Stage 1: non-participant observation, interviews, documental analysis and group recollection with structured focus groups. Stage 2: individual narrative interviews, focus groups and participant observation.
Types of mirror-data		Images (photographs), Videos, Quantitative and qualitative results (tabulated data), Each former section synthesis.	Images (photographs), Videos, Qualitative results.
Stimulus		Mirror-data, panels about the activity system and the expansive learning cycle.	Mirror-data, figures, group dynamics, videos, individual reports, comics, collectively constructed posters.
Tasks given to participants		Interviews, visitation to other organizations	Interviews, ability demonstration
Artifacts		Disturbances diary, historical analysis diary, future vision and implementation plan.	Informative guide for undertaking a research with the external community, sharing of popular virtues.

Other tools	Timeline, activity modeling (past, present and future), recording of sessions in audio or video, transcription of audios, minutes and clips of each session, notes on a whiteboard, notes in a flip chart.	Keywords, timeline, activity modeling (past, present and future), recording of sessions in audio or video, transcription of audios, notes on a blackboard, notes on a notepad, field journal.

Source: the authors.

The purpose of presenting the different characteristics of each experience is to demonstrate how flexible an interventionist experience is in adapting, shaping to different organizations, objectives, profile of participants, among others. In addition, we can not rule out that the interventionist researchers themselves imprint their own characteristics and abilities in the planning, implementation and monitoring, since it is a collective work and therefore characterized by the involvement, closeness to the participants and affinity with the topics covered. However, this flexibility does not prevent the sharing of these backstage experiences in the preparation of new interventions.

6. Executive planning proposal

Considering our experience with the CL and the TI, we propose the interventionist methods' stages to be denominated as: 1) planning, i) Dialogue, ii) preparation and iii) stimulus; 2) Implementation and 3) Follow-up.

To present this proposal, we considered the theoretical aspects previously approached in this article and, also, those that mediated the CL and TI interventions, through which was possible to discuss practical aspects related to the forthcoming conflicts. Thus, we describe the expanded implementation of interventional methods from the scenes of When? What? and how? do. Bearing this in mind, we described the amplified execution of interventionist methods within the backstage perspective, as the following table shows.

Table 2: Executive planning for interventions.

INTERVENTIONIST METHOD			
Stages/levels		**Amplified Execution – Backstage**	
When?		**What?**	**How?**
Planning	Communication	Elaboration of the intervention project for communicating and approving purposes	Meetings involving the staff members; meetings involving the staff and the organization representatives
	Preparation	Preparation of the sessions/conversations	Distribution of sessions/conversations based

			on the expansive learning cycle; definition of the objective of each session/conversation; Distribution of time according to the themes
	Stimulus	Mirror-data collection; panels confection (activity system and expansive learning cycle); analysis and separation of collected data; elaboration of artifacts	Visitations to the organization in order to do the collection; tabulating and organization of the collected data
Implementation		Sessions/conversations	Checking the necessary material to be used in each session/conversation; Meetings arranged before each session; meetings arranged after each session to evaluate it; adaptation of the aspects pointed out as necessary
Monitoring		Follow-up	Meetings with the organization representatives

Source: the authors.

Also in the Preparation stage, at the Stimulus level, the mirror data collection must be performed; the creation of panels (Activity System and Expansive Learning Cycle); the analysis and separation of collected data; and the elaboration of artifacts. This should happen from visits to the organization to make the collection; and the tabulation and organization of the data collected.

In the next step, we propose the Implementation with the realization of the sessions / conversations by means of the conference of the necessary material for each sessions / conversations; of previous meetings to review the agenda to be implemented; evaluation meeting after each session / conversation; and the redefinition of the aspects pointed out as necessary.

In the last step, Follow-up, the Follow-up should take place, from meetings with representatives of the organization.

At this point, it is relevant to mention that the proposal of this formative intervention planning is not a “step-by-step” guide (as table 2) and does not guarantee that the intervention objective will be achieved. This is due to the fact that this experience is something alive, dynamic, creative and, above all, collective. In this sense, the engagement of the interventionist with all the theoretical elements that support their planning is the key point. Similarly, it is necessary for interventionists to know very well their field of research as well as the profiles of the people involved. Changes are of great importance for this intervention to be performed superficially or not to achieve at least few

transformative results. Thus, our proposal is to contribute to future interventionist experiences, if considering the aforementioned aspects.

The complexity of the initial planning is not limited to the planning itself, since reviews and weekly adjustments are subsidized by the re-listening of sessions, by the recurrent contact of the interventionist with organization representatives, participants and fellow interventionists, as well as by the interventionist's self-reflection. This broadening of the activity of planning sessions/conversations is seminal to guarantee the full effectiveness of the method and to maintain the fidelity to the theoretical and methodological aspects that characterize a formative intervention.

7. Final Considerations

It is relevant to emphasize that each of these levels of planning requires dedication and time from the interventionist in order to establish agreements with the organization, as well as with other staff members and interventionists. These activities must be done in a collective, interactive, collaborative and prospective manner, aiming at broadening the transformative action of all involved, concerning the challenges and possibilities of developing interventionist methods. This requires reflection upon the recurrent actions in order to maintain the continuity of the manifested ideas, i.e., actions that enable one to "[…]respond to sudden needs that are not anticipated for action[…]" (Cook; Nemeth, 2013, p. 321, our translation) and, at the same time, to get back to the normal function rapidly without great consequences to participants' development. Yet, it is relevant to emphasize that the result of such reflexive and collective thinking needs to be registered. Therefore, we recommend all communication and/or agreement established during the planning of interventionist methods to be registered in specific forms in order to facilitate the following intervention's stages, i.e., in order to better conduct its implementation and monitoring. Besides that, we indicate the need to think about the tools that will be used as stimulus in each session and/or interventionist communication.

Even though Virkkunen and Newnham (2015) present conceptual and practical tools to be used in the preparation and execution of the intervention's tasks, there are other tools that interventionists can define and/or adapt, considering historical and cultural aspects directly related to the activity of the object of analysis.

Bearing this in mind, we emphasize that the resilience capability of the interventionists are found, for instance, in the sensitivity of thinking fast about each activity to be developed during an intervention, between one session or

communication and the following; the necessary time; what to use as stimulus; how to encourage participation and establish and/or maintain debates; create an environment to favor the synthesis of ideas and the engagement of participants in the activity, as agents of such.

Based on Midgley (2000, p. 113), who defines the intervention as a "purposeful action" that aims at creating change, it is possible to infer that, in this case, the interventionist responsibility is to guide the group, bringing about this change. However, perhaps more challenging than putting oneself as the sole responsible for the change, is to develop it collectively, nay, to set the transformation of both activity and group in motion.

Furthermore, we ratify the appreciation of this detailed process as relevant for the development of knowledge for researchers interested in the broadening interventionist methods. The strict execution of each of the stages are seminal so that the collective and agent character of this intervention are both respected. The respect to the theoretical framework, the sociocultural profile of the participants, the polyphony that emerge from the group, the awareness about the interventionist's limitations, along with a solid preparation and planning, might considerably contribute to the expected changes. However, as mentioned earlier in this article, this does not guarantee favorable and positive results to the organization itself, but rather provokes a change in the people, who afterwards may become willing to undergo other changes.

Antonacopolou (2004) posits that the relation between learning and change should be based in the social, cultural and political contexts of the place where the intervention takes place. Accordingly, here we defend that the backstage must consider the specific traits of the organization and participants so that the theoretical-methodological tools of both CL and TI may be adaptable and resilient to the context of their use.

References

Antonacopoulou, E. P. (2004). The dynamics of reflexive practice: The relationship between learning & changing. In Reynolds, M., Vince, R. (Eds.), *Organizing reflection* (pp. 47-64). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Bitencourt, C. C., & Azevedo, D. (2006). O futuro da aprendizagem organizacional: possibilidades e desafios. *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, São Paulo, v. 46, pp. 110-112, nov./dez. Edição Especial.

Cassandre, M. P. (2012). *Metodologias Intervencionistas na Perspectiva da Teoria da Atividade Histórico Cultural: um Aporte Metodológico para Estudos*

Organizacionais. Tese de Doutorado em Administração, Universidade Positivo, Curitiba, Paraná, Brasil.

Cassandre, M. P., Senger, C. M., Querol, M. A. P., & Paniza, M. D. R. (2016). Agência Transformadora em Intervenções Formativas: o Desenvolvimento Colaborativo de um Novo Modelo de Gestão de Resíduos Sólidos em um Hospital Universitário. In: Congresso Brasileiro de Estudos Organizacionais, 4., Porto Alegre. *Anais …* Porto Alegre: SCBEO.

Clot, Y. (2007). *A função psicológica do trabalho*. Petrópolis: Vozes.

Cook, R.I., & Nemeth, C. (2013). Tomando las cosas con caCLa. Rasgos cognitivos de dos actuaciones con resiliencia. In E. Hollnagel, D. D. Woods, y N. Levenson (Eds.), *Ingeniería de la resiliencia. Conceptos y preceptos* (pp. 231-249). Valencia: Modus Laborandi.

Engeström, Y. (1987). *Learning by expanding*. Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit Oy.

Engeström, Y. (2002). Making expansive decisions: an activity-theoretical study of practitioners building collaborative medical care for children. In: Allwood, K, M.; Selart, M. (Eds.), *Creative decision making in the social world*. Amsterdam: Kluwer.

Engeström, Y. (2001). Expansive learning at work: Toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. Journal of education and work, 14(1), 133-156.

Engeström, Y., Virkkunen, J., Helle, M., Pihlaja, J., & Poikela, R. (1996). The change laboratory as a tool for transforming work. *Lifelong Learning in Europe*, 1(2), pp. 10-17.

Gil Flores, J. (1994). Aproximación interpretativa al contenido de la información textual. In: *Análisis de datos cualitativos:* aplicaciones a la investigación educativa. Barcelona: PPU, pp. 65-107.

Gil Flores, J., Jiménez, E. G., & Gómez, G. R. (1994). El análisis de los datos obtenidos em la investigación mediante grupos de discusión. Enseñanza, v. XII, pp. 183-199.

Grey, C. (2004). O fetiche da mudança. *Revista de Administração de Empresas.* São Paulo, v. 44, nº 1, pp. 10-25, mar. (disponível *online).*

Gutiérrez, K., & Vossoughi, S. (2010). Lifting off the ground to return anew: Documenting and designing for equity and transformation through social design experiments. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), pp. 100-117.

Haapasaari, A., Engeström, Y., & Kerosuo, H. (2016). The emergence of learners' transformative agency in a Change Laboratory intervention. *Journal of Education and Work*, 29(2), pp. 232-262.

Helle, M. (2000). Disturbances and contradictions as tools for understanding work in the newsroom. *Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems,* 12, pp. 81-114.

Kajamaa, A., & Schultz, K. P. (2017). From the abstract to the concrete: Implementation of an innovative tool in home care. Published online before print August, 17. *Health Services Management Research Journal*.

Kerosuo, H., Kajamaa, A., & Engeström, Y. (2010). Promoting innovation and learning through change laboratory: an example from Finnish health care. *Central European Journal of Public Policy,* 4(1), pp. 110-131.

Midgley, G. (2000). *Systemic intervention*: philosophy, methodology, and practice. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum, 2000.

Morais, H. F., & Senger, C. M. Metodologias de pesquisa: o despertar para a prática científica a partir da organização de dados em um Hospital Universitário. In: *Anais*... Paranavaí, EAIC, 2., 2016.

Morselli, D., Costa, M., & Margiotta, U. (2014). Entrepreneurship education based on the Change Laboratory. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 12(3), pp. 333- 348.

Nogueira, R. A., & Odelius, C.C. (2015). Desafios da Pesquisa em Aprendizagem Organizacional. *Cad. EBAPE.BR*, v.13, nº 1, artigo 5, Rio de Janeiro, Jan./Mar.

Pihlaja, J. (2005). *Learning in and for production: an activity-theoretical study of the historical development of distributed systems of generalizing.* Helsinki: University of Helsinki, Department of Education.

Santos, V. T. (2017). *Intervenção Trans/Formativa: Construindo e Implementando uma Ferramenta para a Aprendizagem Organizacional Baseada na Teoria da Atividade Histórico-Cultural e na Psicologia da Libertação.* Dissertação de Mestrado em Administração, Universidade Estadual de Maringá (UEM), Maringá, Paraná, Brazil.

Santos, V. T., & Cassandre, M. P. (2018). Aprendizagem Organizacional para além da Correção de Falhas: Construindo e Testando uma Nova Ferramenta. Curitiba, Pr. *Anais...*Curitiba: ANPAD, 2018. Disponível em: http://www.anpad.org.br/~anpad/eventos.php?cod_evento=1&cod_evento_edicao=93&cod_edicao_subsecao=1570&cod_edicao_trabalho=25214. Acesso em 24/11/2018.

Virkkunen, J., Engeström, Y., Helle, M., Pihlaja, J. & Poikela, R. (1997) The Change Laboratory: a tool for transforming work, in Alasoini, T., Kyllönen, M. & Kasvio, A. (Eds) *Workplace Innovations: a way of promoting competitiveness*, welfare and employment, pp. 157–174. Helsinki: Ministry of Labour.

Virkkunen, J.; & Newnham, D. S. (2013). *The Change Laboratory: A Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education. Rotterdam, NL: Sense.*