Interactive Interspection: Unpicking the Complexity of B2B Action Research

Michel Rod
Carleton University

Nick Ellis
Durham University Business School

Sharon Purchase
UWA Business School

Abstract

In any study, the link between the research question(s) posed and the research method(s) selected will influence the findings obtained and, ultimately, the usefulness of the results and the practical implications. In this paper, we provide overviews of co-constructed autoethnography and describe a variation of subjective personal introspection (SPI) that we term 'interactive interspection'– and, in combining theoretical lenses, illustrate a methodological approach that has the potential to provide a rich 'emic' perspective for those who undertake inductive/abductive, qualitative B2B or industrial network research. The focus of this conceptual paper is to describe a subjective, interactive and interspective method; and then illustrate its use in interpreting data from a series of qualitative interviews. Thus, the aim is to introduce a novel methodological approach to B2B research, while our contribution is in positing that the concepts of interspection and reflexivity are interactive and dialogical – especially in the context of B2B research with its focus on interaction and relationships.

Keywords: subjective personal introspection; co-created autoethnography; theory-practice dialogue; B2B marketing

Introduction

Extant literature positions practitioners and researchers as two separate identity groups, emphasizing the translation of researcher knowledge into practice. Yet, research is an interactive dialogic process entwining academic knowledge and practice knowledge, such that knowing-in-practice i.e., the recursive flows of practice knowledge into academic knowledge into practice knowledge offers the potential for different research approaches (Bouty and Gomez, 2010). This gap likely originates as a result of more 'scientific' approaches dominating B2B research for most of the 20th century (Miller and Tsang, 2011; Sandberg and Tzoukas, 2011). These scientific approaches focus on separating the researcher and the researched to develop models and theories to rationalize the truth as perceived by the researcher.

Our proposed solution to this arguably somewhat elitist, academically-driven perspective on research expands on the notions of subjective personal introspection and autoethnography which move theory building from cognition to practice (Gheradi, 2001). For example, the actions of our research participants should be considered equally as important as what they think (tell us during the data collection process). Too often, researchers apply analytical and discipline-based boundaries that result in isolating language from its environment, thus creating "a dichotomy between text and context" (Goodwin, 2000, p. 1490). What we are suggesting is that there is a need for a more embodied methodological approach that encourages actors to embody their perceptions and emotions in stimulating articulation of their experience through discourse, narrative and stories which will often employ metaphors and other tropes as key discursive connections between the body and mind.

Thus, we introduce interactive interspection within the action-orientated research methodologies as a novel methodology that brings together practice and cognition between the researcher and practitioner. Previous action-orientated approaches already reduce the temporal gap between theory

and practice through a dialogue between theory and practice, so the contribution we make in this paper is in suggesting:

- The introduction of an interactive interspection technique and what this means
- And how we can use interactive interspection within our methodological approaches through to improve dialogue between researchers and practitioner, thus reducing the theory-practice gap.

Thus we hope to encourage researchers to adopt an orientation towards prescience (Corely and Gioia, 2011), through combining lenses such that IMP researchers are better-equipped to make theoretical contributions that exhibit both originality as well as utility (Lepine and Wilcox King, 2010; Okhuysen and Bonardi, 2011). Our additional contribution is in positing that the concepts of interspection and reflexivity are interactive and dialogical and not the independent activities of atomized 'thinkers' – especially in the context of action-orientated IMP research (Mele, 2011; Pereira, Sellitto, Borchardt and Geiger, 2011) which emphasizes genuine interaction and relationships between researcher and practitioner.

The literature review will broadly describe our conceptualization of interactive interspection, and how this approach can contribute to practice and theory. The methodological section will give details of a research project that has employed this technique. Findings will illustrate 1) an analysis of the data from the research project from the perspective of how interactive interspection was conducted during data collection and how discourse analysis was conducted to highlight this interspection, and 2) the benefits to participants through examples of demonstrating how the process develops within the interview context. Our discussion will provide further elucidation of the method and conclude with recommendations for when interactive interspection might be considered as a methodological approach.

Literature review

We start with the premise that with respect to much business marketing research, researchers are in effect 'practitioners' with the responsibility to act, while practitioners are 'researchers' who make generalisations and theories from their observations and experiences (Coghlan, 2001). Hence, dialogue between the two can facilitate better marketing practising and theorising since it is dialogue that is central to practice-informed theory and theory-informed practice (Tenkasi and Hay, 2004). Unfortunately, the extant literature has positioned practitioners and researchers as two separate identity groups, with this separation having led to an emphasis on the translation of knowledge and research *into* practice rather than on interactive, dialogic processes that incorporate knowing and practising as being entwined and mutually-transforming facets of a knowing-in-practice approach (Bouty and Gomez, 2010). Our goal is to introduce a novel methodological approach which highlights the interaction between researcher and practitioner in co-creating insights and which draws on notions of co-constructed autoethnography and subjective personal introspection – which we term interactive interspection.

Like Miller and Tsang (2011), Sandberg and Tzoukas (2011) and Splitter and Seidl (2011), we argue that the academic-practice gap originates in more 'scientific' approaches to business research. Scientific management has been a dominant perspective in business disciplines for most of the 20th/21st Centuries, where scientific mind set privileges an Aristotelian/Cartesian epistemology in which organisational research has focused on the development of various models and theories to rationalise the phenomena of business and management utilising scientism, critical realism or universal/scientific rationalism as variations on *the* single correct, objective mode of representing 'truth' (Miller and Tsang, 2011). It is these issues of separation of researcher and researched and, relatedly, the dominant scientific approach to marketing inquiry that we choose to address in this paper.

We support Gheradi (2001, p.134) who suggests "when the locus of knowledge and learning is situated in practice, the focus moves to a social theory of action that addresses activity and passivity, the cognitive and the emotional, mental and sensory perception as bits and pieces of the social construction of knowledge and of the social worlds in which practices assume meanings and facticity". In subjective personal introspection (SPI), it is thus necessary to take bodies and what they say to each other equally seriously as what they think. Sense -making is not something that only happens in the mind- it actually starts with feelings, intuitions, senses and manifests itself in discourse, i.e., it is embodied. We regard bodily sensing, discursive talking sense and cognitive sense-making as all types of action / practice. What differentiates them is their level of abstraction; with embodied sensing being the most immediately 'practical'. What we are suggesting is that there is a need for a more embodied methodological approach that encourages actors to embody their perceptions and emotions in stimulating articulation of their experience through discourse, narrative and stories which will often employ metaphors and other tropes as key discursive connections between the body and mind.

Our approach embraces calls for B2B scholarship not to view science as merely "synonymous with quantification" (Malhotra and Uslay, 2009, p. 29) and, moreover, to bring to the B2B context studies that draw from across the organisational and broader social science spectrum (cf. Spekman, 2004) with attention to the logic of practice and hence, relevance (Sandberg and Tsoukas, 2011) but also from a discursive, narrative perspective (Makkonen, Aarikka-Stenroos and Olkkonen, 2012). We argue that this is pertinent because the mindful researcher needs to use multiple vistas and, in ultimately describing and promoting an interactive interspective approach to action-oriented B2B research, we believe this to be a superior way to engage with the 'invisibilia' ignored /denigrated by the dominant paradigm.

There are those that recognise that not all marketing research *should* have immediate and explicit relevance to marketing practice (Lee and Greenley, 2010) but our focus is on research that *does* seek to lessen the temporal and practical gaps between theory and practice. In taking this approach, we concur with Venkatesh and Penaloza (2004, p147) that markets "take on distinct discursive forms and material practices across various social contexts and over time".

In trying to make sense of such practices, we introduce interactive interspection as a novel methodological approach that ameliorates the separation between knowing and doing – between researcher and practitioner -- in illustrating a dialogue of theory and practice such that knowledge and practice are entwined. Those that promote 'action research' already have the dimension of reducing the temporal gap between theory and practice through a dialogue *between* theory and practice, so the contribution we make in this paper is in suggesting that action-orientated B2B marketing researchers who incorporate interactive interspection in their work are in a position to further address this theory-practice gap by encouraging dialogue (through interactive interspection) between researcher and practitioner. What we also hope to achieve, in heeding Corley and Gioia's (2011) call for researchers to adopt an orientation towards prescience, is that our research makes both a theoretical as well as practical contribution through combining lenses such that B2B/network marketing researchers are better-equipped to make theoretical contributions that exhibit both originality as well as utility (Lepine and Wilcox King, 2010; Okhuysen and Bonardi, 2011). Our additional contribution is in positing that the concepts of interspection and reflexivity are interactive and dialogical and not the independent activities of atomised 'thinkers' – especially in the context of action-orientated B2B research which emphasises genuine interaction and relationships between researcher and practitioner.

Attention to 'practice'

An ongoing trend in the marketing and management literatures has been the discourse around the academic and philosophical/paradigmatic status of this research and questions surrounding the limited influence that it has had on managerial practice (Lee and Greenley, 2010; Newton, 2010). 'Traditional' organisational researchers criticise applied researchers with losing the objectivity that comes with basic or abstract research, thus making them 'social engineers' rather than investigators

(Schensul 1987). This is problematic because as Mangham (1993) notes, natural sciences-based scientific methods are applicable to phenomena that are amenable to precise specification and measurement and which do not appear to assign meaning to their own behaviour. However, business networks do not subscribe to these conditions. Shotter (2008, p. 504) questions this Western, scientific approach in stating: "we have sought to make sense of humanly organized activities in organizational studies in the same way that we have approached all our other scientific inquiries. That is, we have begun by assuming that there are such 'things' as organizations 'out there' in the world, and we have conceived of them as an arrangement of identifiable objective elements, each with its own discoverable properties, each moving according to discoverable laws or principles, so that by a coordinated division of labour, an organization is able to complete tasks that lie beyond the capacities of its single elements."

In this paper we answer the call for critical research to not only incorporate critiques of existing social practices and organisation as well as articulations of creative alternatives to the status quo, but also to involve researchers to participate in theoretically inspired social change (Murray and Ozanne, 2009). Achieving this sort of change involves a dialogic recognition by marketing scholars that, both in their everyday activities and in their interactions with researchers, marketers engage in acts of 'practical authorship' (Shotter, 1993). Thus, instead of assuming that what comprises a 'good' marketing manager is a certain 'scientific' realism, we argue like Shotter (1993, p.157, emphases in original), that a good manager should be viewed, "not *as if* involved 'in doing science', but as *actually* involved 'in the practical making of history' – thus besides being a 'reader', or a 'repairer', a good manager should also be something of an 'author' too". To fully appreciate this particular managerial contribution to an action orientated research dialogue, we suggest that action-orientated B2B/network researchers embrace reflexivity via interactive interspection in recognition of their *own* 'authorial' participation in this dialogue. Such an approach may facilitate what Shotter (2010, p. 268) terms "situated dialogic action research", and thus truly dialogic marketing learning rather than just presenting marketing managers with "a world constructed for them by academics and other theorists" (Shotter, 2010, p.282) without suitable reflection on this 'theoretical world' and the articulation of the experiences that may have contributed to its emergence.

Marketing and the B2B relationship/network context in action-oriented research

As we bring these methodological deliberations to the sphere of marketing studies, we seek, in part, to build on Shankar's (2009) conceptualisation of 'intelligentsia marketing'; a regime of marketing thought which effectively represents the intersection of reflexive knowledge and non-academic 'external' audiences (Shankar, 2009, p. 685). What we advocate might be considered as a form of 'applied critical marketing' (through action) that involves practitioners and which requires the researcher to 'do' something but most importantly, better achieves this through interactive interspection. In this way, a move can be made towards a more expansive territory of academic *and* non-academic as well as instrumental *and* reflexive knowledge becoming incorporated into research practice.

The marketing field has been receptive to publishing both conceptual and empirical action-orientated marketing research (see Ballantyne, 2004; Daniel and Wilson, 2004: Kates and Robertson, 2004; Maklan and Knox, 2009; O'Leary Rao and Perry, 2004; Perry and Gummesson, 2004; Thompson and Perry, 2004; Wilson, 2004) where rigour has been exercised and where analytical generalisations have been made to contexts outside of the context under investigation. There is much about action orientated inquiry that should appeal to B2B marketing scholars, especially those from the IMP Group (e.g. Turnbull, Ford, and Cunningham, 1996), who tend to favour a case study-based, idiographic perspective on methodology, producing results that have potential resonance for members of the network under investigation as much as for marketing scholarship in general (cf. Wilson and Woodside, 1999). In support of this, an action research approach has been suggested by Canning and Hanmer-Lloyd (2007) in looking at the impact of environmental (green) adaptation efforts on trust in buyer-seller inter-firm relationships. Also, Hammervoll and Bø (2010) employ action research in improving information exchange between marketing channel intermediaries in a Norwegian grocery

supply chain. We hope to build on existing action-orientated perspectives in the study of business relationships in *market* contexts (e.g. Little and Motion, 2004). In particular, we argue that, in order to explore the potential utility of action research for B2B marketing researchers, the approach can be enhanced through interactive *inter*spection. As will be illustrated, we view interactive interspection as an offshoot of subjective personal *intro*spection. As Gould (2008, p313) argues, "the relationship between critical marketing and introspection is symbiotic, if not an embodiment of one phenomenon".

We make an argument for the consideration of interactive interspection in action-orientated research in a B2B context where it is assumed that the researcher *will* have the opportunity to influence practice in a timely fashion by virtue of conducting the actual research and generating actionable knowledge. This is as opposed to *possibly* influencing practice via the traditional route whereby the academic research is published such that the published paper can read by practitioners who choose (but more often, not) to implement this knowledge – where rather than *telling* a story, the researcher '*reports*' in a disengaged, uninvolved 'aboutness' monologic talk. Obvious limitations of the traditional approach are that, despite many journals requiring attention to the managerial implications of the work, much research produces knowledge that lacks practical relevance for managers (Moisander and Stenfors, 2009), the writing style of academic researchers tends to alienate most practitioners (Kelemen and Bansal, 2002), or managers simply don't utilise academic research findings to inform their practice (Guest, 2007) because of these translational problems of knowledge transfer or knowledge production (Van de Ven and Johnson, 2006; Shapiro, Kirkman and Courtney, 2007).

An aim of this paper is therefore to discuss the issue of the separation between theory and practice through our central position that interactive interspection might legitimately prompt a greater understanding of marketing practicing and theorising as entwined dialogic activities i.e., that interactive interspection might legitimately facilitate action research's mandate to decrease this separation. Our proposition is that if academics can 'get out more often' and participate in the practical and embodied world of managers in such a way as there is mutual uncovering of the tacit and subconscious, then some more valuable, non-traditional considerations of practical wisdom or *phronesis* (Schwandt, 1993) can be brought to bear on marketing research. In this sense, it is a call for action-orientated B2B marketing researchers engaging in research which transcends inter-disciplinary and/or inter-active boundaries (Antonacopoulou, 2010a) to be more reflexive and to attempt to get the managers with whom they are working to be more reflexive in doing work that seeks to have more of a phronetic impact (Antonacopoulou, 2010b). A phronetic impact then helps to achieve the dual objectives of action-orientated research to contribute both to theory and to practice. We are not alone in this endeavour as there would appear to be others open to the idea of more critical and reflexive and less naïve managerialist and incrementalist orientations in marketing (Bettany and Woodruffe-Burton, 2009; Brownlie, Hewer and Tadajewski, 2009: Dholakia, 2009; Firat, 2009: Hackley, 2009; Murray and Ozanne, 2009).

The next section of the article will review the key tenets of action inquiry methodologies followed by a review and analysis of subjective personal introspection as an analogue in introducing interactive interspection as a suggested methodological approach for action-orientated B2B/network marketing scholars. By reviewing the methodological and ideological foundations for an action inquiry approach to B2B/network analysis through the incorporation of an interactive interspective ethos, a case for decreasing the gap between theory and practice in action-orientated B2B marketing scholarship will be made, but in such a way as to address the concerns of those who are troubled by the ongoing and counter-productive 'relevance versus rigour' debate (Gulati, 2007).

Reflecting on action-orientated inquiry

It is our contention that in promoting interactive interspection as a novel methodological approach, that we restrict the discussion of context to that of action-oriented research – based on the underlying premises of what action-oriented research is/does, and in the spirit of attempting to bridge the research-practice gap. Robinson (1993) comments that action research is a form of self-reflective

inquiry involving the improvement of practice; the improvement of practitioners' ability to improve their practice, including relevant practice contexts; and the generation of knowledge about practice and the improvement process; suggesting a role for interactive interspection. Israel, Schurman, and Hugentobler (1992) note that action research is participatory, cooperative/collaborative, a co-learning experience, involving system development, an empowering process and attempting to achieve a balance between research and action. It involves researchers actively taking part in real organizational problem-solving by being accountable participants in problem-solving, not merely outside observers of the situation (Checkland, 2010). This also results in researchers choosing to utilise different methodologies (sense-making versus induction and deduction), different criteria and methods of confirmation (evaluation of intended consequences versus logical consistency, prediction and control), and finally a different basis for generalisation (analytical, context-bound versus statistical, universal and context-free). It is this situatedness and context-boundedness of action research that is so important. What makes action research distinct is that it deals with the specific circumstances in which it is situated, not in terms of how it compares to other (perhaps similar) situations (Shotter 2004). Thus, action researchers are required to convey their understanding and knowledge using the language of practitioners – recreating their knowledge in ways that make it useful to managers (Pålshaugen, 2001).

The role of the researcher is extremely important in initiating a dialogue of theory and practice in the simplest form by merely feeding back results to the organisation(s) being studied. Johansson and Lindhult (2008) argue that action research with more of a critical (theory-building/refining) agenda or a pragmatic (action) orientation will be a reflection of the research context. The pragmatic orientation is preferred where decisive and immediate action is needed, whereas the critical is more appropriate where critical thinking and reflection is required before implementing any significant action. They further state that the responsibility of the researcher, as well as the type of knowledge gained may, differ between the two orientations. In revisiting basic notions of pragmatism, Fendt and Kaminska-Labbé (2011) describe design-driven action research that is both relevant and creative. However, we argue in this paper that pragmatic versus critical orientations need not necessarily be a dichotomy and that regardless of orientation, critical thinking and reflection via interactive interspection (cf. Gould, 2008) is useful in both scenarios and can only assist the action-orientated researcher in negotiating multiple roles/responsibilities in generating different forms of knowledge.

Notwithstanding the numerous distinctions and refinements that occur under the rubric of action research, the key aspects of action-oriented research can be simplified to draw out the commonalities between the various approaches *to* and intentions *of* action research. McTaggart (1991) illustrates the cyclical nature of this methodological approach such that:

1. Constructive discourse among participants leads to a plan.
2. Constructive practice involves acting on that plan.
3. Reconstructive practice denotes making observations of the action that has taken place
4. Such that reconstructive discourse can occur. This is simply a reflection on these observations such that the plan can be evaluated and modified which brings the process back to stage 1 again.

Having introduced action-oriented inquiry in a broad sense, we will now turn our attention to some specific issues within this domain that lend themselves to a degree of interactive interspection in action-orientated B2B research. This necessitates a discussion of subjective personal introspection in consumer behaviour research as our foundation.

Subjective personal introspection as the impetus for interactive interspection

As a methodological approach, subjective personal introspection (SPI) comprises the creation of rich, impressionistic stories of one's own experiences regarding particular phenomena of interest (Holbrook, 2005; Olsen, 2012). SPI has almost exclusively been utilised by consumer behaviourists describing either their own personal consumption experiences (Banbury, Stinerock and

Subrahmanyan, 2012; Gould, 1991; 1995; Holbrook, 1986; 1995; 2005; Shankar, 2000; Sussan, Hall and Meamber, 2012; Wohlfeil and Whelan, 2012), as it relates to identity (Béji-Bécheur, Özçağlar-Toulouse and Zouaghi, 2012; Tiwsakul and Hackley, 2012), in the context of multisite/multicultural autoethnographic consumer research (Minowa, Visconti and Maclaran, 2012), or the introspections of consumers other than themselves (Patterson, 2012). On occasion, it has been proposed as something that should be integrated into marketing academics' research processes (Patterson, 2010) or perhaps even a novel theory – Consumer Introspection Theory (Gould, 2012). We view SPI as being grounded in a post-phenomenological orientation where there is a focus on the researcher-researched relationship, on the conceptual assumptions linking 'self' and 'other' and on the role of preconsciousness in illustrating much of the "hidden mechanisms of research" (Letiche, 2009, p. 292). A post-phenomenological perspective stresses "that there is no 'object' (the seen or observed) without the 'subject' (consciousness), and that there is no perceiving subject without something (or 'object') that is perceived……the phenomenology of perception identifies being with seeing, listening and feeling, wherein the being of consciousness is the same as the being of perception" (Letiche, 2009, p. 294).

Thus, at its core SPI utilises the researcher as subject which Wallendorf and Brucks (1993) term 'researcher introspection' as opposed to three other types of introspection: with guided introspection the researcher asks participants (informants, interviewees etc.) to introspect; with interactive introspection both researcher and participants introspect and the data arises from their interaction; while syncretic introspection denotes any combination of the three. Despite their differences, all three types involve "at least one individual providing verbal data on aspects of his/her experience that are consciously available to the introspector but not directly observable by another person" (Wallendorf and Brucks, 1993, p. 340). In fact, eighteen years after the appearance of this paper, although there has been criticism regarding the rationale behind the limitations that Wallendorf and Brucks place on researcher introspection, it continues to have an impact in introspection scholarship around consumption (Emile, 2011).

Whereas action research has been criticised by some (Grønhaug and Olson, 1999), SPI is an even more controversial research technique because it involves examining one's own mental and emotional processes related to a topic of interest and collecting these introspections as personal narratives or autobiographical essays (Brown and Reid, 1997). By controversial we mean that more hypothetico-deductive, quantitative researchers feel that SPI does not adequately addresses issues of reliability, validity and other such positivist research requirements since their view is that subjective experience does not meet generally accepted criteria for 'scientific' analysis due to its lack of objectivity, replicability, and being public. Even for some post-positivist researchers, it is seen to be "rather self-indulgent" (Baron, 2008, p. 313). It has also been claimed that SPI requires the elimination of its subjectivity bias in favour of confirmation (Woodside, 2004) in order to "overcome the fundamental attribution error, inherent cultural prejudices, and the general bias toward self-fabrication" (Woodside, 2006, p. 257) and that it fails to include sufficient complexity to "accurately explain real-life processes" (Woodside, 2010, p. 66). Additionally, it is acknowledged that there could be issues given its reliance upon the author's memories which are arguably susceptible to mental lapses (Holbrook, 2005). These controversies would appear to mainly stem from differences in what researchers deem to be *the* way to conduct research – that is, differing methodological approaches that presuppose very different epistemological and ontological orientations. However, Brown (1998, p. 25) notes "Just because introspection fails to meet the formal criteria for scientific acceptability does *not* mean that the technique is uninsightful". More recently, Brown (2012) has argued that given the continued suspicion regarded introspection by 'leading' journals, there is a badly needed rebranding effort required to avoid its expiration. Perhaps extending its use beyond the domain of consumption and demonstrating its cross-contextual utility is one means of achieving this avoidance of extinction.

What we are proposing in this paper is that as qualitative, interpretivist, phenomenological, action-orientated B2B marketing researchers, interactive interspection entails looking inwards, making explicit our subconscious thoughts, biases, assumptions and tacit knowledge and assessing our own experiences as well as assisting managers to do the same. What we are suggesting is that when

B2B/network scholars choose to engage in action-orientated research in working with managers in the field, there will be much to be gained (in terms of contributions to both theory and practice) if the researcher and practicing manager both interactively introspect – what we term interactive *inter*spection. Whereas with SPI, the consumer behaviour researcher has the opportunity to subjectively introspect because they can utilise their own introspections regarding personal consumption as data in their guise as academic researcher, we propose that when B2B/network scholars engage in interactive interspection with practicing B2B managers involved in action-orientated research projects, there is an opportunity to generate theoretical insights that inform marketing as a scholarly field of research as well as pragmatic insights that inform managerial practice in a manner through these shared and interactive interspections. While SPI denotes the researcher as the subject in the context of personal consumption, with interactive interspection, it is in the context of action-orientated research that both the researcher and the manager can reflexively engage in introspection such that these interactive interspections better inform action research's dual objectives to contribute both to theory (research) and to practice (action).

Our proposed approach ensures the elicitation of what Toma (2000) calls "good" data because it accepts that researchers will view involvement and bias as inevitable and that the aim should to collaborate with 'subjects' in order to generate findings, determine meaning and reach conclusions. Based upon these experiences there is an opportunity to create insightful interspective stories and to "interrogate the way in which [our] own perspectives and frames of reference help shape [our] questions and interpretations, as well as, most fundamentally, the very way in which the area of inquiry is framed" (Ladkin, 2005 p. 109). We believe that this is essential since in action-orientated B2B research the interactive interspective researcher interspecting with managers constitutes both a research instrument as well as a research subject/ in terms of using interactive interspections as sources of data. Gould (1995) nicely summarises why we see utility in incorporating interactive interspection into (some) action-orientated B2B marketing research in noting that it is an approach that relies on the 'reflexive mediation' between one's personal and one's research insights with the added power of 'mindful self-observation'.

Thus, interactive interspection involving the collection and analysis of data about our experiences as well as those of the managers with which we are working is critical when, through the action orientation of our research, our presence has the ability to influence organisational practice. So just as a consumer behaviour researcher can draw upon SPI to investigate personal consumption, B2B/network marketing researchers interested in action research can employ interactive interspection to gain insights that can have utility in better realising the twofold action research objectives of contributing both to theory and to managerial practice. The teleological facet of incorporating interactive interspection into one's action-orientated research means that it can force 'us' (as in B2B/network marketing scholars) to think more critically and openly about how to reduce the gap between these dual objectives and thus better realise a dialogue of theory and practice but also 'us' (as in both we academics as well as the managers we work with in action research scenarios) to take the kind of action that best serves the manager/firm since they will be less interested in making academic contributions. We argue that interactive interspection better equips us not only to be able to conduct better research in alignment with the needs of those business networks within which we work, but also in recounting the stories of what we have done/we are doing in order to more fully explore 'knowing' and its relation to theory such that interactive interspection can contribute to achieving both aims.

Reflection, co-constructed autoethnography and reflexivity

We argue that the critical reflection inherent in interactive interspection should also be a component of action–orientated research in B2B/ network contexts. After all, action researchers are encouraged to employ 'critical subjectivity' in that they must notice their frames of reference, as well as their political, racial, cultural and/or gendered orientation, and question their routinised reactions to people and events (Ladkin, 2005). Marshall (2001) takes this accounting for subjectivity further, asking us to pay attention to how we perceive, make meaning, frame issues, and make assumptions as well as reach outside ourselves by actively questioning or raising issues with others in order to 'test' and

develop ideas. Essentially, for critical subjectivity to play a significant role in action-orientated research, it should assume an interactive interspective orientation since subjectivity and reflection both involve noticing the way in which our consciousness moulds and contributes to the context of the inquiry (Ladkin, 2005). A lack of reflexivity and reflection has been shown to adversely impact on the ability to introduce action-orientated research into strong marketing-oriented organisations (Kates and Robertson, 2004).

The ontological, epistemological and axiological assumptions of interactive interspection encompass the socially-constructed nature of multiple realities, the proximity and interaction of researcher and researched along with the inherent value-ladenness and bias of the research process (Lincoln and Guba, 1985), resulting in findings that should not necessarily be evaluated as being either 'true' or 'false', but rather as being useful or not (Shankar, 2000). With respect to subjective personal introspection, from which we derive interactive interspection, Holbrook states "SPI amounts to a form of participant observation or observant participation in one's own life. In effect, SPI constructs a sort of autoethnography via which the author enjoys privileged access to the relevant phenomena of interest" (Holbrook, 2005, p. 45). 'Autoethnography' involves the researcher's lived experiences (Canniford, 2005) and an autoethnographic, reflexive lens through which one's research is experienced can help to overcome the methodological difficulties associated with revealing the tacit nature of situated learning and the associated development of situated practice (Kempster and Stewart, 2010). Kempster and Stewart (2010) note that there is an absence of autoethnography from practising managers in the literature, so the incorporation of interactive interspection in action-orientated B2B research where the researcher is expected to have an impact on practice would seem to make sense.

Subsequent work by Kempster extends the idea of autoethnography to one of co-constructed autoethnography where the researcher is required to be open to interrogation by co-authors, thus creating a dynamic process where researchers become highly reflexive of their social experiences through iterative probing of emerging narratives with related theory in developing interpretive observations of social practice (Kempster and Iszatt-White, 2012). It is this co-creation that is a hallmark of interactive interspection since in action-oriented research, the co-author is the manager – so we have reflexive, probing dialogue between researcher and practitioner mutually shaping interpretations of "what is actually going on". One might ask what distinguishes co-created autoethnography from our proposed interactive interspection? Here, we would argue that the former tends to connect the personal to cultural identity in seeking to understand experiences whereas with the latter, as a form of interpretive phenomenology, and being aware of context, we propose that interactive interspection seeks to explore individuals' experiences (both researcher and practitioner) without *necessarily* linking experiences to cultural identity (Gill, 2014). This is evident in the recent autoethnographic work of Empson (2012) who illustrated in detail how in her attempt to bridge the research-practice divide, her sustained engagement with management practitioners led to pronounced identity conflict. Interactive interspection acknowledges that this identity conflict may very well occur, and it is certainly something that can and should be discussed between researcher and manager, but it is not the focal story that should be told. Rather it is something that can and should be acknowledged in the co-creating interpretations of experience. Interactive interspection is just as much about the managers probing the researcher as it is the researcher probing the manager.

In telling her own story in her ethnographic research, Berger (2001) notes that autoethnography has the benefits of increasing the rapport between her and her participants by allowing her to be more empathetic towards those participating in her research but also in enhancing their openness as well. Learmonth and Humphreys (1011) use autoethnography to tell their stories about their academic identities as being troubling from a Jekyll and Hyde perspective, however, in writing their paper, their storytelling and analysis relies upon sharing these experiences with one another. We would argue that in both these cases, this amounts to a form of interactive interspection. Through interactive interspection, we are hopefully better able to combine autoethnographic stories from managers as well as from ourselves. This is the hallmark of interactive interspection since it involves shared reflection, and mutual questioning. Because in this context, data comprise our own experiences (introspections) as well as those derived from interactively interspecting with the B2B/network managers with whom

we are working when we engage in action-orientated B2B/network research, Jorgensen (1989) states that we are in a position to question ourselves and act far more critically than would be the case with others. Karra and Phillips (2008) note that an autoethnographic approach possesses four notable strengths: ease of access; reduced resource requirements; ease of establishing trust and rapport; and reduced problems with translation. However, at the same time it also involves three important issues that may require attention: the lack of critical distance; role conflict; and the limits of serendipity. This lack of critical distance and presence of role conflict would probably constitute the bulk of interspective activity when one is attempting to reconcile the multiple and possibly conflicting roles and responsibilities in action-orientated B2B/network research since the action-orientated B2B/network researcher wants to make contributions to both theory and practice while the B2B manager will simply want 'action' that helps to improve his/her practice. Thus, interactive interspection goes some way to addressing these limitations of SPI/autoethnography in that issues of critical distance, role conflict and the limits of serendipity can be mitigated when there is another to question assumptions and share in reflection. In interactive interspection, one's introspections are shared, challenged, negotiated with the other party.

Since we are proposing that interactive interspection is an extension of subjective personal introspection, and that the latter has been offered as a methodological approach that involves reflection and reflexivity, we turn our attention now to notions of reflection and reflexivity. Cunliffe (2002, p. 38) argues that whereas reflection is frequently viewed as "a systematic thought process concerned with simplifying experience by searching for patterns, logic, and order, reflexivity means complexifying thinking or experience by exposing contradictions, doubts, dilemmas, and possibilities". Holland (1999) argues that reflexivity involves reflecting on the manner by which research is conducted and understanding how the research process itself influences outcomes (which we argue is particularly relevant in the context of action-orientated B2B/network research where researcher involvement in the study of the organisation is *expected* to influence ongoing practice and outcomes). It involves questioning dominant disciplinary paradigms and looking across paradigmatic and disciplinary boundaries for help while questioning and evaluating existing systems of knowledge and their association with interest groups and power. Bryman and Cassell (2006) take a broader view of reflexivity in describing it as being "sensitive to the significance of the researcher for the research process, so that the researcher is seen as implicated in the data that are generated by virtue of his or her involvement in data collection and interpretation." (p. 46). Cunliffe (2003) argues that reflexive researchers question the philosophical and methodological certainty associated with the objectives of much social science research in representing the world in absolute terms while Bryman and Cassell (2006) describe researchers engaging in methodological self-consciousness and potentially, self-criticism as 'methodological reflexivity'. Johnson and Duberley (2003) illustrate three different reflexive perspectives including: 1) researchers evaluating and critiquing the use of their choice of methodology, 2) examining their inherent metatheoretical presumptions and allowing self-knowledge in considering alternate possibilities to explain phenomena, and 3) revealing the ways in which knowledge claims are generated while querying their legitimacy in suggesting additional possibilities.

Perhaps some will view interactive interspection as simply a technique – a process for articulating the thoughts of both the action researcher and manager engaged in the research process such that these articulated interspections are considered in the analysis of data and presentation of implications – and by extension in the actions undertaken by the action-orientated research…aka 'in practice'. However, beyond the technical aspects of subjectively and interactively interspecting, our proposed methodological approach can also perhaps be thought of within the domain of phenomenological, ontological and epistemological discourses of consciousness and how a shared exploration of researcher-manager consciousness might have a positive impact on both the refinement of theory/knowing as well as contributing to the action/practice goals in the context of action-orientated research. Having positioned interactive interspection within the broader context of reflexivity and essentially positioning it as 'shared reflexivity', we will now try to summarise our call for an interactive interspective approach to action-orientated B2B and network research.

Towards interactive interspection

What we have argued is that interactive interspection involves reflexive dialogue between the B2B researcher engaged in action research alongside B2B marketing practitioners where the goal is to gain theoretical insights and improve managerial practice simultaneously. Our experiences and the tools we use to make sense of them are intersubjectively constructed, thus any general idea of practice is grounded ontologically in everyday knowledge and action (Bjørkeng, Clegg and Pitsis, 2009). Thus, one of our contributions is in positing that the concepts of interspection and reflexivity are interactive and dialogical and not the independent activities of atomised 'thinkers' – especially in the context of action-orientated B2B research which emphasises genuine interaction and relationships between researcher and practitioner.

In order to summon the resources and methods for practising *interspection*, it is necessary to go back to ethnomethodology and its phenomenological roots. Ethnomethodology was an early movement within interpretivist sociology dedicated to practical accounts of social reality in contrast to 'absolutist', objective or structural functionalist approaches, which were dedicated to a putatively superior (to any practical or 'commonsensical') scientific account of social reality. Rawls (2008) cites Garfinkel's original positioning of ethnomethodology as a theory of communication, organization and information that necessitates mutual understanding (orienting objects, meaning, and identities) in interactions, and mutual orientation to taken-for-granted methods of sense-making. Ethnomethodology or 'phenomenological interactionism' focused on the practical rationality and everyday reality of the subjectively meaningful or 'commonsensical' world as experienced by actors and as described in actor's terms. It was the pioneer in "taking everyday life (interaction) as the primary reality of man" (Douglas, 1971: 18). Ethnomethodology adopted Husserl's phenomenological method of epoché; a form of introspection requiring 'bracketing' of sense-making presuppositions or interpretive schemas by making explicit to consciousness underlying, ineffable or tacit assumptions that frame reality and accomplish action scenes (Rawls, 2008).

This is a kind of 'second order' sense-making (Tsoukas and Hatch, 2001) that involves the suspension of commonsensical lenses in order to examine phenomena as framed by subjectively meaningful presuppositions. Ethnomethodology involves, therefore, coming to see the way one sees things in a kind of holistic, practical-meditative process. Ethnomethodology is thus a method of introspection, simply because it requires using the 'theoretic stance' of making conscious and explicit sense of subconscious, tacit sense-making frames (Douglas, 1971). It involves bringing into view 'taken-for-granted', tacit 'paradigms' (Kuhn, 1962) that configure interpretations of realities. Thus, in the context of action-orientated B2B/network research, we are suggesting that interactive interspection is a vehicle for researcher and practitioner to make conscious and explicit all that is tacit/subconscious in their attempt to generate novel theory while having a direct impact on managerial practice.

Interactive interspection thus draws from ethnomethodology and provides more challenges than purely cognitively oriented approaches to sense-making. Interspection is more holistic and interactive and requires discursive sense-making to be treated as equally important to cognitive sense-making. Thus, sensory, instinctive, emotional, and intuitive sense-making along with discursive sense-making (narrative, metaphoric and other tropal) would need to be accounted for as much as psychological and cognitive sense-making influences (Turner, 1974). Thus, interactive interspection's shared RAR (reflection, autoethnography and reflexivity) approach has embodied (felt), discursive (communicated) and cognitive (thought) levels - it therefore, involves combinations of situated and contextual emotions, sensory perceptions, symbolic interpretations and bounded rationality. It further requires that action orientated B2B researchers and the managers with whom they work would be expected to examine the ethnomethods of the other. This means an expectation that each would co-operatively involve themselves in making explicit the tacit/subconscious of the other i.e., a determination to put oneself 'into the shoes' of the other. The interactive interspector will need to anticipate meaning interaction, enact meaningful interactions and tell stories/ re-enact about what was said that optimise outcomes.

Using interactive interspection to 'know'/'do' action-oriented B2B/network research

Recall Checkland's (2010) point that an action research approach involves researchers taking part in genuine organizational problem-solving by being active and accountable participants in this problem-solving rather than being outside observers of the situation. This provides support for the idea that incorporation of interactive interspection into one's action-orientated research might, in fact, augment this accountability in organisational problem-solving by helping researchers to genuinely think about the multiple roles they assume in order to better realise both the academic (theory) and practitioner (action) facets of their research. The use of interactive interspection can thereby address the tendency for critical thought to privilege "the external analysis of events over their internal construction" (Gould, 2008, p323).

Greenwood (2002, pp. 130-131) states: "conducting [action] research means developing habits of counterintuitive thinking, questioning definitions and premises, linking findings and process analyses to other cases, and attempting to subject favourite interpretations to harsh collaborative critiques… [with] reflection [being] the guiding thread that integrates the work." What we have attempted to convey in this paper is that interactive interspection can make explicit that which is perhaps not apparent at the time. In one sense, it is an exercise in articulating that what we observe and analyse and interpret and translate and write through interspecting with those managers we seek to help, is often more complex than we might originally think and that it is important to acknowledge these tensions. If interactive interspection involves the generation of rich, impressionistic narrative accounts of our own research experiences and those of the managers with whom we work regarding a particular phenomenon of interest, then it serves to expose what a potentially confusing process conducting B2B research can be before it is 'cleaned up' and made less chaotic. On one level, we argue that the process of interspection *may* occur subconsciously when researchers 'write up' their research. This is most evident when we discuss our research findings and attempt to place what we have found in the context of the extant literature and what this means in terms of managerial and/or theoretical implications. But often this is a tokenistic process designed to fulfil standard peer-reviewed journal publishing expectations/obligations rather than reflecting any real introspective episodes that genuinely influence our discussions of the research findings.

Based on the preceding review of the relevant literatures and accompanying discussion, we now present an excerpt from a case study that attempts to illustrate how we employed interactive interspection in our interviewing and how discourse analysis was then used to highlight this interspection.

Case background

In this excerpt, the main researcher/consultant (Rose) writes:

Professor Gavin W and others are working in the area of lipid disorders – in particular, Familial Hypercholesterolaemia (FH). This is a genetic disorder where defective receptors on a range of genes mean that people develop long term heart disease from adolescence. If diagnosed during adolescence, long term heart disease is reduced and people can have a normal life expectancy. The problem that I was brought in to consider is how FH can become translated into mainstream medicine and to investigate whether it is viable in its own right – i.e., to have a not-for-profit organisation focusing on FH. The people in the interviews include:

Gavin – Professor of Medicine at a large Australian university and the developer of the testing regime (GW)

Abbie – research assistant who works with Gavin in developing research projects, getting things done etc.

Penny – Works within State Government Health Department and is trying to facilitate a program for FH to become diagnosed in main stream medicine.

Maude - works for Penny in facilitation of new programs in state health.

Example of interview data analysis

We argue that this conversation, as well as showing some fascinating instances of turn-taking and identity work, suggests that all three participants are jointly making sense as they talk and exchanging tentative thoughts. They willingly share their own (sometimes embarrassing) misconceptions in order to interactively arrive at a conclusion about possible lifestyle treatments and the best way to raise awareness about this illness. Between them, the three participants thus co-create meaning and make interspective sense of a possible strategy for the FH project. [In this exchange, '….' indicates when talk is interrupted by the next speaker.]

Interview talk	Analysis
Maude: Different slant on it, what about dietetics, or clinical nutritionists… Rose: Mhmm… Maude: Because that's another aspect of their treatment, their lifestyle changes… Penny: Yeah… Maude: To prevent the onset, like statin is… Penny: Once you've already got it… Maude: Once you've got it… Penny: It's a secondary prevention. Maude: I'm sure it wouldn't be prescribed just because you've got the DNA, if you've… Penny: If you don't need it… Maude: If you haven't got it, you'd be told to, say you have the gene that predisposes you so you need to change your lifestyle to make sure you're healthy, so, that part of prevention treatment is your dietician, clinical nutrition… Penny: Physical activity… Maude: Physical activity… Penny: Advocate… Maude: Advocate - just another group of people that might pop up from the ranks. It's passion about helping people deal with the cholesterol… Rose: Mmm Maude: That's really what it's about, and higher incidence of cholesterol in their family because of the gene, so… Penny: Mmm… Rose: Mmm… Maude: Just thinking. Penny: Yeah. Rose: No, they're all good thoughts. Maude: Stop thinking. Penny: I can't. Rose: No, don't stop thinking! Penny: Yeah, yes, you're right, the opportunity there is some entrepreneurial people that sort of might be, I mean, John Worsefall of football would be good. Maude: I don't know him, who's he? John who? Rose: John Worsefall, wasn't he a footballer? Penny: Oh, no! Who am I sitting with? He coaches the Eagles. Maude: Oh, of course. Rose: [Giggles] What?! Maude: I'm a dancer and an artist [giggles]. Rose: I said he was a footballer.	Here we see Maude attempting to introduce an alternative perspective to the FH issue by suggesting the inclusion of some other actors in the health network. She explains the rationale behind her 'lifestyle treatment' suggestion, while Rose offers a rather ambivalent murmur and Penny appears to affirm her agreement. Then there is a bit of joint rethinking out loud as Maude explains that a dietary change cannot actually act as a primary prevention; note how, after both Penny and Maude appear to remind themselves (and Rose?) that this is a pre-existing condition, Penny confirms that it would be a secondary prevention, with Maude then explaining that a lifestyle change would be prescribed if the patient suffered from the genetic defect. With Penny offering some supporting words that seem to try to complete Maude's sentence for her, Maude builds on this interjection to explain the role of these dieticians and nutritionists in a prevention program. Penny then brings up the issue of physical activity which is repeated by Maude, with Penny and Maude immediately going through the same repetition with the term 'advocate', serving to confirm the importance of this new network actor. Maude initially offers rather a vague explanation of this term, but then goes on to talk about passion. Rose provides a noncommittal interjection, allowing Maude to come back and explain more about the significance of cholesterol. She then however tails off from this line of argument, leaving Penny to interject briefly with a rather noncommittal expression, and Rose too, thus leaving the conversation at somewhat of a hiatus. Maude then reflects by stating that she is 'just thinking'. Rose seeks to reassure both Penny and Maude that these are 'good thoughts'. Maude then tells herself, and seemingly Penny too, to stop thinking; and Rose once again encourages them not to do this, thereby confirming the value she attaches to her interviewees' opinions. This is taken up by Penny who repeatedly agrees with Rose before mentioning a potential high profile (in her view) sporting advocate. This then causes both Maude and Rose to query who this new person is, to the mock horror of Penny who explains that this individual is a coach with a particular Australian football team. Maude then claims to recognise the person concerned whereas Rose just laughs. Maude then asserts her identity as someone who wouldn't necessarily know about football but also laughs as she does so and Rose defends herself by noting she had recognised the sport. Thereafter Maude makes a joke about not recording Rose's confusion (indicating her awareness of the

Maude: Ok, can we just not record that? Rose: I'm from Queensland, okay? NFL didn't exist until I was in my late 20's. Penny: Oh deary, deary. Maude: It didn't exist until 20 years ago when I moved here. Penny: Just so happens he's also a pharmacist. Maude: Oh, well, there you go. Rose: I didn't know that. Penny: Well, you didn't even know about the football so you've got no chance of knowing what he did as a profession. Maude: Well, there'd be a group of people, NFL's or Rugby Union people. Rose: Well, they'll be fit, won't they? Penny: Doesn't mean that they're not pre-disposed to it, though. Maude: That's right, and a… Penny: And they usually have their life of football… Maude: Very short… Penny: Yes, short, so they'd need to move in to something else. Maude: And either they've lost a family, a father, a bit early, and they're trying to manage it. I can see the ad now - "Did you lose your father early? Do you want to outlive your father?" Rose: It won't be an ad. That would be a great selling point for the philanthropy to raise… Maude: Yep, awareness… Rose: Awareness Maude: Media profile person… Rose: Yeah… Penny: Mmm.	research process), leaving Rose to come back and explain her ignorance further. Penny then jokingly expresses her dismay, leaving her colleague Maude to explain that she herself is only a latecomer to the region. This humorous interaction is important as it allows all the participants to concede and acknowledge areas of less critical expertise, and reveal a little about their personal selves, presumably thereby facilitating a closer working relationship. With a rhetorical flourish, Penny then reveals the extra information that this advocate is also a pharmacist. This seems to impress and surprise Maude and Rose, so Penny's response ameliorates their ignorance. Maude then runs with the idea of working with sporting people. Rose makes a comment about fitness. To which Penny responds by explaining that being fit does not mean these people will not be predisposed to the genetic disorder, something that Maude confirms. The two colleagues then enthusiastically finish each others' sentences as they explain that a person's life in football can be very short. Maude then seems to make an assumption that such a sports person may have lost a relative (presumably to the genetic disorder) and could thus be part of what she calls 'an ad' regarding an FH sufferer's natural wish to outlive their father. Rose then points out that such a communication wouldn't be an ad, and starts to explain how a philanthropist actor could see the advantage of being involved with a (presumably social marketing) campaign to raise awareness. However, Maude is so keen to show that she 'gets' this, she finishes Rose's sentence for her. Rose then confirms the 'awareness' term and Maude chips in with the phrase 'media profile person', showing her understanding of stakeholder communications. Rose confirms this and Penny completes the exchange with what seems to be an assenting murmur.

Researcher's reflections

Although Gavin himself was not involved directly in the above conversation, the participants' talk was not without influence in the wider case. Rose writes:

Penny and Maude have a lot of experience in getting projects within the government going (or stalled). They have an interest in the ability of early diagnosis of FH in stopping heart attacks and thus long term reduction in hospital admissions. Penny is involved in allocating some budget money from state health to fund genetic testing of WA hospital patients through the lipids clinic. Given the network of contacts between each actor, the above exchange appeared to contribute to how the various stakeholders in the FH project came to view the challenges facing them, especially Gavin. Indeed, it is highly likely that the awareness communication strategy being tentatively arrived at between Maude, Penny and Rose was also shared with Gavin. Thus Rose writes:

My impressions of how the feelings changed during the time: Gavin is a person who believes in universal health care and wants to develop a program where FH patients got the best treatment based on public funding. He also wants nothing to do with philanthropy, and expected that government would just pay given the obvious under diagnosis of the disease. In particular, Gavin wants to concentrate on his research and do some clinical practice on the side.

Over time – 6 months – he has now accepted that it won't be adequately funded by government money due to the budgetary constraints and that he needs to change attitude. He has also accepted that

he may have to work for a private not-for-profit organisation to begin full scale treatment as the public system is unable to cope. He has also changed attitude in respect to conducting other activities to raise funds (i.e., pharma trials) and accepts that if there is a commercial person involved in fundraising he will attend some events and speak. He has also accepted that if required he would have to work with groups to raise awareness of the disease and generate funding opportunities for more research.

Conclusions

By illustrating that interactive interspection is essentially a form of shared self-reflexivity, we hope to have successfully argued that personal narratives and making explicit one's feelings, assumptions, dilemmas, questions and tensions in engaging in action-orientated research can lead to both personal as well as shared awareness about social, political and personal processes (Swan, 2008). We also hope that we have widened the forum for incorporating interactive interspection beyond the consumer behaviour context to an appreciation of the benefits of incorporating interspection in action-orientatedr studies of industrial marketing. In addition, we hope that the paper causes qualitative, action-orientated organisational researchers to contemplate a number of questions: what is the role of the researcher; what is the source of their authority to narrate and what are they authorised to recount; and what are the consequences of this (Quattrone, 2006).

This paper has highlighted the significance of the marketing researcher for the research process, so that the researcher is seen as implicated in the data that are generated by virtue of his or her involvement in data collection and interpretation (Bryman and Cassell, 2006). We thus believe that in conducting action-orientated research, interactive interspection (perhaps simply as another term for shared reflexivity) can be a valuable aid in maximising the success of assuming multiple roles in order to better achieve the dual goals of theory-building/refinement in addition to contributing directly to B2B marketing practice. In this way, we are heeding Shotter's (2006) call to better understand process *from within* i.e., 'withness thinking' as opposed to 'aboutness thinking' where traditional researchers think about process from the outside that are observed as happening 'over there'. Action orientated B2B/network research that involves interspection can create a dialogue between theory and practice involving "engaged, responsive thinking, acting, and talking, that allows us to affect the flow of processes from within our living involvement with them [which].....only becomes available to us in our relations with living forms when we enter into dialogically structured relations with them" (p. 585).

We have tried to argue that often our theories separate we researchers from practicing managers so we hope that we have provided support for the notion that we can address this separation and develop *useful/practical* theories through interactive interspection - since from the practitioner perspective, theory-development via interactive interspection occurs on their terms, with them, for them and by them. Interactive interspection can facilitate the development of marketing management theories so that "they better reflect the way actors enact their practice and, thus, are more relevant to practice" (Sandberg and Tzoukas, 2011, p 339).

References

Antonacopoulou, E. (2010b) 'Making the Business School More 'Critical': Reflexive Critique Based on Phronesis as a Foundation for Impact', *British Journal of Management*, 21: S6-S25.

Ballantyne, D. (2004), "Action Research Reviewed: A Market-Oriented Approach", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 38 No. 3/4, pp. 321-337.

Banbury, C., Stinerock, R. and Subrahmanyan, S. (2012), "Sustainable consumption: Introspecting across multiple lived cultures", *Journal of Business Research*, 65(1), 497-503.

Béji-Bécheur, A., Özçağlar-Toulouse, N. and Zouaghi, S. (2012), "Ethnicity introspected: researchers in search of their identity", *Journal of Business Research*, 65(1), 504-510.

Berger, L. (2001), "Inside Out: narrative Autoethnography as a Path Toward Rapport", *QualitativeInquiry*, 7, 4, 504-518.

Bjørkeng, K., Clegg, S. and Pitsis, T. (2009) 'Becoming (a) Practice", *Management Learning*, 40(2): 145-159.

Brown, S. (2012), "Wake up and smell the coffin: an introspective obituary", *Journal of Business Research*, 65(1), 461-466.

Bryman, A. and Cassell, C. (2006) 'The Researcher Interview: A Reflexive Perspective', *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 1(1): 41-55.

Canniford, R. (2005) 'Moving Shadows: Suggestions for Ethnography in Globalised Cultures', *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 8(2): 204-218.

Checkland, P. (2010) 'Researching Real-Life: Reflections on 30 Years of Action Research', *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 27(2): 129-132.

Coghlan, D. (2001) 'Insider Action Research Projects: Implications for Practising Managers', *Management Learning*, 32(1): 49-60.

Cunliffe, A. (2003) 'Reflexive Inquiry in Organizational Research: Questions and Possibilities', *Human Relations*, 56(8): 983-1003.

Daniel, E. and Wilson, H.N. (2004), "Action Research in Turbulent Environments: An Example in e-Commerce Prioritisation", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 38 No. 3/4, pp. 355-377.

Fendt, J. And Kaminska-Labbé (2011) 'Relevance and Creativity through Design-Driven Action Research: Introducing *Pragmatic Adequacy*, *European Management Journal*, 29(3): 217-233.

Gould, S. (2008) "Introspection as Critical Marketing Thought, Critical Marketing Thought as Introspection, in M. Tadajewski and D. Brownlie (eds.). *Critical Marketing: Issues in Contemporary Marketing*, pp.311-327. Chichester: Wiley & Sons.

Greenwood, D. (2002) 'Action Research: Unfulfilled Promises and Unmet Challenges', *Concepts Transform*, 7(7): 117-139.

Grønhaug, K. and Olson, O. (1999) 'Action Research and Knowledge Creation: Merits and Challenges', *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 2(1): 6-14.

Gulati, R. (2007) 'Tent Poles, Tribalism, and Boundary Spanning: The Rigor-Relevance Debate in Management Research', *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(4): 775-782.

Holbrook, M. (2005) 'Customer Value and Autoethnography: Subjective Personal Introspection and the Meanings Of A Photographic Collection', *Journal of Business Research*, 18(1): 45-61.

Holland, R. (1999) 'Reflexivity', *Human Relations*, 52(4): 463-484.

Israel, B.A., Schurman, S.J. and Hugentobler, M.K. (1992) 'Conducting Action Research: Relationships between Organization Members and Researchers', *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 28(1): 74-101.

Johnson, P. and Duberley, J. (2003) 'Reflexivity in Management Research', *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(5): 1279-1303.

Karra, N. and Phillips, N. (2008) 'Researching Back Home: International Management Research as Autoethnography', *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(3): 541-561.

Kates, S.M. and Robertson, J. (2004), "Adapting Action Research to Marketing: A Dialogic Argument between Theory and Practice", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 38 No. 3/4, pp. 418-432.

Kempster, S. and Stewart, J. (2010) 'Becoming a Leader: A Co-Produced Autoethnographic Exploration of Situated Learning of Leadership Practice', *Management Learning*, 41(2): 205-219.

Kempster, S. and Iszatt-White, M. (2012), 'Towards co-constructed coaching: Exploring the integration of coaching and co-constructed autoethnography in leadership development', *Management Learning*, 44(4), 319-336.

Ladkin, D. (2005) 'The Enigma of Subjectivity – How Might Phenomenology Help Action Researchers Negotiate The Relationship Between 'Self', 'Other' And 'Truth'?, *Action Research*, 3(1): 108-126.

Learmonth, M. and Humphreys, M. (2011), "Autoethnography and Academic Identity: Glimpsing Business School Doppelgängers", *Organization*, 19, 1, 99-117.

Letiche, H. (2009) 'Reflexivity and Affectivity', *Culture and Organization*, 15(3): 291-306.
Lincoln, Y., and Guba, E. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Makkonen, H., Aarikka-Stenroos, L. and Olkkonen, R. (2012). Narrative approach in business network process research—Implications for theory and methodology. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 41(2), pp.287-299.

Marshall, J. (2001) 'Self-Reflective Inquiry Practices', in P. Reason and H. Bradbury (eds) *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice*, London: Routledge.

McTaggart, R. (1991) *Origins of Educational Action Research, in Action Research: A Short Modern History*, pp. 1-40. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Minowa, Y., Visconti, L.M. and Maclaran, P. (2012), "Researchers' introspection for multi-sited ethnographers: a xenoheteroglossic autoethnography", *Journal of Business Research*, 65(1), 483-489.

Nas, P. J. M., Prins, W. J. M and Shadid, W. A. (1987) 'A Plea for Praxeology', in G. C. Wenger, (ed), *The Research Relationship*, pp. 18-42. London, UK: Allen & Unwin.

Okhuysen, G. And Bonardi, J.-P. (2011), "Editors' comments: The challenges of building theory by combining lenses", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 36, No. 1, pp. 6-11.

Olsen, B. (2012), "Reflexive introspection on sharing gifts and shaping stories", *Journal of Business Research*, 65(1), 467-474.

Pålshaugen, Ø. (2001) 'The Use of Words: Improving Enterprises by Improving their Conversations' in P. Reason and H. Bradbury (eds), *The Handbook of Action Research*. pp. 209–218. London: Sage Publications.

Patterson, A. (2010) 'Art, Ideology, and Introspection', *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 4(1): 57-69.

Perry, C. and Gummesson, E. (2004), "Commentary: Action Research in Marketing", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 38 No. 3/4, pp. 310-320.

Robinson, V.M.J. (1993) 'Current Controversies in Action Research', *Public Administration Quarterly*, 77(3): 263-290.

Sandberg, J. and Tsoukas, H. (2011) 'Grasping the Logic of Practice: Theorizing through Practical Rationality', *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(2), 338-360.

Shankar, A. (2000) 'Lost in Music? Subjective Personal Introspection and Popular Music Consumption', *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 3(1): 27-37.

Shapiro, D.L., Kirkman, B.L. and Courtney, H.G. (2007) 'Perceived Causes and Solutions of the Translation Problem in Management Research', *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2): 249-266.

Shotter, J. (2010) 'Situated Dialogic Action Research: Disclosing "Beginnings" For Innovative Change in Organizations', *Organizational Research Methods*, 13(2): 268-285.

Splitter, V. And Seidl, D. (2011), 'Does Practice-Based Research on Strategy Lead to Practically Relevant Knowledge? Implications of a Bourdieusian Perspective', *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 47(1): 98-120.

Sussan, F., Hall, R. and Meamber, L.A. (2012), "Introspecting the spiritual nature of a brand divorce", *Journal of Business Research*, 65(1), 520-526.

Swan, E. (2008) "Let's Not Get Too Personal: Critical Reflection, Reflexivity and The Confessional Turn', *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 32(5): 385-399.

Toma, J.D. (2000), "How getting close to your subjects makes qualitative data better", *Theory into Practice*, 39(3), 177-184.

Tsoukas, H., and Hatch, M. J. (2001), 'Complex thinking, complex practice: The case for a narrative approach to organizational complexity', *Human Relations,* 54(8): 979-1013.

Turnbull, P., Ford, D. and Cunningham, M. (1996). Interaction, Relationships and Networks in Business Markets: An Evolving Perspective. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 11(3/4), 44-62.

Wallendorf, M. and Brucks, M. (1993) 'Introspection in Consumer Research: Implementation and Implications', *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(3): 339-359.

Wilson, E. J. and Woodside, A. G. (1999). Degrees-of-freedom Analysis of Case Studies in Business Marketing Research, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 28(3), 215-222.

Wilson, H.N. (2004), "Towards Rigour in Action Research: A Case Study in Marketing Planning", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 38 No. 3/4, pp. 378-400.

Wohlfeil, M. and Whelan, S. (2012), ""Saved!" by Jena Malone: an introspective study of a consumer's fan relationship with a film actress", *Journal of Business Research*, 65(1), 511-519.

Woodside, A. (2004) 'Advancing from Subjective to Confirmatory Personal Introspection in Consumer Research', *Psychology & Marketing*, 21(12): 987-1010.

Woodside, A. (2006) 'Overcoming the Illusion of Will and Self-Fabrication: Going Beyond Naïve Subjective Personal Introspection to an Unconscious/Conscious Theory of Behaviour Explanation', *Psychology & Marketing*, 23(3): 257-272.

Woodside, A. (2010) 'Bridging the Chasm Between Survey and Case Study Research: Research Methods for Achieving Generalization, Accuracy, And Complexity', *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39(1): 64-75.