


**Territorial Development Series**



# The Evolution of Action Research for Territorial Development

Nurturing an intergenerational  
and multicultural environment

Edited by  
**Patricia Canto-Farachala**  
and **Miren Estensoro García**

 <https://doi.org/10.18543/DHFW6722>

 **Deusto**  
University Press



The Evolution of Action Research  
for Territorial Development:  
Nurturing an intergenerational  
and multicultural environment

La evolución de la Investigación Acción  
para el Desarrollo Territorial:  
nutriendo un entorno intergeneracional  
y multicultural



# The Evolution of Action Research for Territorial Development: Nurturing an intergenerational and multicultural environment

Patricia Canto-Farachala  
Miren Estensoro García

2025  
Orkestra - Basque Institute of Competitiveness  
Deusto Foundation

## Territorial Development Series

This book may not be reproduced, distributed, publicly disseminated or altered without the permission of the copyright holders, unless otherwise prescribed by law. Please contact CEDRO (Spanish Centre for Reprographic Rights - *Centro Español de Derechos Reprográficos* - [www.cedro.org](http://www.cedro.org)) if you need to photocopy or scan parts of this book.

© Basque Institute of Competitiveness - Deusto Foundation



Mundaiz 50, E-20012, Donostia-San Sebastián  
Tel.: 943 297 327. Fax: 943 279 323  
[comunicacion@orquestra.deusto.es](mailto:comunicacion@orquestra.deusto.es)  
[www.orquestra.deusto.es](http://www.orquestra.deusto.es)

© Deusto University Press  
P. Box 1 - E48080 Bilbao  
e-mail: [publicaciones@deusto.es](mailto:publicaciones@deusto.es)

ISBN: 978-84-1325-251-3

## Chapter 11

# Departing from Self-Inquiry to Facilitate Co-Creation of Local Public Policies with Young People: A Strategy for Young Researchers to Avoid Putting the Cart before the Horse

*Claudia Icaran-Díaz de Corcuera*<sup>1</sup>

### **Abstract**

By taking part in a process of Participatory Action Research (PAR) with young people in the UPLIFT project and, at the same time, in reflection spaces at Orkestra, where I am a pre-doctoral researcher, I was able to explore the following question: What does the inclusion of a young researcher in a process with these characteristics mean for the empowerment of the young people involved? To do this, I will first describe what the project and the reflection spaces (three in total) consisted of and then discuss how the reflection process influenced the empowerment of the young participants in the project. Also, based on this reflection, I highlight the value of combining processes of self-reflection, i.e., first-person action research, with processes in which the researcher involves third parties, in this case, young people, in research processes (known as third-person action research).

### **Resumen**

*Una investigadora novel ante un proceso de co-creación de políticas públicas urbanas con personas jóvenes. La autorreflexión como estrategia para fijar los cimientos de la facilitación*

Participar en un proceso de Investigación Acción Participativa (PAP) con personas jóvenes en el marco del proyecto europeo UPLIFT y, simultáneamente, en espacios de reflexión en Orkestra, lugar en el que trabajo como investigadora predoctoral, me ha permitido ahondar en: ¿qué supone la implicación de una investigadora joven en cuanto al empoderamiento de las

---

<sup>1</sup> Orkestra-Basque Institute of Competitiveness, University of Deusto.

personas jóvenes involucradas? Para ello, en primer lugar, desgrano en qué han consistido, tanto el proyecto, como los espacios de reflexión (tres en total) para, posteriormente, hacer hincapié en cómo se ha desarrollado el proceso de reflexión y en cómo ha incidido en el empoderamiento de las personas jóvenes del proyecto. Así mismo, partiendo de esta reflexión, pongo de relevancia el valor de vincular los procesos de autorreflexión, es decir, de investigación acción en primera persona, a procesos en los que la persona investigadora involucra a terceras personas, en este caso personas jóvenes, en procesos de investigación (lo que se conoce como investigación acción en tercera persona).

### **Laburpena**

*Ikertzaile hasiberria, gazteekin hiri-politika publikoak elkarrekin sortzeko prozesuaren aurrean. Autohausnarketa, erraztearen oinarriak finkatzeko estrategia gisa*

UPLIFT proiektuan gazteekin Ikerketa Ekintza Parte-hartzaileko (IEP) prozesu batean parte hartzeak eta, aldi berean, Orkestrako hausnarketa-espazioen parte izateak, honako galderari erantzuteko aukera eman dit: zer suposatzen du ikertzaile hasiberri baten parte hartzeak gazteen ahalduntzea bilatzen duen prozesuetan? Galdera honi erantzuteko, lehenik eta behin, proiektuak eta hausnarketarako guneeak (hiru guztira) zertan datzan azalduko dut, eta, ondoren, hausnarketa prozesua nola gertatu den eta proiektuan nola eragin duen aztertuko da. Era berean, hausnarketa horretatik abiatuta, garrantzia ematen diet autohausnarketa prozesuei. Eta, konkretuki, prozesu hauek duten garrantziari hirugarren pertsonako ikerketa-ekintza prozesuetan.

# Departing from Self-Inquiry to Facilitate Co-Creation of Local Public Policies with Young People: A Strategy for Young Researchers to Avoid Putting the Cart before the Horse

## 1. Introduction

Between September 2021 and December 2022, I was involved in the co-creation of a Reflexive Policy Agenda (hereinafter RPA) in the Municipality of Barakaldo (Basque Country). The process was developed between a local public institution, the City Council of Barakaldo (Basque Country), a group of young people from the municipality, and the research institute I belong to, Orkestra-Basque Institute of Competitiveness, within the framework of the UPLIFT Project, funded by the European Commission<sup>2</sup>. The aim of the project was to put young people's voices at the centre of public policies in the areas of housing, education, and employment.

Since the beginning of the project in January 2020, the UPLIFT collaborators agreed to carry out action research, particularly participatory action research (PAR), in the co-creation phase with public authorities and young people. Moreover, as a predoctoral researcher in Orkestra, I adopted action research (AR) during the project not only to involve public authorities and young people in the development of the RPA but also to inquire about my performance in the project and to explore matters of mutual concern with other researchers of my organisation. To explore my performance in detail, I identify three spaces within Orkestra: the debriefing sessions of the UPLIFT project, Zubigintza, and the training space.

My participation in the UPLIFT project and the aforementioned spaces in Orkestra constituted my first contact with the academic field, excluding my student years, specifically with action research. This was also my first time facilitating a co-creation space between public institutions and young people. In this context, I acknowledge that, as a young action researcher, my involvement in spaces for self-inquiry within the organisation had an impact on my approach to PAR with public authorities and young people.

Moreover, in both the project and the spaces for self-inquiry, I had the chance to learn more about and experiment with multiple concepts and theories that emanate mainly from the literature related to action research and community research: action research inquiry modes (Reason & Bradbury, 2008) (Marshall, 2004), community members as facilitators of transformative research (Sousa, 2021), participatory action research (Freire, 2000) (Fals-Borda & Rahman, 1991), and intersectional participatory action research (Wheeler, Shaw, & Howard, 2020) to name a few.

From these frameworks, I conclude that although much of the available literature argues that researchers often engage in self-inquiry processes (first-person AR) while doing action research with the community (third-person inquiry), these explanations do not consider the implications of self-inquiry for the process of AR that involves the community.

In order to fill this gap, this chapter seeks to show how the reflections made in the three spaces regarding my role as a young researcher resulted in specific actions within

<sup>2</sup> Horizon 2020 was the EU's research and innovation funding programme from 2014-2020, with a budget of nearly €80 billion (European Commission, 2024).

the UPLIFT project. Given their objectives and mechanisms, each one of the spaces allowed me to develop distinctive and complementary reflections on my performance in the project.

To begin this chapter, I briefly overview the project, the three spaces, the methodology and the method. Next, I present one situation that illustrates each space's self-inquiry process. Thirdly, I expand on how, based on this reflection, I implemented a facilitation action in the co-creation process, which affected the empowerment of the young people within the process. In the final part, I analyse the concepts and theories I identify as travel companions in this journey and draw some conclusions.

## 2. Case Study

In the first section, I show how the debriefing sessions, Zubigintza, and the training space allowed me to explore my facilitation within the UPLIFT project, and I discuss the repercussions of this self-inquiry process on the project's development.

Specifically, my self-inquiry was oriented towards gaining insight into my role as a young researcher facilitating a process with young people and examining how this inquiry influenced the empowerment of the young participants in UPLIFT.

In the following lines, I will begin with a brief contextualisation of the UPLIFT project and the three spaces. I will then present the methodology and methods used and go on to analyse my self-inquiry process within the three spaces. Finally, I will discuss the implications of my self-inquiry for the process.

### 2.1. Context of the Case

#### THE UPLIFT PROJECT

With the goal of putting young people's voices at the centre of public policies in the areas of housing, education, and employment, four European cities, Amsterdam (Netherlands), Barakaldo (Basque Country), Sfantu Gheorghe (Romania), and Tallinn (Estonia) co-created a Reflexive Policy Agenda between September 2021 and December 2022, based on participatory approaches and methods.

In the case of Barakaldo, the co-creation process involved 26 young participants aged between 18 and 28 from different origins and socio-economic backgrounds, local public authorities in Barakaldo, municipal youth services (Gazte Bulegoa), the public urban development association (Eretza), Barakaldo City Council's Social Action Department, and two researchers from Orkestra, who facilitated the process. The Reflexive Policy Agenda was created collaboratively by these young people and institutions to improve housing public policies in Barakaldo.

These actors worked in two different spaces in the city: the "Youth Board" (YB), designed as a place for young people to interact with each other, and the "Social Lab" (SL), where technical and political representatives from the City Council and Eretza worked on the RPA alongside two YB representatives who rotated during the process. Orkestra facilitated both spaces. Twelve meetings were held over the course of the process: five involved the Youth Board members, five involved the Social Lab members, and two with members from both spaces, Youth Board plus Social Lab.

## THE DEBRIEFING SESSIONS

In order to ensure the successful advancement of the co-creation process, the Orkestra team carried out debriefing sessions after each meeting of the Youth Board and the Social Lab, as well as following the two meetings with the members from both groups. A total of twelve debriefing sessions were held, one per meeting.

The meetings were structured around four key questions: What happened? How did you feel? How do you think the others felt? What would you change for the next time? Both facilitators, my co-worker from Orkestra and I had the chance to answer the four questions in each session. While one of us was responding, the other was responsible for taking notes of the answers, and vice versa.

## ZUBIGINTZA

The members of Zubigintza agreed in September 2019 that it would be a learning space where professionals working on Action Research for Territorial Development reflect on theory and methodology and develop their capabilities. As such, researchers who conduct action research in Orkestra consider it a safe space.

Since the beginning, the contents proposed for the monthly meetings have been diverse. Nevertheless, for the objective of this chapter, it is particularly relevant to focus on the period 2022-2023, as this was when researchers had the chance to present to the group the facilitation challenges we were encountering at that moment. The structure of the sessions during this period was as follows: one group member was in charge of sharing a specific challenge in the first hour, followed by other researchers offering comments on the presentation in the second hour.

## THE TRAINING SPACE

Between March 2021 and February 2023, eight members who joined Orkestra as pre-doctoral researchers participated in this space that used to meet for two-hour sessions every other Monday. The aim of this space was to develop facilitation capabilities among the institute's newly recruited young professionals. I started to attend these sessions in September 2021 when Orkestra hired by me.

Miren Larrea, a senior researcher at Orkestra, designed the process in three phases. The first phase, June 2021-June 2022, concentrated on readings suggested to the group by Miren, who facilitated these sessions. The readings were primarily related to action research. In the second phase, June 2022-October 2022, each member of the group facilitated a session departing from a book that Miren had assigned to each of us. In the third phase, November 2022-February 2023, each member once again facilitated a session, but this time drawing from our own experiences. In the case of this third space, two chapters in this book delve into the dynamics that took place there.

### 2.2. *Methodology and Methods*

In the UPLIFT project and the three inquiry spaces within Orkestra, the researchers adopted action research as our methodological approach. Therefore, in the four spaces, we recognise the potential of action research to generate alternative knowledge systems that

are nourished by different voices and ways of knowing (Reason & Bradbury 2008). Likewise, we understand that through our collaboration in processes of learning and action, where knowledge generates action and action feeds knowledge, the people involved have the potential to generate transformations, at least in our most immediate contexts (Burns, Harvey, & Ortiz Aragón, 2012).

Even though all the spaces are guided by the general principles of action research, they have each been shaped by different interpretations of the methodology. On the one hand, the UPLIFT project is closer to the postulates of participatory action research (PAR) in so far as the emphasis is on the importance of young people being able to examine and interpret their own social world through reflection-action cycles (Freire, 2000). On the other hand, Zubigintza and the training space are influenced by the territorial development approach to action research (Karlsen & Larrea, 2014), and particularly by Pablo Costamagna and Miren Larrea's (2018) work that explores the potential of learning and action cycles to generate capabilities among territorial actors, in this case, the researchers from Orkestra. Finally, the four questions that guide the debriefing sessions can be considered the bridge between reflection and action in the context of the UPLIFT project.

The data examined in the following sections, along with the analysis and discussion, corresponds to the systematisation documents of the three spaces. The two facilitators of the research process shared a Google Drive folder where they could upload the minutes of the debriefing sessions. For Zubigintza, Patricia Canto, a researcher at Orkestra and facilitator of the space, gathered in detail all the contributions made by the different group members and promptly sent the meeting minutes as soon as the sessions concluded. Regarding the training space, even though we did not systematically gather the information of every session in a shared document, the sessions worked in such a way that each of us took our own notes. In my case, the notes of these sessions were recorded in my notebook, indicating the date and the subject of each session. Moreover, the information in these documents is complemented by the data compiled in my research diary.

To analyse this data, I use in-depth storytelling as my research method. According to Plummer (1995), this narrative practice allows the narrator to appreciate their own accounts, descriptions, and theories of their own life, making them the storyteller ethnographer in their own right. This way, the author highlights the potential of this method to create a context for a deep and emotional understanding of the lived experience, unmasking truth claims and allowing for a creative experiment in the production of knowledge.

Thus, I use literal excerpts of the minutes from the three spaces to support my narration about my self-inquiry process and my facilitation of the co-creation process in the framework of the UPLIFT project.

### 2.3. *Case Analysis and Findings*

As stated at the beginning of this section, being part of the three spaces allowed me to inquire about my facilitation of the UPLIFT project as a young researcher. In this subsection, I describe one situation for each space to illustrate how this happened.

#### SELF-INQUIRY IN THE DEBRIEFING SESSIONS

Before the first Social Lab session with public local authorities and two representatives from the Youth Board, the Orkestra team met to agree on how to facilitate the meeting in order to empower the young people in the SL.

Based on our previous answers to the debriefing questions until that date, we concluded that the young participants were more willing to share their ideas with someone close to their age, including the young researcher involved in the process. As I expressed in one of these meetings: “conveying my discomfort about my salary conditions, or my difficulties in obtaining housing at a fair price, speaking in simple words, or not using proverbs has helped me to be closer to the young people I was working with.” (Minutes from the preparation session for the SL 1). Thus, we built on this conclusion to develop the role of “the youngster’s facilitator” in the process, which I myself adopted.

We defined the youngster’s facilitator as someone who: “acts as a bridge between young people and local public authorities, helping young participants articulate the messages they want to transmit to policymakers.” In order to guide them throughout the process, “this person will have regular meetings with the young people before the sessions with the public authorities, both online and in person, to go over the main contents and prepare their interventions” (*ibid.*).

Apart from helping the young participants with their interventions in formal spaces, for the informal spaces, we agreed that: “the youngster’s facilitator will interact with the young people in the coffee breaks after every session and on extra trips and team building activities that are anticipated within the framework of the co-creation process.”

#### SELF-INQUIRY IN ZUBIGINTZA

During a Zubigintza session on February 14, 2023, where we could share our facilitation challenges, I presented the difficulties I was facing within the framework of the UPLIFT project. Nine members of the group had already shared their experiences, four of whom had joined the group at the same time as me. In this context, I felt comfortable sharing a very personal experience with the group.

Drawing from my lived experiences within this project, I connected them with concepts and theories in the literature that put names to my experiences as a young researcher. Given my own brief background, relying on the work of more experienced researchers helped me feel more legitimised. Nevertheless, in my view, I was brave enough to talk about the feelings and emotions in facing my facilitation challenges.

I emphasised a particular message among others: “Although I had previously thought about myself as a woman, as a white person or as a resident of the town I lived in, I had not thought about myself as a young person.” In contrast, in this project, “at times I feel that my contribution to the project is reduced to my experience as a young person and that I leave out many aspects of my experience as a woman, or as a white or heterosexual person, for example.” (Manuscript for the Zubigintza session 16/02/2022).

The meeting minutes show the active involvement of all the group members who participated in the session. Conceptual insights can be found among their inputs, with one of the participants raising the following point: “This contribution links directly to how gender, race and age intertwine to define the identity of the facilitator” and more personal reactions: “I also felt vulnerable as a young researcher, and in my case, finding safe spaces and mentors definitely helped me” (Minutes from the Zubigintza session, 16/02/2022).

#### SELF-INQUIRY IN THE TRAINING SPACE

As part of the second phase of the training process for young professionals in Orkestra, I departed from the book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* written by Paulo Freire in 1968 to facilitate a session on July 12, 2022.

Reading the book and presenting my main conclusions to the group allowed me to connect with the participatory tradition of action research. Freire and other authors, such as Fals-Borda and Rahman (1991), depart from contexts of emancipatory learning experiences at the community level to work on participatory approaches to AR (PAR). Through these experiences, researchers engage with the members of the community involved to examine and interpret their own social world and, ultimately, to transform it through action (Freire, 1970/2000).

Thus, by connecting with this literature, I was able to reflect on how, through my facilitation, I could generate the necessary conditions in the context of the UPLIFT project for young people to be aware of their own circumstances and act to transform them.

### 3. Discussion

In the last part of the case study section, I discuss if my self-inquiry process, focused on understanding my role as a young researcher facilitating this process, empowered the young participants in the project through my actions as a young researcher. To address this issue, I link the three moments of my self-inquiry process, analysed in the previous section, with evidence illustrating the empowerment of the young participants in the process.

#### 3.1. *The Impact of the Youngster's Facilitator on UPLIFT*

As a result of the reflection developed in the debriefing session regarding the role of the youngster's facilitator, I met with the two young people who were going to participate before the first Social Lab meeting with policymakers. Since it was Monday, we discussed our weekend, our plans, and how we were starting the week before we began preparing the session. This conversation fostered a relaxed atmosphere in which we started to work on their interventions. Two days before the online meeting, I sent the young people a presentation with the contents for the Social Lab meeting. We pinpointed the two moments when they were expected to intervene: at the beginning, to present the Youth Board's conclusions and in the group dynamic, where the policymakers could ask questions about their proposals. For them to be comfortable, we adopted two strategies: writing down the essential points they had to address and expanding on them by using their own experiences.

After the meeting, one of the main conclusions extracted from the subsequent debriefing session was that: "The active involvement of the young people in presenting the group's perspective was evident after laying the groundwork with the youngster's facilitator." Thus, "This preparatory work can be applied to both formal and informal interactions between the youngster's facilitator and the group of young people."

#### 3.2. *The Impact of the Intersectional Approach on UPLIFT*

By defining myself as a young person, I felt I was leaving aside many aspects of my existence. The fact that I could reflect on the perception I had of myself allowed me to keep these aspects in mind during the facilitation process.

Thus, I could integrate aspects such as ability, ethnicity, sexuality, race, class, and gender into my perceptions of the young participants. By being aware of these elements, I identified the relative power of some group members over others.

In the case of the co-creation process in Barakaldo, the participants who were born and raised in the Basque Country, almost half of the group, were in a privileged position compared to those who had recently arrived from Northern African countries, the other half of the group. This position was mainly determined by the knowledge of the people born and raised in the Basque Country regarding the language used and the policies addressed during the process of writing the Reflexive Policy Agenda.

The awareness of the advantages of one group over the other is noted in the debriefings after the YB sessions with the young people. After every session, the facilitators highlighted the leading role of the local participants, stating that: "There are two very different groups" and "some of them have a lot to say and monopolise the discourse." Apart from the facilitators' awareness of the differences between the two groups, the systematisation documents of the process show the facilitation actions developed to foster collective action to address the multiple realities represented in the group.

A clear example of this is one of the four actions set out in the Reflexive Policy Agenda, the main result of the co-creation process: *the development of a digital tool to improve young people's access to support for promoting their emancipation in Barakaldo*. Thus, as part of this digital tool, the participants involved agreed to include access to information in different languages, including Arabic, the mother tongue of the group members from Northern Africa.

### 3.3. *The Impact of Breaking the Subject-Object Logics in UPLIFT*

The following two questions were the title of a banner created for the project's first meeting: "Are you having problems with emancipation?" "Do you want to rent but do not know where to start?" Departing from the studies by the Observatorio Vasco de la Juventud (the Basque Youth Observatory), i.e., *Juventud, emancipación y necesidad de vivienda en Euskadi* (2021), we put the spotlight on emancipation as the main challenge faced by young people in the Basque Country in the field of housing. We then established certain parameters, such as the age range, to observe a young person's living conditions in the Basque Country, particularly in Barakaldo.

Although emancipation was seen as the main problem among youth at the beginning of the project, other unforeseen issues began to emerge once the process started. Some members of the group of foreign backgrounds expressed that their main challenge regarding housing was finding a landlord who allowed them to officially register at the property they were renting. According to them, it is common for owners to "ask for extra money for us to register, which is illegal."

In this context, departing from the knowledge of Freire and other authors such as Fals-Borda and Rahman allowed the facilitators to examine and interpret together with the young people what their main housing challenges were. Thus, we involved the young participants in reframing the problem by developing a shared vision of all the group, in which registration was included as a housing problem for young people in the municipality.

## 4. Conceptual Framework

Embarking on this process has involved exploring different concepts and bodies of the literature.

In the first place, the contributions of Reason and Bradbury (2008) and Marshall (2004) have allowed me to understand the different modes of action research inquiry. It is through

the work of these authors that I have been able to identify that my contribution with this chapter is to highlight how the learnings of self-inquiry processes (developed within the three spaces at Orkestra) can impact action research projects that include a wider community (the UPLIFT project).

Reason and Bradbury (2008) describe three modes of action research: first-person, where the researcher examines their own life to be aware of how their acts affect a given context; second-person, which involves a group of researchers jointly studying matters of mutual concern and; finally, third-person AR, where the researcher includes a wider community in processes. In the debriefing sessions of the UPLIFT project, Zubigintza, and the training Space, I inquired in the first person. Simultaneously, I carried out third-person action research by involving the group of young people from Barakaldo in the process through participatory methods. According to Marshall (2004), although action research processes involve all the three alternatives, it is unusual to find contributions that reflect the impact of doing first-person on third-person inquiry.

Secondly, reading Sousa (2021), who draws on the work of authors like Judith Butler or Gayatri Spivak, has given me the opportunity to gain insight into my twofold role in facilitating the UPLIFT project: as a researcher and as a member of the collective I was researching with, the young people.

Through his words, I understood that incorporating a young researcher in the UPLIFT project could help overcome power imbalances that characterise community-university collaborations. As the author explains, in collaborative endeavours between the university and the community, the latter have traditionally been excluded from participating as facilitators.

Nevertheless, Sousa (2021) also helped me proceed cautiously. As a young person who works in academia, I am aware that I have embodied the social structures of the academic social space. As the author acknowledges, my perceptions and thoughts about the community, particularly about young people, are conditioned by my participation in this space. In this context, it is essential to challenge the notions presented in classic European sociology that classifies the community as “a people group that is not part of mainstream society, commonly victims of structural injustice such as colonialism, poverty and racism” (Sousa, 2021: 15).

This conclusion leads me to underscore the influence of authors such as Freire (2000) or Fals-Borda and Rahman (1991) in my contribution. As they suggest, involving young people in iterative processes to examine and interpret their own social world, like the UPLIFT project’s participatory action research, can increase their autonomy in advancing their own research agenda. As a result, this can foster the idea of envisioning them beyond a position of marginality in the academic space.

Finally, the work of Wheeler, Shaw, and Howard (2020), allows for a better understanding of how the multiplicity of lived subjective experiences of the community and the facilitator influence their levels of power in a participatory action research process. According to the authors, socially constructed identities in terms of age, ability, ethnicity, sexuality, race, class, and gender function reciprocally to open or constrain opportunities in action research processes, as in any other context.

Based on this article, I identify how “socially constructed identities”, class and gender in my case, had an impact on the other participants’ perception of me and, therefore, on my level of power within the process. Moreover, they guided me in how to become aware of the multiplicity of lived realities within the group of young people and how to foster collective action despite these differences through my facilitation.

In fact, the authors argue that adopting an intersectional lens in participatory action research processes (Intersectional PAR) can be beneficial in two ways: firstly, it can help the community develop collective action to address a multitude of subjective experiences and;

secondly, it can help practitioners and facilitators navigate the power dynamics across the members of the community involved and to reflect on their positionality and relative power within the group as well as in relation to the wider community.

## 5. Conclusions

As I finish revising this text for the umpteenth time, a victim of the insecurity that is typical of those of us who are just starting out on our academic career, I think I can draw several conclusions from my experience departing from self-inquiry to facilitate the co-creation of local public policies with youth and subsequently from writing this chapter.

Firstly, I can say that the debriefing sessions, Zubigintza, and the training space were instrumental in the beginning of my journey as a facilitator. As I show in this chapter, being part of these spaces allowed me to undertake a self-inquiry process that has, without a doubt, strengthened my facilitation of the co-creation process in Barakaldo.

Secondly, based on the discussion section's evidence, I can affirm that the reflections derived from this process have been translated into specific actions to foster the empowerment of young people in the process.

Finally, regarding the conclusions drawn from writing this chapter, first of all, I recognise its potential to move beyond the assumption that action researchers inquire in first, second, and third person in AR processes by exploring how first-person inquiry influences research developed with a wider community (third person).

At the same time, I hope young researchers, particularly those working with young people, find this contribution meaningful. It can serve a dual purpose in so far as it shows specific situations where having a young researcher on board can benefit the process while also pointing out a number of issues that need to be considered to avoid perpetuating simplistic conceptions about the youth community.

Last but not least, with regard to the structure of the chapter, the fact that the case study precedes the conceptual framework is not a coincidence. This change in the order of the sections reflects my epistemological positioning. Thus, I believe that the main contribution of this chapter draws from my own experience, and I view the authors mentioned in the conceptual framework as travel companions in articulating this experience.

## References

- Burns, D., Harvey, B., & Ortiz Aragón, A. (2012). Introduction: Action research for development and social change. *IDS Bulletin*, 43(3), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2012.00318.x>
- Costamagna, P., & Larrea, M. (2018). *Facilitative Actors of Territorial Development: A social Construction based Approach*. Deusto University Press. <https://www.orkestra.deusto.es/images/investigacion/publicaciones/libros/colecciones-especiales/Facilitative-Actors.pdf>
- Fals-Borda, O., & Anisur Rahman, M. A. (1991). *Action and knowledge: Breaking the monopoly with participatory action research*. Apex Press.
- Freire, P. (1970/2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.). Continuum.
- Karlsen, J., & Larrea, M. (2014). *Territorial development and action research: Innovation through dialogue*. Routledge.
- Marshall, J. (2004). Living systemic thinking: Exploring quality in first-person action research. *Action Research*, 2(3), 305-325. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750304045945>
- Observatorio Vasco de la Juventud (2021). *Juventud, emancipación y necesidad de vivienda en Euskadi*. Servicio Central de Publicaciones de Gobierno Vasco, Vitoria-Gasteiz. [http://observatorijove.info/doc/Informe\\_ENDV\\_Behatoki\\_2021\\_es.pdf](http://observatorijove.info/doc/Informe_ENDV_Behatoki_2021_es.pdf)

- Plummer, K. (1995). *Telling Sexual Stories: Power, change and social worlds*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203425268>
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.) (2008). *The SAGE handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848607934>
- Sousa, J.W. (2021). Community members as facilitators: Reclaiming community-based research as inherently of the people. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.5130/ijcre.v14i2.7767>
- Wheeler, J., Shaw, J., & Howard, J. (2020). Politics and practices of inclusion: Intersectional participatory action research. *Community development journal*, 55(1), 45-63. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsz036>