

**4<sup>TH</sup> WORLD CONFERENCE ON WOMEN'S STUDIES**  
**DECONSTRUCTING THEORY-PRACTICE: RE-THINKING**  
**METHODOLOGY**

Swarnima Kriti

Ambedkar University Delhi

**Abstract:** This paper is based on an 'action research' work (in Mardapoti, a largely Gond adivasi village in Chhattisgarh, India) on the 'gender-labor continuum in household spaces', where I, along with a group of young women and men (aged from sixteen to twenty-two) re-thought research as 'co-research *with* community' (and not *on* community), methodology (as *actioning research* and *researching action*) in the context of transforming the extant structure of the sexual division of labor in the village and the household. We *together* worked towards a deconstructive relation with the problem of the scarcity of water to arrive, in turn, at the underlying problem of labor sharing among women and men. Through the mixed group of young women and men, we tried to re-orient the young men to participate in household labor (especially that of fetching water from faraway sources). Such experience of *immersion* (not fieldwork) in community contexts and the practice of engendering labor sharing in household spaces brought me to the threshold of questioning existing set of methodologies; or perhaps the questioning of methodologies brought me to the question of praxis. The overdetermined experience of 'knowing the researched' and the 'being of the researcher' are perhaps not enough for a methodology to be feminist. One perhaps needed to engage in transformative social praxis with women (and men). One needed to engage collaboratively with the community in the researching of the problem and the actioning of research findings for a possible *feminist* future (in this case the question of labor sharing). This paper shall argue that such a feminist methodology also calls for a questioning of the strict compartmentalization of disciplines, which has also made me (re)think binaries like natural science/social science, fact/value, objective/subjective and so on. The paper in the process asks: What is knowledge? What makes knowledge possible? Is 'attachment' a hurdle to the production of knowledge? Or does it facilitate knowledge, a different kind of knowledge, albeit?

**Keywords:** action research, gender-labor, immersion, feminist methodology, praxis

## **INTRODUCTION**

The idea and argument that is being foregrounded in the paper is born out of an 'action research' work in Mardapoti (a village in Chhattisgarh). This village is approximately ninety kilometers

south of Raipur and situated at the Narharpur diversion on the Dhamtari-Nagri highway. The village has 73 households. This is largely a Gond<sup>1</sup> village (49 Gond households), with also Yadavs (10 households), Tamrakars (10 households), Muslims (2 households) and Devdas (2 households). The action research work navigated through three immersion experiences to make sense of the question of ‘scarcity of water’ and its relationship with ‘labor’ within the household. This not so obvious relationship between scarcity of water and the sexual division of labor was placed before me by a group<sup>2</sup> of young women and men who also helped me re-think research as *co-research with* community (and not *on* community), methodology (as actioning research and researching action) in the context of transforming the extant structure of the sexual division of labor. The group traversed and worked through the problem of ‘scarcity of water’ to collectively discover the knotted difficulty of labor sharing among young women and men. Through the mixed group of young women and men, we tried to re-orient the young men to participate in household labor (especially that of fetching water from faraway sources). Such experiences of *immersion* (not fieldwork) in community contexts and the practice of engendering labor-sharing in household spaces brought me to the threshold of questioning existing set of social science methodologies, methodologies that were circumscribed by the logic of knowing, whereas we tried to inaugurate questions and processes of ‘being’ and ‘doing’ along with knowing. Or perhaps the questioning of methodologies brought me to the question of transformative praxis.

## MARKING A DIFFERENCE

Having presented this paper under the (technical) session title “the nature of research and writing by and about women” in the 4<sup>th</sup> World Conference on Women’s Studies, 2018, I wondered if the “about” in this question of research carries us to debates on vanguardism, or that which also resembles the basic co-ordinates of governance feminism<sup>3</sup>. The methodology of immersions

---

<sup>1</sup> Gonds are an adivasis community, who live in Central India and speak the Gondi language. They generally situate themselves in the governmental category as Schedule Tribe.

<sup>2</sup> The group had been kept open for the young in the village, yet it had nine constant members of which six were young women and three were young men.

<sup>3</sup> Governance Feminism not only ‘has a will to power’, but ‘it has actual power’ which extends from the highest echelons of state (courts, legislatures, ministries, commissions, committees) to the whole range of private actors (corporate houses, corporate social responsibility agents, gender budgeting, NGOs) and “to the minute power dynamics that Foucault included in his theory of the governance of the self.” Governance feminists “[b]y positing themselves as *experts* on women, sexuality, motherhood...walk the halls of power” as they work closely with the state and law in the sphere of policy-making, legislation and litigation as well as in consciousness raising and

partially discussed earlier, as against 'field work' take us beyond research and writing 'about' or 'on' women. It reaches the new difficulty of co-research, of researching 'with' women. I do not, however, elaborate on any model of success. I hereby present to you *one of the many* ways of research and writing; in this case, an *immersive* way of research and writing. Thus, this paper *parts its ways with* one, research that is *on* women, two, methodologies of 'knowing' women, and, three, writings that are *about* women. Though I must admit, the paper I write and the work I embark upon grapples with the idea of writings 'by' women (considering in turn the sense of 'plurality' or originary multiplicity that would haunt women's writing), highlighting in the process the existing limits of translating 'co-research' into forms of 'co-writing'. This paper thus underscores a different feminism – a feminism marked by both *co-research* and *transformative social praxis*. It is also a feminism intertwined with post-colonial perspectives in Gond adivasi contexts.

The next section tries to develop a deeper understanding of 'action research' such that one can mark the traces of co-research and transformative social praxis in it; such that one realizes the need to make a movement from 'research' to 'action research' as also think through questions of practical philosophy, justice and well-being in feminist methodologies.

## REVISITING ACTION RESEARCH

This work does not just take to action research (as against research). It also revisits the extant and canonical idioms and methodologies of action research. The rethinking of action research, and not just the turn to action research, also contributes to a rethinking of feminist methodologies.

The efforts of psychologist Kurt Lewin to study groups and their processes, for a step towards change in the political, brought him to develop the idea of Action Research. The idea was to enter a *live laboratory* with an unknown hypothesis, methodology and result. In other words, it is about entering a *functioning human situation* as in psychoanalysis (*not* as an observer or an ethnographer, more as a participant but not as a passive participant), giving the process

---

grassroots campaigns. In their strategies there is a strong tendency towards accessing state-centered power through Law with an overwhelming emphasis on criminal law remedies and enforcement. Thus, we need to acknowledge that Governance Feminism has a dark side to it. In Janet Halley's provocative words, "[t]hat dark side includes its vanquished, its prisoners of war...[it is] Feminism with blood on its hands." Therefore, in the current legal milieu, unless feminism takes a break from itself, "it can't see injury to men. It can't see injury to men by women. It can't see other interests, other forms of power, other justice projects" (see Vashisht, 2018)

time, becoming a part of the situation and analysing the complexity of unfoldings. It is about building a certain kind of adaptability. It is about unlearning first and then co-learning *with* the ‘community’; for it is only in the process of unlearning and co-learning that one can finally (and only to some extent) solve the problem of translation between different lifeworlds (in this case, “my” life-world and the young group’s complex and heterogenous forms of being-in-the-world). The major aim that *Development Practice as an action research programme*<sup>4</sup> manages to inaugurate through the process and journey of village immersions is to minimize difficulty of translation between lifeworlds; I as a Development Practice action researcher lived at the boundaries of the two life worlds for ten months.

In this section, I shall discuss first the two known moments of the development of action research (Wallace, 1987; Kemmis, 1988; McTaggart, 1991; as cited in Carr, 2006). The first moment (between the 1920s and 1950s) was marked by the “application of scientific methods to the study of social problems” and was pioneered by Kurt Lewin (Adelman, 1993; as cited in Carr, 2006) who developed a method of testing “the established laws of social life” in practice and in terms of their practical effectiveness (Lewin, 1952; as cited in Carr, 2006), including the devising of the ‘the action research method’ portrayed as a spiral of steps, each of which is composed of ‘a circle of “planning”, “action” and “fact finding” about the result of the action’ (Lewin, 1946; as cited in Carr, 2006). The first moment remained firmly wedded to the ‘applied science’ view of the relationship between social science and social change embedded in turn in the epistemological assumptions endemic to the positivistic culture that largely dominated social sciences in the 1940s (Sanford, 1970; as cited in Carr, 2006). The second moment was marked by the ‘resurgence’ or ‘revival’ of action research in the context of educational, pedagogical and curriculum research in the UK in the early 1970s (Elliott, 1998; Kemmis, 1988; Stenhouse, 1975 as cited in Carr, 2006) that led to the rejection of a positivistic research methodology in favour of the kind of ‘interpretive’ methodologies that were increasingly being employed in the social sciences. Action research was mostly seen as a form of inquiry that utilised ‘qualitative’ rather than ‘quantitative’ research methods, that focused on the *perspectives of participants* and social actors (Kemmis, 1988; as cited in Carr, 2006) and that generally took the form of *case studies* of

---

<sup>4</sup> Development Practice is an MPhil programme offered by Ambedkar University. This course enables scholars aspiring to do action research, to work in five states, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and Orissa. These are *adivasi* belts in central India where we work with the help of a non-governmental organization named PRADAN2.

specific situations (Wallace, 1987; as cited in Carr, 2006). What also distinguished this revised version of action research was a radically different conception of its object of study. Whereas Lewin and his followers had construed ‘action’ as little more than a practical skill or technique to be assessed in terms of its instrumental effectiveness, its principle exponents now insisted that ‘action’ referred to an *ethics of practice* (as also practice of ethics), including *well-being* and *justice* considerations, which in turn, was understood as ethically informed ‘transformative social action’ through which certain values were pursued (Elliott, 1991; as cited in Carr, 2006). Practice was thus viewed by action researchers as *informed committed transformative social action* (Kemmis, 1988; as cited in Carr, 2006). As a result, action research was no longer seen as a method for assessing the practical utility of social scientific theories but as a means whereby researchers, activists and practitioners could in turn test the ‘theories’ implicit in their own practice by treating them as experimental hypotheses to be systematically assessed in specific developmental contexts. Reviewed and revised in this way, Lewin’s action research cycle was transformed from a method by which practitioners applied social scientific theories to their practice into a method which allowed researchers, activists and practitioners to assess the practical adequacy of their own tacit theories ‘in action’ (Elliott, 1991, 1998; as cited in Carr, 2006); transformative social action could now give birth to new theories; one had also moved from mere practice to praxis and from *poiesis* (i.e. making/production/repetition) to *phronesis* (i.e. reflexive doing in particular contexts) (Dhar, 2018). One had also moved from the applied science model to the process of reflexive praxis. There was, however, one fundamental lacuna. In the second moment, the community was not included in the action research. The action research question emerged from the community context (which is why the second moment is not application of knowledge produced elsewhere), say the classroom, but did not emanate from the community.

Building on the two moments described above, I hence come to the third moment. In the third moment, the action research question came from the community (and not just from the community context) and its experiences of discrimination, injustice marginalization etc.; say ‘pani ki samasya’; the community and the researcher thereafter co-researched the ‘problem’ and co-worked towards a solution. The solution integrated self-transformation and social transformation. The third moment sees action research as a modern manifestation of a much older tradition of *practical philosophy* but with which one has perhaps lost touch. The third

moment turns to (a) the old and short-lived Socratic urge to be *in* the polis (Arendt, 2005), (b) *praxis* (Marx, 2016), (c) the *coordination of brain and hand* (Tagore, 2011 [1925]), (d) *phronesis* (Heidegger, 1985) and (e) the “slave’s know-how” (Lacan, 2007; [a] to [e] as cited in Dhar, 2018) as against the hyper-separation of one, “thought and action” (Arendt, 2005; as cited in Dhar, 2018) and two, the world of knowing (*theoria*), world of making (*poiesis*) and the world of doing (*praxis*) (Carr 2006; as cited in Dhar, 2018). Action Research in the third moment is thus a form of research that understands ‘knowing’, ‘being’ and ‘doing’ in its deeper and interrelated complexity. It is through a deeper exploration of questions of ‘being’ that deeper ‘knowing’ can be attained and a powerful ‘doing’ can happen in turn.

Through immersion and living in the village one cannot but enter into a relationship with the villagers. This relationship can vary in its nature, but cannot not exist. Such Action Research then keeps space for a blurring, even if limited, of the differences between the worlds of the researcher and the community co-researchers. This difference gets blurred specifically through processes of unlearning and co-learning. Conducting a research through knowingness or through a priori axioms fails us in the creation or enegendering of new knowledge; all the more if knowledge is to be co-created. Knowingness constitutes itself as a hurdle in group work; thus to be able to move ahead we must go back, we must forget and forgo. Such research thus, does not study a community, but enables a search that the community (co-researcher) and the scholar (action researcher) undertake together.

Further, action research distinguishes itself from any other form of research through the difficult conduit of transformative social action or praxis. Action research crawls beyond mere simple, complex or analytic reading of a situation to reach a common or shared problematic. The need of reality is perhaps more than what natural, social or psychologised sciences can provide in their bounded upbringing. In uncontrolled conditions, that which recognizes dis-ease and identifies with pain, a need asserts itself for something to be done. Action research then plans to do something or perform an action in the context of the problem it encounters in the village. Though we should be clear that, an unthought, unreflected, uncritical action is worse than non-action; action research hence hopes to combine critical theory and reflective/nuanced practice to create context serving praxis. Action Research through its concrete shift from ‘knowing and doing’ to ‘being, (un)knowing and (un)doing’ brings the space of development practice and that of the university as knowledge producer closer to each other.

The greater aim of research however has been knowledge production, one that is closest to actuality, but the broader “inherited divisions of fact/value, sensory-experience/lived-experience, objective/subjective, universalism/contextualism, explanation/interpretation” (Dhar et al, 2017: xx) restrict access to real knowledge. Knowledges “need to interrupt each other, so as to give birth to *possible third spaces*<sup>5</sup>, rather than be simple add-ons which do not disturb the basic premises of each discipline” (ibid.:xxi; italics and footnote mine). As practice is interjected by theory, and as theory is interjected by practice, it gives rise to praxis. The request for functioning in the village in a certain way, does not aim or preach for an unreflective union of opposites, but an analytical shift to understanding union itself, *encore*. For example, the experience of community dining in the village can be a value laden fact. It is an experience that is both lived and sensory. It is an event that has several truths and several myths. Practice thus sits uneasily at the cusp of fact and value, sensory experience and lived experience, as also objective and subjective axes; because practice is both an off-shoot of reality and reality is in turn an offshoot of practice. Reality however is never one; reality is rather bent, dented, sometimes broken into pieces that we rather fit in our limited understandings of bineric frameworks. The naive oscillations between constructed opposites in theory have left spaces between sameness and difference as clogged and undiscovered. Thus, a moment of oneness and beyond has to be captured between the two; to decipher the best of both and yet, more.

### **FOREGROUNDING ‘OUTSIDEDNESS’ OF ADIVASI LIFE-WORLD AND FEMINIST-FEMININE ATTRIBUTES**

The action research work I undertook in Dhamtari, Chattisgarh was undertaken in a largely Gond adivasi village/context. Thus, this section shall focus on highlighting the ‘outsidedness’ of the context and the attributes I worked in/with. It hence becomes important to mark the difference of the unassimilated to foreground what and how methodologies lack. It also brings to light the difficulties of action research in adivasi contexts, in contexts where the Other is not reduced to the logic of the Same (see Irigaray, 1993). It is on such grounds that I urge for a ‘new’ methodology; one that has some ability to address the nuanced realities of this context.

The adivasi context where I worked, has for time immemorial been undergoing ‘cleansing’ in the name of development. Their form of life has been represented as primitive and

---

<sup>5</sup> It is such *possible third spaces* that I would later argue for under what Diotima calls the ‘in-between’.

understood as the *past* stage/state of a westernized modern developed face of India. In this context, the adivasi must “...retire into history [and into museumized artifacts], vacating space for more spectacular [forms of capital-centric] development...” (Chitranshi and Dhar, 2016: 4). The adivasi is, as if, the *lacking other* – the underdeveloped other of a narcissistic resurgent India, an India that lives as a split subject between hyper-eroticized egoism and feelings of inferiority – an inferiority it projects on to the adivasi. The discourse of development is derived by the narcissistic resurgent India from, on the one hand, the logic of capitalo-centrism and on the other, from the logic of Orientalism. In the midst of such a discourse and politics of development the adivasi emerges as the *living dead* (Chitranshi and Dhar, 2016) that erases its own past and present to fulfill the dream of a capitalocentric, westernized, modern and developed India (ibid.). As development creates ‘dependent’, ‘underdeveloped’, ‘psychologically malnourished’ subjects (who are made to believe they belong to the register and realm of the past, who need to be dynamic, who need to change as soon as possible and who are made to live in the guilt of being who they are), development remains incapable of accessing the life-world, experience, suffering, grief, and pain of the adivasi ‘community’. Development has created its own narrative that we as subjects have learnt to recite at every possible event; such that problems in the ‘rural’ become limited to infrastructural development and the State-sponsored deepening of the ‘beneficiary psychology’. Data and statistics about such life worlds look to be emotionally impoverished, and psychologically detached. Developmentist social science manage to see only the smooth surface workings of such life worlds whereas the Other<sup>6</sup> suffers within and beneath. Such suffering remains unknown, remains crypted. While extant natural science and social science largely lack the ability to feel pain and identify with suffering, adivasi reality on the other hand look to be entrenched in both.

Thus, adivasi logic-language-ethos remain crypted, remain outside the knowledge systems, that have created their respective methodologies. A closer engagement with this life-world reveals its experience of ‘outsidedness’. Which methodology do we then carry to these spaces? Perhaps we need a deeper understanding, a new logic and a new methodology to interact with an adivasi life-world.

Women and the woman question (especially those from adivasi contexts) have similarly remained excluded. In recent times – through the efforts of the women’s and the feminist

---

<sup>6</sup> The Other represents the inassimilable nature of the context, that which cannot be known fully.

movement in India – women have been included within institutions and within discourse; but *gendered perspectives* and *feminist-feminine attributes* still remain largely absent. Absence of women and the woman's perspective brought philosophies and the nature of knowledge into question. "In a series of influential books and articles, the traditional stance of the man of reason (independent, neutral, and unemotional) was shown to be an illusory ideal, made possible only when fundamental features of human nature were bracketed and then dismissed as "womanly"". (Falmagne and Hass, 2002, p. 2).

A masculine omnipotence has taken over the logic and lens of the world such that feminine logic (which is not necessarily the logic of femininity; the invocation of the logic of the "two lips" by Irigaray as against dry erectility of "phallic logic" is closer to what could be provisionally designated feminine logic; feminine logic puts to question two-valued logic; feminine logic inaugurates the *écriture féminine*) has got foreclosed. I talk not only about the choking tentacles of patriarchy and androcentrism but of the giant invisible phallogocentric culture that we are absorbed in. Andrea Nye's *Words of Power: A feminist reading of the history of logic* found formal logic guilty of powerful suppressions of speech/expressions that had little capacity of resistance. The constant quilting of experience in formal logic, according to Nye, is a secret desire for power and control (ibid., 2002, p. 3). Trudy Grovier finds the neutral looking norms of formal logic also serving laws of repression and silencing (ibid., 2002, p. 3). The desire for power and control, laws of repression and silencing have always had a sexual backbone. Thus, such a context requires a deeper analysis of language, logic and reasoning. Irigaray "...argues that the supposedly neutral symbolic mechanism conceals a hidden isomorphism with our cultural structuration of masculinity" (Hass, 2002, p. 71). Irigaray finds empirical evidence to state that language is never sexually neutral. *When law, language and logic that birth and raise (action) research methods and methodologies are tainted with biasness, perhaps we need a new logic and new methodologies.* Irigaray's response to such prejudice has been "towards an alternative representational structure that can serve as a counterpoint by symbolizing that which remains necessarily unsymbolized in the system" (ibid., p. 71). The structures of law, language, logic and economy that lack the touch of the feminine; the feminine essentially represents women's *bodies* through the selective imagery of flow, fluidity, indefiniteness etc. The paper thus, explores new methodologies – at the cusp of feminism and action research – that can be more reflexive in their nature.

## UNDOING BINARIES: RE-DOING METHODOLOGIES

As I create space for discussions on a different methodology, that which we (the development *practice* [not development management/intervention] community) call Immersion, it becomes important to spell out its meaning. Immersion presents itself in this paper as a constant and troubling parallel to existing forms of methodologies. Immersion builds on the realization that “reality is complex and quasi-natural” (Dhar et al, 2017, p. xx); and perhaps an interdisciplinary peeping into knowledge of reality – as also an integration of natural and human science perspectives to reality – would give us a comprehensive view. Understanding reality through the compartmentalized lens caught in the system of binaries or that of perceived opposites perhaps are not enough. The paper creates space for a holistic perspective. On most days in the village I have found myself ill-equipped in methodology to study realities that function under uncontrolled conditions (where people, time, weather conditions, subjectivities, everyday occurrences etc. are never constant). The action research work hence had to draw upon multiple knowledge systems (Psychology, Political Science, Sociology, Anthropology and so on) to cater to an overdetermined contingent reality that is constitutively created of natural science, social science, myths, lived experiences, cultural norms/values, community legislations practice etc. to reach a nuanced sense of practice as also a nuanced and reflective practice of transformation – transformation with considerations of social justice and well-being in mind; where nuanced and reflective practice is the flash of critically reconstituted theory – reconstituted not in the classroom but in the immersion field – amidst largely *Gond* life worlds. This is also important because on the one hand, this work operates at the cusp of “politics of water” (which in conventional developmental discourse and practice looks to be a natural science question) and on the other, the “politics of the continuum of gender-labor” (which again in the standard practices of gender empowerment is seen as a social science question). The work at the intersection of the two in Mardapoti necessitates the integration of natural and human science perspectives as also perspectives of theory and practice to reach an action (a care system that is both sustainable and sensitive). Reality, life and living are a conglomeration and complex coming together of natural science-social science, theory-practice, truths-illusions, facts-values, sensory-lived experiences etc. Immersion enables the action researcher to reach its co-researchers not only through ‘one’ lens (sociology, anthropology, psychology and so on) but through what lies ‘in-between’ them.

### THE IN-BETWEEN:

Irigaray in “Sorcerer Love: A Reading of Plato, *Symposium*, “Diotima’s Speech”” from her book, “An Ethics of Sexual Difference” breaks down ‘binaries’ and explores the ‘in-between’. Diotima, through her rendition of dialectics, establishes an *intermediary* as a means or a path that reaches a ‘third’ term which is non-destructive and non-reductive of the two terms but which nevertheless is a progression: “from poverty to wealth, from ignorance to wisdom, from mortality to immortality” (Irigaray, 1993, p. 21). Similarly this paper makes space for a *third*, a third beyond and yet born out of – natural science and social science, practice and theory, fact and value, sensory and lived experiences as also knowledge and reality. Irigaray through her invocation of the *in-between* urges for an engagement between thought and living, life and labor, love and touch etc. As Irigaray re-produces Diotima, she opens up reflection on the enmeshed ontology of praxis; she breaks into the reality/knowledge divide. As for Diotima, knowledge is born from reality and reality is born through knowledge. Thus to reach wisdom we would have to unblock roads of the in-between, and to attain wisdom our theories will have to confront experience. Knowledge in the adivasi lifeworlds are not manuscripts in libraries, they are living traditions that reach every generation with some gain and some loss; as reminders that are also reminders of their uncanny non-existence, their erasure by the discourse of development. In the experience of immersion there is no theory devoid of the everyday and no everyday bereft of theory; where knowledge is not restricted to questions of science or myth, but grows through engagement with emotions – one’s own as also that of the community; the relationship between one’s own and that of the community; the point where the two meet.

Knowledge is thus, partially premised upon the relationship between the researcher and the community. But to get into a relationship one needs to be in contact; one needs to be in touch; not in physical contact or touch that demands proximity; rather touching the other’s life-world. It is in this regard that during immersion the researcher stays for ten months in the village; to at least be in touch or reach the other’s (the community’s) life-world. Immersion then is a way of engagement, that which facilitates building of relationships among the researchers; especially between the action researcher and her/his co-travelers. Immersion becomes an important mode to cater to the two important words in the stated title of this session which are – “research(er)” and “women”. We understand ‘women’ in its constitutive multiplicity/plurality; the category woman cannot but operate under the umbrella of an originary multiplicity/plurality. During the

experience of immersion the researcher lives with a host family in the village and shares with them their everyday lifestyle, food habits, labor habits, language and much more. The researcher's everyday constantly rubs against the rural (most times adivasi; most times women's) life worlds. It is through such efforts and experiences that the (action) researcher connects to the multiplicity/plurality that the term "woman" carries. This complicates the intrigues of relationality.

Diotima says, "If we did not, at each moment, have something to learn from an encounter with reality, between reality and already established knowledge, we would not perfect ourselves in wisdom" (Irigaray, 1993, p. 21). Thus, wisdom in immersions is also a question of self-transformation. It becomes important for the research to consider how does the 'being' of the researcher connect to the 'being' of the community, catering in turn to the dynamics of desire and transference. Quoting Diotima again, "...Contrary to the usual methods of dialectics, one should not have to give up "love" in order to become wise or learned. It is love that leads to knowledge, whether in art or more metaphysical learning" (Irigaray 1993, pp. 21). Diotima creates space for an action researcher as an *involved* participant; for a lover cannot not be involved. She discards the process of observation without involvement, for she says "love leads to knowledge". The urge to re-learn learning is tied to the relationships in the village – relationships of trust, dependence, value, interest, love, gratitude, honor etc. Thus love, knowledge and the barefoot philosopher walk together in immersions; they walk towards transformative praxis. But what is knowledge? What is love? And who is a philosopher?

For Diotima, 'eros' – which is one of the many forms of love – is the child of plenty and poverty. Having been the child of poverty "eros is always poor, rough, unkept, unshod, and homeless" ... "yet again, in keeping with his father, eros urges for the beautiful and good, is bold, intense, eager in invention, searching after wisdom and so on (Irigaray, 1993, pp. 23). Like Eros, the one who stands between ignorance and knowledge remains the seeker of wisdom. Knowledge being also a quest for love – love for several things (beauty, wisdom, and much more) – leaves the philosopher as a 'seeker' like love. Irigaray believes that the philosopher like love, should be poor, dirty, unhoused, struggling, but curious, skilled in ruses and tricks, a sorcerer, a sophist and so on; giving us in turn an imagination that completely remains opposite to how philosophers are – a well-dressed, learned person with good manners and who knows everything (Irigaray, 1993, pp. 24). Diotima's *practical* philosopher resembles the action

researcher who is like a “barefoot waif who goes out under the stars seeking an encounter with reality, the embrace, the knowledge or perhaps a shared birth ... of whatever benevolence, beauty, or wisdom might be found there” (Irigaray, 1993, pp. 24).

‘Knowing’ born out of love, affect, care, relationality and such kinds of involvement-attachment is different for it remains inspired by what is between the two (the researcher and the community). Similarly the action or the ‘doing’ born out of such ‘knowing’ is different. It is in such light that in Mardapoti a problem of scarcity of water was peeled through questions of labor and that of care. The concern for young women who labored extensively through the day and carried heavy buckets of water from the source to their houses, lead us to question access to water as a problem than its mere availability. Having reached this self-knowledge, a group of young women and men thought through sharing of household labor in the community (between women and men). This is not a simple questioning of the sexual division of labor, it is rather a journey that urges us to take ‘care’ of the tired and aching bodies of young women trapped and struggling between household work and studies.

This paper thus brings together an experience of co-researching and collaborative collective action with a mixed group of young women and men while the action researcher was in immersion in a rural adivasi context. The transformative praxis thus engendered was constitutive of both self- and social- transformation.

## CONCLUSION

The paper thus argues for five inter-related departures in the context of feminist methodologies: One, it argues for a movement from conventional research to action research; such that one does not just research on women and write on women, but also tries to “*right the wrongs*” in women’s life-worlds.

Two, it argues for a movement from fieldwork, including participatory observation to Immersion.

Three, it argues for a movement from disciplinary silos to integrating natural and social science perspectives in action research. Or perhaps, action research requires an integration and movement beyond extant silos.

Four, it argues for a movement from ‘detached knowledge-making’ to ‘attached knowledge-making’ – thus making a case for (a) Immersion-based relational knowledge and (b) a breaking of the binary of reason-emotion.

Five, it argues for a movement from researching *on* communities to researching *with* communities, including collaborative transformation of the self and the social in group contexts (in this case a group of young women and men).

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank the people in Mardapoti, Chattisgarh (specially Savitri didi and Sukh). This action research work was possible because of their kind acceptance and constant assistance. I would also like to record my gratitude to my mentors Anup Dhar and Bhavya Chitranshi.

## REFERENCES

Carr, W., 2006, Philosophy, Methodology and Action Research. *Journal of the Philosophy of Education*, 40(1), 421-435.

Chitranshi, B., & Dhar, A., 2016, The Living Dead. In: *From Death Drive to State Repression: Marxism, Psychoanalysis and the Structural Violence of Capitalism (De la pulsión de muerte a la represión de Estado: marxismo y psicoanálisis ante la violencia estructural del capitalismo)*, edited by D. P. Cuéllar, & N. L. Junior. (Mexico: Porrúa), pp. 59-77.

Dhar, A., 2009, Sexual Difference: Encore, Yet Again. *Annual Review of Critical Psychology* 7, 168-186.

Dhar, A., (2015), "Action Research: Writing on Righting Wrongs" - [https://www.csu.edu.au/\\_\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0009/1450188/Action-Research-writing-on-righting-wrongs-Anup-Dhar.pdf](https://www.csu.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/1450188/Action-Research-writing-on-righting-wrongs-Anup-Dhar.pdf) - paper presented at Symposium on „Research and education for rural development and food security to build resilient rural environments: Australian and Indian perspectives”.

Dhar, A and A. Chakrabarti., 2015a, The Althusser-Lacan Correspondence as ground for Psycho-social Studies. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*– Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com), 12 (3).

Dhar, A., 2009, Sexual Difference: *Encore*, yet again. *Annual Review of Critical Psychology*, 7, 168-186 .

Dhar, A. K., Niranjana, T., & Sridhar, K., 2017, *Breaking the silo: Integrated science education in India* (New Delhi: Orient BlackSwan).

Dhar, A., Forthcoming, Abandonment and Abjection: Melancholy in Philosophy and Art. In: ed. Saityabrata Das, Delhi: Aakar Books).

Falmagne, R. J., & Hass, M., 2002, Introduction. In: *Representing reason: Feminist theory and formal logic*, edited by R. J. Falmagne, & In M. Hass. (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield), p. 1-10.

Haas, L., 1993, *Of waters and women: The philosophy of Luce Irigaray*. *Hypatia*, 150-159.

Hass, M., 2002, *Fluid Thinking: Irigaray's Critique of Formal Logic*. In: *Representing reason: Feminist theory and formal logic*, edited by R. J. Falmagne, & M. Hass. (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield), pp. 71-88.

Irigaray, L., 1985, *Speculum of the Other Woman*. Ithaca, (N.Y.: Cornell University Press).

Irigaray, L., 1985c, *This Sex Which Is Not One*, trans. Catherine Porter and Carolyn Burke, (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press).

Irigaray, L., 1993a, *An Ethics of Sexual Difference*, trans. Carolyn Burke and Gillian C. Gill, (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press).

Rose, J., 2014, *Women in dark times*, (London: Bloomsbury).

Vashisht, L. 2018. **Law, Feminism and Emotions: Working through the 'Legal Unconscious'** (unpublished PhD Thesis).