**Abstract.**
In a recently published Norwegian book (Rennemo 2006) there is argued for a new action based model in organisational development. The model is based both on the authors practical experiences from doing action based programs in a number of private and public firms during the last 15 years and from theoretical studies of the different action based learning and research-traditions, emphasising the strength and positive contributions from the different ones. The model and development approach are connecting to democratic traditions in Scandinavian working life and to the "Tavistock travel" to Norway in the sixties and therefore opposing the top-driven BPR-thinking that has dominated processes of change in most organisations the last 10-15 years.

The aim of the paper is to present the model, to have a critical discussion of it and hopefully to transform it to new networks of action researchers and practitioners.

The model, rhetorical expressed as an overall model, is arguing for four values or processes that could, but not necessarily should, be emphasized in action based development programmes: This is; 1) the value of innovation and creativity (exploration), 2) the value of production of appreciated and measurable results (production), 3) the value of creating new learning and competencies both for individuals and for organizations (knowledge creation) and finally 4) the value of using and developing transformable knowledge from and back to
"the state of the art" (information). The paper will give examples of different theoretical action based traditions showing that most of them emphasise and give operative advice for some, but seldom all, of these values and even to different organisational "levels."

By focusing on these four values the action based practitioner or researcher is given a better possibility both to design and to evaluate a concrete development program. In collaboration with the organisational field, he/she is provided with a practical tool helping to focus on which of the four values are going to be emphasized, and to what extent, in the program. In the planning period of the program, it is necessary to consider all the four values to be familiar with what you exclude as objectives. This is also a necessary clarification in the contract relation between coach and client and/or other working relations in the program.

The model is illustrated as a platform or a chair with 4 legs. Depending on the arguments within or with the field, the actual program will crystallise itself into a chair of 1, 2, 3 or 4 legs. Each of them could be a perfect starting point for action based development, but obvious quite different starting points with quite different implications for the coming work. Though, the model is not a normative one.

The paper will also give some few examples from the author’s practice and consultancy showing different organisations and programmes where the values in the model have been considered to a different extent. It will also give examples of programmes where the model has been followed as an entirely model and discuss the outcome of such an approach. To some extent the paper also will give examples of tools helping to perform success when working with each of the values in the model, or legs in the chair.

**A practical entrance to the model**

About ten years ago, attending a facilitator program in Siemens Germany, I learned a simple exercise illustrating some principles when groups work to improve a production process. Since then, I have introduced this exercise in several working groups in different companies and found it very useful as an eye-opener. We start forming groups of 6-8 people and hopefully there are enough people to make at least 3 groups. One in each group is assigned as a time keeper, but with the possibility of taking part in the problem-solving of the group. A
mobile phone is excellent as a time measure instrument because of it’s accuracy in tenths and hundreds of a second. Before the groups start I demonstrate the task with one of them. I ask this demonstration group to form a small circle. Then I feed this group with 3 tennis balls in succession, starting with myself and passing them around between the group members in the same order. Each member of the group may decide which person he/she will pass to, but it needs to be the same person and the last person will pass the balls back to me. The balls cannot be delivered “dead” from one hand to another, they need to be “in movement” and they need to be passed in the same order from person to person without dropping them on the ground. Normally we need to practise a few times before the demonstrating group manages the task. Then we ask a time keeper to measure the time it takes, usually about 10 seconds.

Now there is time for all the groups without my help. I tell them that they are free to organise the production process as they want to if they follow the rules and achieve the quality criteria. I also tell them there is possible to benchmark with the other groups to find best-practice and besides I ask them to look upon the other groups as competitors. They are also encouraged to think “out of the box.” Then I tell them that their first goal to achieve is 8 seconds and I ask the time keepers to report back to me when the goal is reached. What we usually see is that the different groups start forming the process exactly like the demonstration group without much interest of what other groups are doing. After some practising, they all usually reach the goal. Then I give them a new goal, for instance 5 seconds, and now interesting things start happening. Some people start questioning the goal, some turn pessimistic, some are outgoing and eager to continue in the same way, some begin to discuss different competencies in the group thinking of how the differences may be used, some start thinking for themselves, some looks over the shoulders to see what other groups are discussing. Most groups though, find out that they have to reorganise in some way or another. Quite often they end up making a kind of a gutter or maybe even more effective, a funnel. By changing to this way of organising, they easily reach the 5 seconds in an enthusiastic, positive and competitive spirit with many celebrations. Now it is very easy to set new goals and we seldom stop before we have reached goals between 1 and 2 seconds. Most groups feel very successful when we finish and indeed they are. They have improved a process from 10 seconds to about 1!

The next step is reflecting about the whole process — what was the reason for this improvement? A summing up of the answers most mentioned are;
• We had clear goals and got immediate response from the time keeper upon our performance. We got challenging goals but felt they were achievable.
• When we started experimenting and thinking in other dimensions then we could make big steps in our improvement.
• We could improve by training and practising and we were allowed to fail. We also had a great helping team spirit with lot of fun.
• We started benchmarking with other groups and saw that the best practice shifted among the different groups.

Here, in this simple demonstration, we find a practical justification for the model presented in this paper. Summing up the experienced success-criteria, it is often quite easy to sort them on a flip-chart in a four-rooms table where the names of the four rooms are;

1) Production.
2) Information
3) Exploration
4) Knowledge Creation

In the table below I have put in the words a group of Scandinavian leaders from Coop actually mentioned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCTION</th>
<th>EXPLORATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Clear goals</td>
<td>• The need of thinking “out of the box”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ambitious goals, but we felt they were achievable.</td>
<td>• We had fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Immediate feedback</td>
<td>• Willingness in the group to give up the way of thinking we started on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competition with other groups. We wanted to win.</td>
<td>• Scary to experience how easy we started the same way as the demonstration group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE CREATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• We benchmarked with the competitors</td>
<td>• The leader (my role) obvious believed we could succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We saw another group using and developing our idea. This gave us some new ideas back.</td>
<td>• We could improve by practising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good co-operation and team spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Everybody were involved in the group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allowed to fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This simple exercise I have done in many groups and the success criteria happens to be very much the same. Can the model be then justified from other authorised sources? What about the literature and the various theoretical approaches to action based development in organisation? Before examining that, let us defend the model from a practical definition of an action based developing program, then see the model in another variorum edition.

**The Model**

What does characterise an action based development programme? I assume most researchers or practitioners would agree upon following description. In action or experienced based programmes there is the actor’s own understanding of his/her or the companies’ situation which are the starting point for a problem solving and/or the learning process. Unwanted conditions in the actors own situation or environments are the aim for improvement. Consequently, the actor remains in his professional role during the program. He/she will never become a student or a “victim”, but in lead of the production-, problem solving- or learning process. Others in the actor’s organisation are also involved in different ways and to different degrees. The practical development situation will generate questions that require search for new information, new theories or new knowledge. In that way the development of theories is anchored in and generated by practice. At the same time people involved reflect upon the ongoing experiences, both on the concrete level but also on the meta level. 

(Coghlan&Brannick 2005) about structures and underlying ways of thinking (frames) that influence the situation. This exploration of the mindsets of the actor, or what Rorty calls ironising (Rorty 1989), might be ground-breaking and gives possibilities for ‘double loop learning’ (Argyris&Schön 1978) and important knowledge creation. Creating successful learning cycles is a demanding process, not only for the coach/facilitator or researcher but for all the actors involved. It demands an attitude which Bill Torbert describes as ‘Action Inquiry.’

*Action inquiry is a way of learning anew, in the vividness of each moment, how best to act now. The source of both its difficulty and potential is that action inquiry requires making ourselves, not just others, vulnerable to inquiry and to transformation* (Torbert 2004:2).

From this description we also may extract the important processes that need to be questioned and handled in an action based programme. Usually there are some expectations of 1) problem-solving or appreciated results to be achieved; there is a need for 2) learning on both
an individual and organisational level to manage the problem solving; often the challenges need reorientations and development of 3) completely new mindsets and behaviour open to transformation and in this work there could be obvious use for 4) information from ‘state of the art’ and back again if the work is successful. In that way others could learn from the programme. These 4 processes are the same as mentioned above extracted from the practical exercise and the following illustration of the model will probably make sense.

The model could be considered as a chair with four legs and all actions in the program will originate from an interest of taking care of any of the four legs, values or processes. Different programs though, will differ in their interests or ambitions of watching the four. Important though is considering the weight the different ones will be given in the developing program and how much energy, resources and competencies there is a need for if succeeding with the ambitions. Therefore, the model could be useful when planning the program in co-operation with all those involved. The outcome of this planning could end up with a chair/platform consisting of everything from 1 to 4 legs as shown in the figure below. Of course this discussion could also be taken after finishing a program in an evaluation exercise.
Planning: Which chair do you want? - or –
Evaluation: Which chair did you get?

One-leg Two-legs
Three-legs Four-legs

You may criticise the outline of the model for giving an impression of either-or. Seldom will any of the legs be totally absent. Therefore, you will mostly have programs where some of the legs are long (considered being very important on any organisational level) and other shorter. The illustration below is more dynamic.

In this illustration you are given the possibility of expressing the ambitions you have, regarding the four processes, on a scale from zero to ten. It is natural to talk about the different activities that need to be done to fulfill the ambitions. The result could be a picture as shown down to the right in the figure. This picture is actually an evaluation of an action based management training program. In this program both the participants and the management was very pleased with the business results (P) that were achieved and their solutions were very well anchored in the organisation, i.e. almost full score. The participants
did a good job when handling the task to be solved back to the company when finishing the program, but felt they could have done much better in collecting information from state of the art (I). This could have helped when working with exploration and the creative processes. They felt having challenged themselves and changed their way of thinking several times. On the other hand they had not sufficiently opposed the internal way of thinking inside the company (E). They were very satisfied with the learning aspect of the program, both on an individual level as managers and on a team level as a group. They were not quite confident though about the way they had stimulated learning in the organisation while working with their task, and this part was given less priority in their final presentation (KC).

**Theoretical background of the model**

During the last 30 years a variety of action or experience based traditions have aroused within the organisation development field and achieved significant influence (Minzberg 2004). When examining them, they might be quite different, emphasising different values, approaches or tools. Here we will focus upon their positive contribution, i.e. what help they might give when we are working with action based development programmes in organisations.

Among the theoretical contributions you may see a tendency placing oneself under an Action Research or an Action Learning label. As the names indicate, the last one is focusing upon the pedagogical situation, on development of participants in a situation where they are working with practical problems from their daily work. The generation of local knowledge that makes life better for the participants is often the expressed main goal (Marsick 2002, Revans 1977, 1983 and Schön 1983). Action Research is often mentioned as an alternative approach to science with an expressed ambition to add transformable knowledge to state of the art. An unwanted company problem is attacked by a researcher and a company client in a spirit of equality and democracy. The researcher could be both external and internal, for instance a leader doing research in his/her own organisation (Coghlan and Brannick 2005). Some theorists have announced Action Research to be the “big brother” of Action Learning (Tiller 1999), but I would oppose such a construction. It gives a misleading impression of superiority and inclusiveness which is hard to defend after practical examinations. The choice between Action Research and Action Learning as a preferred label seems to be quite influenced by the authors’ professional standpoint. Action Research is often preferred by those closest
connected to academic institutions and the theoretical field while Action Learning often attracts those with closer ties to the practical field, for instance consultants. Sometimes you find authors with one ‘big foot’ in both fields choosing labels that do not easily connect them to either of the two, for example Evert Gummesson (2000) who connects to Chris Argyris’ preferred concept, Action Science (Argyris, Putnam and Smith 1985), because of his reason to worry that the Research-concept may be associated with positivistic traditions in science. Apart from the influence of the professional standpoint there seems to be a tendency of having a stronger individual focus in the Action Learning tradition. Besides the focus on the coach as a catalyst for groundbreaking development, individually and organisationally, is more emphasised. ‘Action Researchers’ are more often focused on the system level, for instance on big groups or the whole organisation and they seldom express themselves as coaches, more often as researchers or facilitators. The theories of learning though, are very much the same in both traditions. They very much lean on activity- and experience oriented theories from for instance Dewey, Argyris, Schön and Kolb.

In which way though, might the different traditions be helpful when working in action based programmes? The review below has no ambition of being complete; nevertheless it may show some important tracks to follow.

In most action based programmes there are usually some unwanted conditions or problems driving reflection- and action oriented processes. Between reflection and action, information from state of the art is often needed to transform this knowledge into local theories. This is illustrated in David Kolb’s learning cycle (Kolb 1984). If the whole process is successful there may also be desirable to bring the new knowledge back to state of the art, as shown in the figure below.

![Transformability of the Action Project](image-url)
This flow of information is not self-moving; there is a need for competencies and quite often I have seen that the ability of bringing relevant information from state of the art is totally lacking among participants as well as coaches in action based programmes. Among academics and researchers this dimension is better taken care of, quite naturally. They usually have access to university libraries and publishing are normally a part of their reward system. Therefore, when the program consult is anchored to academic institutions, there is reason to believe that the information process is better handled. Still, a library seminar could be an appropriate initiative in most action based programmes. The Action Research tradition is consequently a track to follow when improving the information- and theory development process. Though, I have heard Norwegian action researchers admitting that at least the transforming of new knowledge back to state of the art has been suffering (Levin 2005, Ravn 2006). According to Greenwood and Levin, action researchers share knowledge to a lesser degree than you could expect and are quite unaware of important contributions from others (Greenwood and Levin 1988:5). This is probably because of the fragmented and uncoordinated network of action researchers.

Important information work supporting local theorising is sometimes seen inside companies as well. When Siemens started up with a new global and action based strategy for management training in 1995, global, regional and local groups of leaders worked with action projects as a basic part of the training program. Both to support and get use of this work they established an intranet based marketplace where all projects where reported and used as both a knowledge base and a meeting place for discussion and problem solving among participants from different programs and countries. At a particular time when I took a check in 2002, the information base had 9 000 users, 90 ongoing and 1 200 closed projects. I know that similar efforts and systems could be found in other companies as well, but I have not seen any evaluation of their use.

If the production of measurable and economic results is an overall or important goal for the participants or the company involved, then it might be very helpful to seek inspiration in the foot marks of Jack Welsh and the management training programmes he established in General Electric in the 1980ies. Some theorists have labelled his tradition the ‘tacit’ one (Marsick 2002) because the learning dimension on both individual and organisational levels happens more coincidentally and not as a result of expressed focus in the programme. Demanding challenges in the company are normally handled over to a heterogeneous group and the
expectations of producing appreciated results are highlighted. This tradition has become very popular in North-America and is often seen in productivity improvement programmes. In the beginning of the 1990ies Robert Schaffer formulated a business improvement method, called the Breakthrough Strategy, arguing for the method in a couple of articles in *Harvard Business Review* (Schaffer 1988, 1991, 1992). The key words in his method are measurable breakthrough goals, speed and motivation. Many big companies and lines of business all over the world have imported or translated his method into company specific programmes. For instance, the national health service in a number of European countries has imported these ideas from an American relative, Institute of Healthcare Improvement in Boston, who started with their breakthrough projects in 1995. To Norway the ideas have been “successfully’’ transformed through the network of the Norwegian Medical Association (http://www.legeforeningen.no/) and at the moment it is a common development recipe to meet in a number of Norwegian hospitals. Another example: As mentioned above Siemens, the global company reengineered their management training programmes in 1995 towards an Action Learning approach. A dominating part of the different programmes all over the world was ‘Business Impact Projects’, a translation of Schaffer’s ideas. Both his book and some of his articles followed the instructions given to the participants. Indeed, there is no doubt that both inside Siemens, the Norwegian health care system and General Electric as well, you will find many success stories and great results achieved by this way of result oriented organisational development. On the other hand, it is likely that you will find some weaknesses if you strengthen the demands of exploration and learning.

Reginald Revans, both the person and the name, was obviously an important network player from who the Action Learning ideas spread in the 1970ies and 80ies, even in Scandinavia and specially among consultants. He started action based program in co-operation with Stichting Industrie-Universiteit in Belgium. The aim was management training, but later his ideas were transformed to overall organisational development programmes. The best known are those within the health care system in Great Britain. Marsick (2002) label his tradition the ‘scientific’ one, because Revans himself was anchored in the scientific tradition and to the logic of rationality. In “his” programmes people gathered in groups are taking their own projects with them or working with a common one. Many interesting results were created thorough these programs, mainly connected to the task. We seldom find learning coaches in these programmes and though the learning and creative aspects are mentioned as important these processes are entrusted the participants themselves.
If the focus switch from the production and information processes to learning there is much help to find among those who have been working in the intersecting point between action, experiences and learning, especially within the literature of organisational learning where contributions from Kolb (1984), Argyris and Schön (1978, 1996), Argyris, Putnam and Smith (1985), Senge (1990) and Argyris (2003) is natural to mention. They are all concerned about the importance of practical and local experiences and the impact critical reflection might have on knowledge creation. As a consequence they are focusing upon the “art” of listening and questioning, and thereby on the ontology of reality. We also here find a much stronger focus upon personal development, unlike the tacit, scientific and Action Research traditions where the system level normally has priority. In addition to these learning tools, this tradition is also emphasising the learning situation, questioning what could be a beneficial environment for knowledge creation. Chris Argyris (1990) theory of helping Model II-behaviour versus contra productive Model I-behaviour is a relevant example. Here we find a very strong focus upon the positive attitudes from both coach and learning fellows, that helps and stimulates the local learning processes, unlike the problem orientation highlighted in those business and result oriented traditions mentioned above. A development method, individual and organizational, build upon this positive thinking is Appreciate Inquiry (Cooperrider 1990, Cooperrider et al.2000, Cooperrider, Witney and Stavros 2003).

As a starting point for change, Appreciate Inquiry also emphasises the creation of new and positive mental models. That is why we here find help when working with the last process in the model, the exploration. Torberts (2004) concept of Action Inquiry argues in favour of exploration in development programs, Rorty (1989) gives a valuable philosophical defence for irony and self-irony as a way of overcoming the obstacles of thinking new, or what others call deframing (Dunbar, Garud and Raghuram 1995), James March (1988) presents a strategy for finding alternative actions in his “technology of foolishness” where playfulness is regarded as an important element helping to overcome our analytical, rational and uncreative way of thinking in western culture and Michelle and Robert Root-Bernstein(2003) structure “intuitive tools for innovative thinking” after examining the practice of a variety of persons in creative professions. These, and others, give valuable written help, they give understanding of the ontology of innovation and creativity, but they are not necessarily the concrete tools that may guide us from one dimension or way of thinking to another. Then, for instance, we might have better need for all sorts of art (visual, literary and music), metaphors, storytelling, myths,
marginalized viewpoints, humour, dancing and physical exercises. Exploration is about crossing mental borders. I have therefore named these types of tools “borderline tools”. They promotes ground-breaking border crossing into new knowledge by stimulating other senses than the analytical. “The artist is not a man who describes but a man who feels” (E.E.Cummings, the poet). In their study of creative people, Root-Bernstein emphasise the importance of intuition as a source for creativity and innovation, located in feelings and other parts of body, before conceptualized by the brain (Root-Bernstein and Root-Bernstein 2003). I guess we may argue for placing these source of intuition in relations, networks and collective processes as well.

**Political implication of the model**

In action or experienced based development programs, unwanted conditions in the actor's situation or environments are the aim for improvement. The actor remains in his professional role and will be in the lead of the local production-, problem solving- or learning process. If a researcher or coach is taking part in the project, this is done in democratic co-operation. If knowledge creation is a process to be valued in the program, principles of reflexivity lie with both the “coach” and the “client.” This way of working will oppose the mainstream way of organisational development in Norway the last 10-15 years, Radical Change by Business Process Reengineering. BPR is usually centralised processes, necessarily staged and run by the top management. The outcome is usually a reorganised organisation where fields of activity are closed down or outsourced, often with negative consequences upon the employees. The top down process creates feeling among the employees of being declared without the legal capacity. Unfortunately, we know that these processes sometimes are necessary, but the method should not be the only one to be taught, developed and practised in the organisation. Empowered employees on any organisational level need methods for local business or organisational development. The overall action based model may gives help for developing such methods. When local development is regarded and handled successfully as a continual process, the need for reengineering processes will be reduced. Incremental change is normally in literature regarded as time consuming with little organisational effect while radical change has a much more potent reputation as shown in the figure below. If several local processes of development are functioning at the same time, producing appreciated
organisational results, creating learning and mental breakthroughs and are connected to the world around by information processes, then the picture could be presented as the figure to the right as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of change</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different strategies for organisational development

**Radical change – the only thing that helps. BPR is the method!**

The alternative?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of change</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Model as a producing network element**

The model has no normative intention. It is to be hoped that it will function as a tool that gives the user possibilities of choosing a design for the action based program, suitable for their purpose. Besides, with a viewpoint from Actor Network Theory (ANT) (Law 1992, Latour 1999, Rennemo 2002), the model will be translated and materialised (Callon 1991) to new forms or editions when brought into play, hopefully in many new networks. This is an exciting process to follow in posterity, after published and brought into play. So far it is brought into action in 2 companies, Siemens and Coop, both on a Scandinavian level and in management training programs, and a couple of ongoing master thesis. Consequently, it is a bit early to follow the effect of the translated editions. Still, some examples are seen and one is here to be mentioned:

A project group in Siemens working with a task from Siemens Wind Power in Brande, Denmark decided to have their attention to all values or processes in the model. Their main task given from the company was to reduce installation costs by x% within a project period of
6 months. When presenting their work in June 2007, they summarised the work with these words:

The group has worked according to all the method in Action based model.

**Action based Production:**
- Achieve a measurable result by saving x% on the installation costs
- Ensure that the organization is motivated, by understanding the problem and listening to the organization

**Action based Communication:**
- Communicate within the organization to get people motivated.
- Coaching of key persons — get them to talk and get their support
- Remember to give feed back to the persons we have interviewed/ key persons
- Ensure that stakeholders are informed
- Benchmarking

**Action based Exploration:**
- Think out of the box
- Be open to the ideas/ opinions from organization. Do not jump to the result from the start
- Do not do as we are used to doing
- Knowledge sharing with the other teams
- Use some of the tools we have been introduced to
- Challenge one another within the team

**Action based Knowledge:**
- Get an understanding of the barriers in the organization that stands in the way from reaching its goals.
- Give each other constructive feedback
- Understand and learn method for project execution and follow up from wind power
- Observe and reflect about the role of the coach
- Training in project work in general and according to the BIP method (Bekkevik, Kalmar, Oskarsson, Olsen, Larsen, Søndergaard 2007)

In this evaluation we find an example of the dynamic process mentioned above, called translation. This group of Siemens leaders obviously found it more meaningful to change/translate the name of the Information-process in the model to Communication and the bullet-points tell something about the activities they regarded to be most important. Still the model gave help when planning and evaluating their work.
In Conclusion

The title of the paper addressed a question, the need for still another model. There were different reasons, theoretically and practically, for that question. When working inside different companies and consultancy firms, I have experienced both strengths and weaknesses in most of them when modeling the action based approach. For instance when working with Siemens, I experienced that the focus upon measurable results and economic breakthroughs dominated the process in a way that prevented exploration and mental breakthroughs. With this focus it is quite natural that the knowledge creation and the exploration processes were set aside. The lack of an overall model made it difficult to discuss these problems. In these programs both the participants and the program administration, where eager to use the actions as learning possibilities. It was questioned though whether the learning created the type of “more” knowledge and not so much “new” knowledge. An opposite example is Management in Lund (MiL), probably one of the strongest bastions for action learning methods in Scandinavia. MiL is a network of both membership companies and consultants and they have their own action based label, Action Reflection Learning (ARL). I have also had the benefit of working for them in different companies the last 10 years and experienced a tradition extremely clever on challenging the participants and creating “new” learning, especially on the individual level. In most MiL-programs there are action based group projects with a project host from the actual company. The project groups are always facilitated by a learning coach from MiL. From my point of view there is reason to believe that the MiL-tradition could be strengthened by focusing and structuring the production process better. This has been considered with regard to the model presented in this paper and some of the methods mentioned in the text have been used in new MiL-programs that have started this year.

When examining different theoretical action based traditions the same type of critics could be put forward. They are focusing upon several of the legs in the presented action based platform, but not all. They give good help when working with some of the legs, but we need to combine theories and models from different traditions if we want to work with all at the same time. The model gives us a possibility of being aware of this and to find adequate methods. From my point of view there is need for this model, at least in my practice. Further discussions will hopefully give more answers from other practitioners.
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