

ACTION TECHNOLOGY CRITERIA AND DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN  
ACTION LEARNING AND ACTION SCIENCE

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Action Learning</i>	<i>Action Science</i>
Philosophical Basis	Humanism and action research	Humanism and action research
Purpose	Behavioral change through reflection on real practices	Behavioral change through articulation of reasoning processes and improved public disclosure
Time Frame of Change	Short and mid-term	Long-term
Depth of Change	Interpersonal and instrumental	Interpersonal and intrapersonal
Epistemology	Placing theories into tacit experience	Making explicit tacit theories-in-use
Nature of Discourse	Rational, making meaning from experience	Emancipatory, exploring the premises of beliefs
Ideology	Arising from intrinsic natural learning processes within the group	Subscribing to particularistic double-loop learning concerned with elicitation of mental models
Methodology	Processing of there-and-then problems occurring within one's own work setting	Processing of here-and-now reasoning, or of on-line interactions
Facilitator Role	Passive, functioning as mirror to expedite group processing	Active, demonstrating and orchestrating on-line Model II learning skills
Level of Inference	Low	High
Personal Risk	Political, peer dissatisfaction or career derailment resulting from poor project performance	Psychological, exposure of personal defenses and vulnerabilities
Organizational Risk	Moderate, needs top management and supervisory management support	Heavy, requires all management levels to expose their assumptions
Assessment	Project effectiveness, systemic change	Managerial effectiveness, systemic change
Learning Level	Second-order, challenging assumptions underlying practice interventions	Third-order, challenging premises underlying theories-in-use and underlying management's governing values