

Title: *Appreciating diversity in Personality: developing a masks and scenario roleplay pedagogy*

Abstract:

An Appreciative Inquiry (AI) was used as a practitioner-researcher inquiry-change method to develop a pedagogy using masks and scenario role play, to develop learner capability for appreciating and working with diversity, e.g. for teamwork. AI stories were gathered and interpreted via Thematic Analysis following AI Principles: from educators at one university via a focus group and interview, following workshops using the pedagogy; and from archive reflections from the researcher-practitioner's experience, developing and delivering workshops using this from Sept 2014-July 2017. A rich 'Provocative Narrative Dream' was generated, of what is most valuable and could be most valuable about this pedagogy, to guide, motivate and inspire future co-creation of this pedagogy.

Acknowledgements

I would like to offer my sincere gratitude and thanks to all the participants who have helped me, since the inception of this pedagogy, in development of this work, at Falmouth University and the University of Westminster, and those helping its development at the EAPRIL conference.

I would like to thank both ex- and present supervisors, Steven Cranfield and Pauline Armsby for all their very helpful support, guidance and feedback, throughout the development of this work since the beginning.

I would also like to thank my very kind, generous and patient wife, for supporting me through all this, at considerable personal sacrifice to herself!

Contents:

Chapter 1 (Ch1): Introduction, Background & Context (pg 4)

Chapter 2 (Ch2): Literature Review (pg 8)

Chapter 3 (Ch3): Aims, Objectives, Outcomes, Research Questions (pg 16)

Chapter 4 (Ch4): Methods (pg 18)

Chapter 5 (Ch5): Provocative Narrative ('Findings') (pg 26)

Chapter 6 (Ch6): Discussion (pg 33)

Chapter 7 (Ch7): Conclusions (pg 41)

Chapter 8 (Ch8): Reflection (pg 44)

Appendices:

Appendix 1 (App1): References (pg 46)

Appendix 2 (App2): Sources of Data (pg 51)

Appendix 3 (App3): Workshop Design (pg 55)

Appendix 4 (App4): Focus Group Protocol (pg 56)

Appendix 5 (App5): FU Ethics Form (pg 58)

Appendix 6: (App6): UoW Ethics Form (pg 65)

Appendix 7 (App7) Invite FAQ for Workshop and Focus Group (pg 72)

Appendix 8 (App8) Participant Information Sheet & Consent Form (pg 76)

Appendix 9 (App9) E.g. page of 1st pass coding (pg 79)

Appendix 10 (App10) E.g. page of 2nd pass coding (pg 81)

Appendix 11 (App11) E.g. page of codes to categories (pg 83)

Appendix 12 (App12) E.g. page of themes, categories, higher level codes (pg 84)

Appendix 13 (App 13) E.g.s of thematic analysis memos (pg 88)

Appendix 14 (App 14) Full version of Provocative Narrative (pg 89)

NB full transcripts and evidence of thematic analysis, additional sources of data, etc, workshop materials, final approval of ethics from FU board, available upon request.

Title: *Appreciating diversity in Personality: developing a masks and scenario roleplay pedagogy*

Ch1: Introduction, Background & Context:

This research is about my development of a pedagogy, since 2014-15, using masks and scenario roleplay. The project itself an inquiry-change project, that has taken place during this academic year 2016-17, to simultaneously investigate and move forward my pedagogy, using Appreciative inquiry. To put this in context, I explain some biographical detail.

I am a Senior Lecturer at Falmouth University (FU), since November 2016, where I am course leader of a PGCHE and MA in Creative Education (FU). FU is a small, fast growing, entrepreneurial, teaching-focused arts-based Higher Education Institution (HEI) in Cornwall, strategically focused on student employability in creative industries.

Before doing this, I taught since 2009 in a much larger, more diverse and established HEI, the University of Westminster (UoW). I started as a Visiting Lecturer (VL) in Psychology, then in the Westminster Business School (WBS), later becoming a FT SL in the Leadership & Professional Development Department (LAPD) and the Human Resources Management department (HRM). Here I was taught psychology/organisational behaviour, leadership, professional development, and consultancy skills, on UG and PG courses and MBA. I came to academia late, from a career as an organisational psychologist, working mainly in leadership development and assessment in large corporate, global organisations. This was after returning as a mature student to do a BSc then MSc Organisational Psychology, after a previous career as professional actor.

I successfully embraced academic work, but experienced professional tensions and issues, from my previous backgrounds. In those backgrounds, experiential learning, skills development and practice, roleplay and practical knowledge were prioritised, which was not usually the norm where I worked in WBS, which I found a deficit.

This led to me successfully applying for a WBS L&T grant for 2013-14, originally to explore the potential value of incorporating professional actors, e.g. via a Forum Theatre (Boal, 2002) approach, in our L&T at WBS. I shifted this exploring the use of Sociodrama (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000) instead.

For me sociodrama was a cheaper, flexible, more widely applicable approach, with more learning gain from participants engaging in scenario roleplay themselves, versus letting actors do it for them, as so often happens with Forum Theatre applications, despite Boal's (2002) intentions.

However, although staff and students who engaged with it valued it, I often had to spend a lot of session time and skill 'warming up to action' (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000) participants reluctant to engage in roleplay, a common issue with this learning method, when this was often limited in the curriculum. When applying it to larger modules, therefore needing to train staff in this, they found this aspect challenging

Theatrical masks seemed to offer a potential solution, as these are often used in actor training to help actors overcome inhibitions and engage in improvised roleplay. So, I applied successfully for a WBS L&T grant for 2014-15, which enabled me buy masks to explore the use of masks for L&T in WBS. At the same time, I became heavily involved in PG teaching, where the focus was more on individual leadership, versus a wider range of organisational behaviour topics in UG modules. This led me away from a focus on group explorations via sociodrama, to focus on using masks to explore individual leadership styles and interpersonal strategies and the concept of a 'leadership mask'. The sourcing of the masks also contributed, as the mask maker I chose had previously always used his masks outside theatre for individual development applications, including leadership.

A colleague offered an opportunity to do a workshop with masks on an MBA professional development module (MW1, App2). This was during a transition period with very demanding workload, with my preparations very last minute and rushed. For me, this first workshop was a disaster (Peisley, 2016), resulting in many MBA students responding with bewilderment and anger. Some even complained to the MBA Director about being used as guinea pigs for yet another wacky experiment by staff. It was a mess, which really hurt, for which I took full responsibility. I had not prioritised enough time to think through carefully my approach, based on what I knew about MBA learners and from doing a PGCHE. The learning outcomes I had were vaguely and loosely defined; around the learners focusing on developing their emotional intelligence, opening up alternative approaches to leadership and experientially exploring the impact of different leadership approaches. Learning activities were not constructively well-aligned, consisting of exercises I had drawn and roughly adapted to my learning outcomes, from my own experience of using masks teaching actors, and those I had experienced as an actor myself, both in the past, and recently in a 'refresher' masks workshop I had recently done as a participant (App2, MPDA1). The refresher workshop was loose

and hardly 'well-constructively' aligned, so not the best example to try to adapt for MBA learners. It was very much allowing actors to engage in free improvisation, alone and together, and follow creative impulses in the masks wherever they led, which I had enjoyed immensely.

This was a humiliating experience, which had significant impact on the subsequent development of this pedagogy. I had been proud of how I had developed and grown as a L&T practitioner and on my CPD efforts, e.g. through a PGCHE/MA in HE. I prided myself on aspects of curriculum design and facilitation I had worked so successfully and hard to develop: like clear structure, organised facilitation, well defined, achievable learning outcomes, constructively aligned and thoughtfully diversified learning activities appropriate to the particular group of learners I was teaching, etc. Yet here I was throwing all this away, introducing a very unfamiliar approach and resources hitherto only encountered in horror films, to a very internationally mixed cohort of 'business-focused' post-experience adult learners. This also was an MBA cohort renowned for its challenging nature and dysfunction as a group.

My response was to retreat rapidly and shift the focus from 'leadership' to more familiar solid territory for me; psychological 'science' and Personality theory/research, an area that as a consultant I had experienced as more acceptable for those working in large corporates than 'drama': Personality theory/research. Any expectation that the learner might have to creatively imagine, improvise or invent, was kept to a minimum. Clear, simple, tightly defined instructions in exercises, and prescribed lists of influencing strategies, appropriate to particular personality types, were provided in handouts. Sets of PowerPoint slides were shown, with personality theory explained clearly in carefully chunked bullet points. The humiliation I had experienced was never, ever going to happen with these 'business context' learners again.

The result: success: subsequent WBS workshops with staff and students (App2, MW2-4), including the same MBA workshop slot in the following year, were much more successful, with positive engagement and feedback from participants. I was so pleased with myself that I wrote a blog post for the Theatre, Dance and Performance Training (TDPT) Journal Blog, sharing my new-found expertise on how to use theatrical mask work effectively with 'business context' learners (Peisley, 2016). I have kept the same basic workshop design, developing just my skill at facilitation in it, except for one later innovation exercise for the EAPRIL conference (App2, MW6), as a better bridge for participants from meeting the masks to being able to engage in scenario roleplay with them.

However, despite this, I felt stuck, frustrated and disheartened. Despite positive responses from participants, numbers attending workshops were consistently low. There had to be causes for this, but I could only guess why. I had a feeling myself of 'so what?' after each workshop: e.g. So, they have really engaged fully, in an embodied way, learnt about a Jungian personality model and practiced a few influencing approaches...And? I wanted to help people develop interpersonal skills and emotional intelligence (EI) skills, to work more effectively with others, and for this to be of practical use and value. I was convinced this work was valuable, but did not know how or why, or where to take it next. I also felt very isolated, developing this 'wacky' activity marginal to staff colleagues' concerns, on my own as an activity marginal to my main teaching duties, despite much encouraging support I received from colleagues in LAPD.

This situation and state to my formulation of research Aims, Objectives and Outcomes in Ch3.

Ch2: Literature Review

There are a number of aspects of learning that could be valuable for an effective pedagogy, beyond knowledge transmission and lower level cognitive skills (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Learners could be encouraged to engage in 'deep' learning', e.g. a high level of cognitive engagement with task, vs 'surface' learning, e.g. a low level of engagement in the task (Dunn et al, 2004). Learner engagement in deep, active learning, might be more desirable than surface, passive learning (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Experiential learning could be important (e.g. Kolb, 1984; Brookfield, 1986); that learners need to engage in doing something as an experience and reflecting on that. Experiential learning is usefully multi-model (Heron, 1982), involving not just conceptual modes, but also practical, imaginal and affective modes of learning, nourishing all other modes for grounded knowledge to happen (Postle, 1993). Emotions in learning can be important for learner motivation, as desiring to learn, involves emotions, drives and feelings, so a powerful force in learning, without which quality learning might not occur (Race, 2007). Likewise, if learners do not feel positively towards their learning environments successful learning can be less likely (Race 2007). For Race (2007), there are five factors underpin successful learning e.g. 'wanting, needing, doing, feedback, digesting'. If learners enjoy learning activities; deeper, better quality learning is more likely to happen.

Using multiple means of engagement might motivate students to learn (Hall & Stahl, 2006). A pedagogy that engages learners not just cognitively, but also involving their whole person and body, might be more powerful than one that did not. A range of different aspects of cognitive 'intelligences' have been claimed (e.g. Gardner; 1993), so it might be useful to engage more than a small number of these 'multiple intelligences', to include e.g. spatial, interpersonal, intrapersonal and bodily-kinaesthetic intelligences. Goleman (1995) highlighted the importance of not just developing intellectual skills for success in life and work, but also developing 'Emotional Intelligence' (EI), including components of: self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills; so addressing these in pedagogy could be useful.

Drama and drama derived methods, such as roleplay, could be said to engage learners in all these above aspects for successful learning, as could methodologies that employ roleplay as part of their pedagogy, e.g. psychodrama, sociodrama (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000), and Forum Theatre (Boal, 2002). Such drama-derived methods are widely used to facilitate learning in a wide variety of different learning contexts (Hutchinson & Lawrence, 2011). Scenario simulation is also widely used, e.g. in nursing education, to help nurses practice medical procedures in a safe environment (Nagle et

al, 2009); advantageous because it can allow nurses to apply practical as well as interpersonal communication skills crucial to nursing practice (Reid-Searl, 2014)

However, despite widespread use and benefits, participants dislike and/or are reticent to engage in it because: 'play acting' seems incongruous with normal activities; they feel they lack adequate acting skills; or have had bad experiences with it at school or work (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000). Even experienced actors can feel anxiety with these in improvised roleplay (Johnstone, 1979). Anxiety can be a serious enemy of deeper learning (Biggs & Tang, 2011), causing an intense need to get out of the situation and learning environment, negating some of the learning benefits of roleplay.

Mask use in drama contexts:

One way to overcome this in actor training is to ask learners to wear and act in masks. Masks are seen as liberators (Hall, 2000), that diminish self-consciousness and fear (St Denis, 2008; Arrighi, 2010), freeing the wearer to be more daring, willing to risk (Daste, 1945), enabling the 'unblocking of natural instinct' (Barrault, 1962, pg 113). Masks hide the face and the wearers' persona, relaxing them to provide confidence, comfort and 'performative safety' (Arrighi, 2010, pg59), so other parts locked away can be expressed (Taymor, 1999). Full and half masks do this, with half masks more accessible and swifter in achieving this (Baldwin, 2010) sometimes instantly (Johnstone, 1979).

They have been said to "transform consciousness' (Wiles, 2000, pg289), so that wearers feels that they are not themselves but the character (Barrault,1962), with neutral masks said to diminish the self, allowing a neutral state (Arrighi, 2010). Wearers report being 'governed by the mask' resulting in feeling free, voice and movement (Wiles, 2000, p162) with claims that the actor is possessed by the mask and must go with it (Hall, 1982). It is often seen important in mask technique, for the actor to surrender conscious control 'to receive impulses perceived to come from the mask' (Wiles, 2000, pg124) or for actors to go into a trance state (Copeau, 1931). Masks have been seen as a 'shamanic tool' (Leabhardt, 1995) enabling mediation between worlds and wearers to step out of the ordinary (Eldredge, 1996). Some steer away from these controversial, mystical claims and supposed need for wearer 'possession', adopting a more secular, practical approach (e.g. LeCoq, 2002; Wilsher, 2007), although even when practitioners carefully avoid promoting this, wearers themselves often report experience the mask as having agency (Arrighi, 2010). Being 'possessed' by a mask might be highly undesirable in some learning contexts, e.g. in medical training scenario. However, it might be useful for learners anxious about roleplay, in some learning contexts, to at least feel some sense of being

‘governed by a mask’, enabling release of their habitual control on their impulses, thoughts, feelings and actions.

Masks are seen as transformers (Eldredge, 1996), displacing ‘the principle communication methods (LeCoq, 2002), compelling wearers ‘deprived of physical expression to make richer use of the body’ (Wiles, 2000, pg 287), helping ‘regain the totality of expression in the human being’ (Barrault, 1962, pg113). Changing the body is claimed to change the minds of the wearers, allowing them to do feats they cannot usually do in everyday life (Wiles, 2000), something that might be useful for learners in many contexts.

Despite feeling liberated as hidden, masks magnify and expose physical expression, to expose lack of sincerity and ‘untruthful’ acting to wearers and observers, acting as ‘lie detectors’ (Brook, 1987), revealing the ‘inner person’ (Feral, 1998), helping actors to rid their acting of habitual mannerisms (LeCoq, 2002), be authentic and communicate more simply, directly and sincerely (St Denis, 2008). This might be useful in any pedagogy which tries to develop EI, interpersonal or presentation skills, or help learners become ‘authentic leaders’ (Gardner et al, 2011).

Masks are claimed to heighten and release the emotions of wearers, enabling contact with high emotional moments (Saint Denis, 2008), heightening emotional expression and making the wearer feel that something is forcing them to go to the limit of the feeling being expressed (Daste, 1945). An actor wearing a mask

‘doesn’t need elaborate language, the mask is so powerful in itself, it needs more naked expression of emotion’ (Arden, 1967). However, this is not at the expense of control, with claims that masks ‘simultaneously provoke strong feelings while also compel, because of being restricted to physical expression, the actor to ‘detachment and lucidity’ (St Denis, 1982, pg 170). Given the importance given to emotions in successful learning (Postle, 1993; Race, 2007) these affective effects might well be useful for other learning situations, e.g. social skills development.

Masks might be a ‘strategy for unlocking the imagination’ (LeCoq, 2002), engaging wearers in an immersive experience (Arrighi, 2010), bringing about heightened perception (Johnstone, 1979), to enable deeper imaginative exploration than possible without the mask (Baldwin, 2010). They can open up ‘heightened spontaneity and receptivity in imaginative visualisations (Arrighi, 2010), putting wearers in touch with their creative impulses (Chase, 2017). Masks allow them to ‘immerse themselves in a subjective world while at same time forcing them to objectively relate to those

watching' (Baldwin, 2010), opening wearers to the space about them (LeCoq, 2002). Placed in a 'state of openness, freedom to receive' (LeCoq, 2002), they are alert and available, ready for anything but not anticipating anything in particular (Arrighi, 2010, pg 52). They can be more greatly sensitised to the outside world around them, 'to see, feel, touch things as if for the first time' allowing them to 'renew their experience of the world without the weight of accrued knowledge' (Murray, 2010, pg 231).

Nor is such immersive engagement so 'heavy' that participants find it hard to engage in social interaction, with masks claimed to bring about greater spontaneity (Baldwin, 2003; Rudlin, 2010), enabling lightness, free play, and pleasure (Murray, 2010; Grantham, 2000; Fo, 1987), especially half masks (Johnstone, 1979). They can encourage heightened collaboration and be used to foster collective play in an ensemble of actors (Rudlin, 2010), as opposed to narrow self-obsession with individual psychology, that other drama methods might cause (Murray, 2010).), They can make it easy for wearers to create imaginary persona (St Denis, 1982). They can make roleplay improvisation much easier (St Denis, 1982; LeCoq, 2002) and of better quality, and easier to do in role for longer without noticing time (Arrighi, 2010; Johnstone, 1979). Educators wanting to encourage more 'time on task' and improvised roleplay by reticent learners for experiential learning, might well find these useful qualities.

Learning benefits are also claimed for observers of masked roleplay. in roleplay. Masks can take away the distractions of the person underneath, allowing them better focus on an area of target focus (Decroux, 1974), with masks emphasising the clarity of intention of wearers (Wilsher, 2007). Sculpted faces are also claimed to be better at expressing emotions more powerfully than natural faces (Wiles, 2000). Observers can feel safer to more easily watch masks wearers go through emotional extremes, normally frightening to watch (Hall, 2000). Masks can 'disrupt our learned ways of viewing' (Wiles, 2000, pg287), playing with people's perceptions, e.g. so people see what their brains think ought to be there (Wilsher, 2007); aligning with findings from psychological perception research (e.g. Gregory, 1998). They can act to frame clearly what is being said and done by the wearer as having particular significance (Eldredge, 1996). Small movements are amplified and invested with meaning by those watching (Arrighi, 2010), with slightest movements conveying different messages, meaning that mask wearers can do very little themselves, for audience to see meaning, expression and characteristics being expressed through roleplay. All people; no matter what their age or body shape, are given access to portray convincingly to others, all types of

characters (Decroux, 1974). For reticent non-drama learners, asked to learn by engaging in and observing scenario roleplay, mask use might offer useful benefits.

A limitation with all these benefits claimed for masks in drama contexts, is that most are made anecdotally by practitioners sharing their work with other practitioners, or by academic researchers investigating their accounts of their lives and work, not products of more rigorous academic research. There are some exceptions (Wiles, 2000; Vervain, 2004; 2011; Eldredge, 1975; Evans, 2009; and Arrighi, 2010). These use qualitative approaches, unlikely to satisfy a hardened positivist, about any potential generalizable 'valid' claims for masks and mask use. When they do engage learners as research participants, their findings, perhaps unsurprisingly, do echo many of the claims made anecdotally for masks made by theatre practitioners (e.g. Arrighi, 2010), but examples of these studies are very few. Another issue, regarding any 'validity' claims for mask effects, is that researchers investigating mask use in drama contexts are invariably conducting research from a starting point position of a passionate interest in mask use, given that this is, in western theatre, an area fringe to mainstream theatre practice. However, one could argue that, regardless of any 'validity' for mask claims made, if learners perceive many of these effects, they still could be usefully harnessed for enabling learning, regardless of objective 'validity'.

Mask use in non-drama contexts:

Research into mask use for learning in non-drama contexts is also rare, although some benefits for learning have been claimed. Mask making has been claimed to facilitate verbal and non-verbal reflection for counselling clients (Trepal-Wollenzier & Wester (2002), in human services education (Lashewicz et al, 2014), and in leadership development for Health & Social care professionals (Hughes, 2011) where reflection is claimed to move beyond just thought, to masks stimulating interaction between thoughts, feelings and action. When activities go beyond mask *making*, to include some kind of roleplay using masks, claims for reflection transfer into action are stronger, such as when Leach (2010), claimed mask making followed by masked improvised performative inquiry enabled reflection go beyond thought to stimulate interaction. Likewise, Reid-Searl et al (2014) claimed learner reflection as action-oriented and purposeful, when trainee nurse participants took part in Mask-Ed nursing simulations with skilled medical instructors playing patients wearing highly life-like masks.

Masks are said to allow leaders' deeper self-exploration (Taylor & Ladkin, 2009), and counselling clients to explore dreams and imagery. Hughes (2011) claimed using mask as a metaphor via mask making enables leaders to explore levels of subjective experience and beliefs, values and experiences in leadership style and behaviour (Hughes, 2009). They are claimed as powerful tools to develop self-awareness for teachers: through surfacing aspects of self that are normally kept hidden, e.g. tensions (Leach, 2010); and in leaders to surface feelings and hidden agendas to reveal uncomfortable truths about self, deepening understanding of conscious and unconscious drivers, thus deepening self-awareness (Hughes, 2009; 2011). Mask-making is claimed to help develop insights and information about a leaders' self, unavailable through written and spoken language, and lead to both individual and collaborative awareness in human service providers (Lashewicz et al, 2014). Masks are also claimed to enable self-expression: to help human services learners feel more relaxed, be themselves and as a medium to share things they would not otherwise share (Lashewicz et al, 2014); to help counselling clients get in touch with and express emotions (Trepal-Wollenzier & Wester, 2002); and via improvised performative enquiry, enable teachers to engage with and emotionally express tensions and dissonances with various personae and professional/personal life stages.

Mask making has been used to help learners express identity in a group and social role (Trepal-Wollenzier & Wester, 2002); act as mediators between selves and outside world and disclose teachers complex and sometimes dislocated narratives of personal/professional identity (Leach, 2010); and use experiential learning, reflection and creativity to engage human services students in professional identity development (Lashewicz et al, 2014). Most of this is exploration of individual identity, although Sutherland (2013) made some use of masks as part of drama for group identity exploration, to explore power, identity, race issues in South Africa. Embodied processes of performance (including some mask use) enabled students to interrogate complexities of power and identity, resulting in significant shifts about race and racial privilege amongst white students. Lashewicz et al (2014) claimed mask making helped develop appreciation for diversity in disability studies.

Mask making is claimed to help analysis and problem solving. Trepal-Wollenzier (2002) claimed it can help counselling clients represent two opposing sides of a conflict and gain a unique perspective on problems they face and possibilities they might have to address these. Leach (2010) claimed masks helped teachers open up multiple perspectives on issues, identify inhibitions and barriers, and better understand and transform forces that impeded progression and being effective (Leach, 2010).

Hughes (2009;2011) claimed freeing up of creative thinking, lateral thinking promotion and encouragement of alternative perspective-taking on leadership issues and situations, thus safely deepening understanding of situations and what may be going on in them (Hughes, 2011). Leach (2010) claimed that masked improvisation developed previously inaccessible agency in the learners to tackle issues. Reid-Searl et al (2014) claimed facilitation of nurses to engage in problem solving of nursing scenarios, through Mask-Ed scenario roleplay with instructors wearing realistic masks simulating various patient conditions.

This study also unusually claimed mask use to develop social skills, in that this more interactive Mask-Ed approach develops student nurses' therapeutic communication skills and awareness of empathy. Lashewicz et al (2014) also claimed that mask-making activities can help with relationship building in child and youth care. However, it is striking just how relatively few of these focus on active development of social skills, and facilitate practice of these through interaction with others.

Finally, masks have been claimed to enhance learner engagement, with Reid-Searl et al (2014) claiming learning made fun by roleplay with masked educators, and with mask making; students enjoy kinaesthetic aspects of mask making, enjoying a method not requiring high levels of verbal articulation (Hughes, 2009), and it is an activity offering inspiration and/or captures learners' awareness (Lashewicz et al, 2014). It is also said to be an inclusive activity, for example, in helping learners with disabilities to engage more easily with curriculum (Roy & Dock, 2014). Hughes (2009) claimed that working with masks can offer a way to transform learning and deepen understanding; explores creative alternatives to logical, rational approaches; and combined with coaching dialogue, can surface more learning leading to more effective leadership, improving the quality of workplace action. Lashewicz et al (2014) claim that mask making is a supportive activity, promoting confidence and risk taking in social work practice, which usefully de-emphasises instructor authority. For Reid-Searl et al (2014), nursing students can benefit from interacting with 'someone real' rather than a fellow student, in the form of a skilled clinician educator wearing a highly realistic patient mask, who can expertly guide the roleplay to focus the learning.

These claims made for mask use suggest that useful potential applications for masks for learning outside drama contexts, offering valuable learning benefits. However the lack of studies suggests a need for further studies to explore more fully, how when and why masks may be useful. Studies exploring masks used in business context education are even scarcer, despite increasing recognition that integrating arts-based approaches into business education can be valuable (Adler, 2006), and

occasional anecdotal practitioner reports of using masks in such contexts (Chase, 2017). Most studies in non-drama contexts, apart from Reid-Searl (2014) are done by insider researcher practitioners, using mainly qualitative interpretive approaches, which limits any attempt to generalise claims. Most involve mask *making* and primarily intrapersonal skills development, rather than scenario roleplay interaction with masks and more interpersonal skills development. This leaves many of the potential benefits claimed for masks by theatre practitioners unexplored, except perhaps Reid-Searl et al (2014). Even here, the learners were not wearing masks in the simulations, e.g. as a way of helping them more deeply empathise with patient perspectives, and more fully and easily engage with improvised scenario roleplay; masks were worn by the tutors. The masks used were also limited: because so realistic, they were extremely expensive and could be used once only (Heyman et al, 2014), and the life-like 'Hollywood' naturalism of them resulted in a public outcry for perceived social stigma promotion against certain patient groups (BBC, 2015).

The limitations in studies of mask use in drama and non-drama contexts, might suggest that there could be a need for more variety of research that: 1) investigates the use of masks used for *interpersonal* skills development; 2) where the pedagogy involves learners embodying and acting in the masks themselves to gain roleplay benefits; 3) where the research might surface for investigation more of the claims made for masks in drama contexts translating to non-drama contexts, especially in business management education.

Ch3: Aims, objectives & outcomes

AIMS:

- RA1: Develop capability in learners for leading and working with other people, especially in business and workplace contexts
- RA2: To develop a pedagogy that facilitates this, using masks and scenario roleplay
- RA3: To help nurture a community of practice to support this pedagogy

OBJECTIVES & OUTCOMES:

- RO1: Further development of this pedagogy, ideas for next steps and clarification of future direction
- RO2: Richer understanding of what is perceived by learners to be valuable about it, and how it could be made even more valuable, especially for learners in business learning contexts.
- RO3: Positive, sustained and sustainable, motivated change, in myself and my practice of this 'masks and scenario roleplay' pedagogical approach
- RO4: Engagement of more teaching and learning practitioners, in using, supporting and developing this approach, as part of a developing community of practice.
- RO5: A rich, positive, generative AI story/narrative/argument about the above.
- RO6: PA set of principles to follow and ideas for future workshop design and facilitation and ideas for further research.
- RO7: OA research report (including all the above + critical discussion of potential implications, limitations, & issues).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

- RQ1: What is valuable about this pedagogy for learning? 'What is working and gives life here?' How and why? Especially for learners in business contexts?
- RQ2: What could make this even more valuable? How and why? Especially for learners in business contexts?

Comment: The research design has evolved through the life of the project (see Methods). Within this, Aims, Research Questions and Objectives & Outcomes O1,2,6 & 7, have remained in essence

the same. With O3, 4, & 5, these have evolved as I have developed more understanding of how I might most productively apply Appreciative Inquiry (AI) methodology to my project within my circumstances, and as I changed some of my methods and procedure.

Ch4: Methodology

The overarching methodology is an Appreciative Inquiry (AI), Mixed Methods approach.

I used AI because I am committed to bringing about positive, generative change in this masks and scenario role play pedagogy, grounded in what I and others perceive as already working in it, as an insider researcher practitioner. I am inherently and inextricably biased as a researcher in my underlying personal belief in the value of this as a pedagogy and my continued commitment and desire to further positive development of this work. As a consequence of this, the most productive way forward seemed to choose a research methodology accommodating that, congruent with my research aims, objectives and personal values. I have also had some training in this, which was helpful.

AI is a simultaneous inquiry and change methodology, which is both an extension and a critique of Action Research (Cooperrider & Srivasta, 1987). It differs from Action Research, as with all deficit based change methodologies, in deliberately not focusing on inquiring into what is not working and how to fix it, but on collaboratively discovering what is collectively perceived to be already working, and how can we build on that to make it even better.

AI practitioners have resisted attempts since the start (e.g. Cooperrider, 1987) to rigidly define AI as a fixed technique (Ludema et al, 2001), so there are adaptations of AI rather than one 'correct' process to follow (Bushe, 2011), but arguably it is AI if it follows the AI Principles (Watkins et al, 2001).

Constructionist: AI takes up a social constructionist position on reality and knowledge, asserting that what we know as reality in the world as reality, is constructed through our social discourse (Watkins et al, 2011). This fits my beliefs and values. I accept that reality is socially constructed, and on that basis, I set out deliberately to engage others in co-constructing generative stories about this pedagogical practice to move it forward. Within this report I am not engaging in generating 'objective', 'valid' or generalizable knowledge, but producing and sharing one possible set of stories about this work, to stimulate myself and others to further co-construction of this pedagogy.

Simultaneity: AI asserts that inquiry is simultaneously the production of self-and- world (Bushe, 2012), that inquiry *is* change, 'the way we know is fateful' and inquiry *is* intervention (Watkins et al, 2001). I am intending to change this pedagogy by the questions I ask, thereby developing this

pedagogy simultaneously in directions dictated by those questions. I want to move it into a positive, generative future, therefore I am deliberately asking positively framed research questions about this pedagogy, deliberately *not* inquiring into what might *not* be working and might be negative about it. This why I chose AI, rather than Action Research (AR).

Anticipatory: AI claims that the 'horizon of expectation' that we project ahead of ourselves 'brings the future powerfully into the present as a mobilizing agent' (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2001, pg 21). The 'artful creation of positive imagery on a collective basis' is something to be nurtured as part of a simultaneous inquiry-change process. This dictated my RQ2 and encouraging and sustaining focus on this throughout the data gathering and analysis process, so that images that I and my participants can create of a future for this pedagogy, will work to mobilise a positive future for this into the present. I followed this in my creation of a Provocative Narrative (PN) about this pedagogy from my synthesis interpretation of participants' stories, including mine, amalgamating both the 'best-of-what-is' and the future possibilities that could make it even better, framed as already positively happening in the present (Ch5, and analysis procedure below), in order to achieve RO1-6, especially RO3.

Poetic: AI privileges stories for gathering 'more holistic information' than facts in a change-inquiry than just facts, including experiences, emotions, and sensory details (Watkins et al, 2001). I gathered and drew from stories from my participants, including me, of our experiences with this pedagogy, focusing on what has been perceived as most valuable and might be even more valuable about it.

Positive: In AI, a positive focus is deliberately adopted and maintained throughout the inquiry/change process, on what is most positive, generative, and life-affirming; on 'what gives life here?', what is working and how can we get more of it; rather than what is not, how to fix it. This is how it is a critique of other deficit-based change/inquiry processes like Action Research. 'The power of the unconditional positive question' (Ludema et al, 2000, pg 189) is valued, as 'the way we know is fateful'. If you keep looking in a particular direction, you are more likely to go in that direction. I want to make this pedagogy more valuable for myself and others and to go in that direction. Relating to this is the AI theme of Continuity; that a change process will generate more sustainable motivation and energy from the 'whole system' engaged in it for a change process, if the change envisioned is grounded in what is already generative and working well in that system. As explained in Ch 1, I have struggled with feeling isolated and disheartened with this pedagogy (Ch1), so this could help me sustain change in it to achieve RO3.

Wholeness emphasises that in order to best change/develop any social system, the 'whole system' and as many 'voices' in it as possible should be involved. I wanted to involve research participants from all learning environments at UoW and FU where I was developing this pedagogy, within the practical and ethical constraints under which I was working, in as equal collaborative co-creation as possible. However, with the relocation to Cornwall & new role, including UoW participants became increasingly unfeasible. Then my definition of the 'whole system' shrunk further as it became clear that FU participants could not be practically involved as co-creators beyond a focus group after a workshop. Then in the interpretation of the (sometimes conflicting) stories I had co-constructed with my participants, I had to make choices for inclusion for the Dream PN I created (Ch5), which meant privileging some voices and de-privileging others, especially with regard to the 'future possibilities'. In this, ultimately, I had to make choices that were most congruent with my values and capabilities, and experience of what might work best with business learners (OSD1-21), while still staying open to the challenge of a range of possibilities, as I am the practitioner at present who seems to be taking this pedagogy forward. So, while I tried to be as inclusive as possible with as many 'voices in the system' as possible, the 'whole system' as the focus of this AI inquiry-change reluctantly became: 'my pedagogy' rather than 'our pedagogy'.

Design

I used the '4D' version of the AI process stages (Watkins et al, 2001, pg86; Bushe, 2011). This model has the four stages of:

Discovery: appreciating that which gives life

Dream: envisioning impact

Design: co-constructing the future

Delivery or Destiny: sustaining the change

Initially I intended to use these as follows:

- 1) *Delivery*: of a workshop, to a group of FU staff participants
- 2) *Dream + Design*: – Focus Group (FG) with same FU participants asking 'what is working well here' about this workshop and 'what could make it even better'
- 3) *Design*: me redesigning workshop based on FG stories.

- 4) *Delivery*: of redesigned workshop to UoW staff participants
- 5) *Discovery + Dream* - FG conducted with same UoW participants, asking same questions as FU FG
- 6) Design – me redesigning the workshop based on FG stories

However, this became unfeasible half way through the process, with regard to involving UoW participants, so design became:

- 1) *Delivery*: of this pedagogy as a workshop (MW7, App2), in April 2017 to a group of FU staff participants
- 2) *Dream + Design*:
 - FG conducted after the workshop, with those FU participants, asking ‘what is working well here’ about this workshop and ‘what could make it even better’.
 - + Interview with same questions to FU staff course leader of a UG business course (following an earlier April workshop for his 3rd year UG students), particular focusing on potential of pedagogy for business contexts
 - + collection and reflection on previous past workshops (MW1-6) and all available documentation relating to them, (OSD1-21, see App2)
 - Qualitative analysis of all above, to generate rich, positive, generative ‘Provocative Narrative’ Dream, answering both research questions, for future Design & Delivery stages.

Data Gathering:

Workshop with FU staff (1.5 hrs):

Participants were a convenience sample of 10 FU staff volunteers (P1-10), from FU and FXPlus, from a range of different disciplines and functions (NB cannot give details because of anonymity, with small HEI and sample). 60% of these were also my students, doing a PGCHE/MA in Creative Education (see Ethics below). Recruitment was via email invite and FAQ (see App7), explaining workshop and FG and what asked to do.

Procedure: Participants did workshop using this pedagogy (App3).

Focus Group (FG) with FU staff immediately after workshop (1 hr):

(NB – I refer to this throughout as an FG, but actually it became a group interview. But to avoid reader confusion through this document, I continue to call it an FG)

Participants were as above, with all opting to remain for the FG immediately after workshop. Procedure was participants were asked to answer a series of questions as individuals and as a group, flexibly following a semi-structured interview protocol (App4) based on my AI research questions, following AI principles. This method/procedure was chosen, as opposed to alternatives e.g. 121 interviews, as one that could gather diverse qualitative rich data and AI Discovery stage stories, within severely limited time and availability for myself and participants.

Semi-structured Interview (1 hr):

Interview with an FU staff course leader (IP) of UG business course. Procedure was as with the FG with questions and AI process, based instead on similar earlier April workshop done with his students, with added focus how might work best in business contexts.

Gathering of Other Sources of Data

Procedure here was to gather all available information re my experience of pedagogy in personal archives relevant to RQ1&2 since inception, Sept 2014 (*OSD1-21 – see App2*), to work around practical constraints yet enrich the data pool with ‘voices in the system’, beyond the restricted FU staff sample, especially regarding application of this pedagogy to business context learners.

Data analysis

I used a Thematic Analysis (Cohen et al, 2011), as an accessible, appropriate way for inexperienced researchers of doing a qualitative analysis, but following AI principles.

Procedure: Given practical constraints, I privileged the focus group data analysis as central fulcrum to focus and inform interpretation through the subsequent analysis. FG was transcribed and coded (x2), then I moved codes towards generating into tentative categories. With interview: I immersed myself in listening to the recording (x 3) then on 4th pass made detailed notes and selective quotes using codes from the focus group as a framework to identify similarities and differences with interview data, moving then to arranging categories in themes (App9-13).

In line with an AI approach and the Dream stage, I then brought the other sources of data (OSD1-21, App2) to the codes, categories and themes I had created, to generate a positive, generative AI 'Provocative Narrative'(PN) (Ch5), structured as a set of Provocative Propositions (PP), of what I currently interpret is valuable about this pedagogy and how it could be made even better in the future, framed as if already positively happening in the present. (for a more 'balanced' and/or 'deficit-based' analysis/critical evaluation, see Ch 6).

I have not included quotes from individual stories in this PN as might be more usual with a presentation of 'findings' derived from a form of Thematic Analysis, e.g. to support it's 'trustworthiness', or e.g. to ascertain the relative agreement between participants in relations to any claims I might make from that. This is because: 1) these were negatively impacting the flow, clarity and Poetic value of the PN, when that is important to achieve RO1-6, especially RO3 &5; 2) any attempt to present anything like a 'trustworthy', 'objective' set of 'findings' would be disingenuous and not fit the social Constructionist AI principle; 3) privileging quotes from particular individuals seemed to contradict 'Wholeness', and is not usually what Dream output consists of, out of a Discovery process from individual stories, 4) individual quotes were framed in the tense of when they were uttered, which dragged against the Anticipatory Principle in what I was trying to generate as a PN, amalgamating best of now and future possibilities, framed as if already happening in the present.

Ethics, insider issues.

I gained ethical approval from UoW and FU (App5&6), however only FU was relevant, outlining measures to protect my participants from physical and psychological harm that I then followed. I addressed informed consent by providing participants with full information in the email invite (App7) and in a full Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form (App8), which outlined the parameters of how I would be respecting their informed consent, anonymity and confidentiality, and right to withdraw, as well as regarding storage of their data.

Insider researcher issues:

Insider issues were always going to be an issue with this project, due to this being a form of action research where I am researching my own practice, as both participant and researcher, with participants who are staff colleagues in the HEI in which I am working. Because of the nature of the

convenience volunteer sample, 6/10 of the FG participants were also my students. I addressed this by this making clear that this was a volunteer activity, not related directly to any the curriculum, especially assessments. However, I cannot rule out how my participants, or those PGHCE staff-students who did not attend, really perceived this, regardless of what I said and meant. I kept alert to any signs that these power issues might be having any impact on them, heading off any slight hint that these were going on, but I cannot escape that I was still their teacher with power over them. Even if I gathered feedback through a 3rd party from them to surface any issues, in such a small HEI, staff would know ultimately I was behind this, and possibly shape their responses accordingly. My teacher role here also might affect their ability to exercise right to withdraw. On the other hand, they were voluntarily giving up their holiday time after a busy term to participate, the majority of my students who did not attend were clearly being supported in that, and the atmosphere of both workshop and focus group was incredibly positive, fun and joyous, with clear signs of strong enjoyment from all present and in communication from others later.

The best way I dealt with these issues was through following the AI Positive Principle with data gathering and analysis, one reason why ethics boards can be favourable to AI projects. This meant that participants were already channelled into only sharing positive things about me and this pedagogy, minimising e.g. the chance that they would say something negative about this and thus consciously or unconsciously influence my treatment of them in the PGCHE. However, one could say that AI in itself is exercising power in that respect, and me in it, as I am sure a Foucauldian analysis of AI process could delineate. Ultimately every way I have turned with this to try and escape and address these insider issues with my research design has always revealed more potential issues, especially in relation to the Wholeness Principle. Ultimately I had to try and stay as alert as I could throughout the process, acknowledging to myself when this might be happening to trying to address it as it occurred.

An example was with the focus group, which became very clear to me in my transcription of it. I can clearly see some of those power dynamics, that a discourse analysis might surface, of how I, and other participants, might be subtly shaping and blocking others views, especially about some areas of possibly conflicting views of future possibilities, e.g. regarding whether this pedagogy could make use of professional actors in scenario roleplay. One or two of those in favour of this idea are clearly persuading others in favour of this, due to their positive experiences of this in their own training work, and despite me attempting to be neutral and open, it is very likely that in my non-verbal communication (NVQ) as facilitator and PGCHE teacher, and what I do say, that I am showing that I

have quite strong reservations about this idea, and this might impact at least some of the PGCHE staff-students, particular one or two that I get on well with and/or who are very conscientious and ambitious students. More generally, because of my inexperience with conducting a group interview, a small number of the FG participants are dominating the story telling, including to my shame myself when I get carried away with one of their ideas, which is silencing other potential voices in the group. At the time, I resolved this for myself before the focus group, that I was a co-creator and participant too in this inquiry-change process, so should allow myself to participate more freely and transparently, rather than adopt 'objective' 'neutrality'. However, I was struck by the potential impact of that when transcribing, and I am not sure now, ethically and in terms of data richness, that was the best decision. 121 AI interviews, at least as a first stage, might have helped address some of the group dynamic issues if not the issue of me being PGCHE teacher. Not using PGCHE staff-students would have been optimal, but that luxury was not possible for me with my current practical constraints.

I found the data analysis and PN generation challenging throughout with regard to ethics, concerned that by making myself the 'whole system', I was violating Wholeness in terms of power and inclusion, and perhaps was going against the way I had promoted the process as collaborative in ethics form (App5) and my communications to participants beforehand (App7&8). However, I realised that actually I was not doing so, and had clearly spelt out in FG and Interview that I was to be the one after the focus group to be taking it forward in AI process from that point and how, while inviting any who wanted to be involved if they would like, which they did not take up despite unanimous enthusiasm for the work (e.g. as holidays, other commitments).

Ch5: Condensed AI Provocative Narrative (PN) (for full PN see Appendix 14)

Provocative Narrative: 'What is perceived as valuable about this pedagogy?':

Summary:

APPLICATION: This pedagogy is most impactful for *improving teamwork*, by participants *actively practicing appreciation of diversity* through *Using Personality as a metaphor*. It is also a flexible approach, suitable for a *range of possible applications*. **WAYS OF SUPPORTING LEARNING:** Learning is well supported by: *scenario roleplay practice with masks, the power of masks as enablers, lightness and play, simplicity, good scaffolding and structure, user-friendly information and strong facilitator support*. **LEARNING GAIN:** The gain for learners is enhanced *emotional intelligence skills*, for working more effectively with other people.

APPLICATION:

In terms of applications, this pedagogy is most impactful for *improving teamwork*, by participants' *actively practicing appreciation of diversity* in an embodied way, through the use of *Personality as a metaphor*. It is also a flexible approach, suitable for a *range of possible applications*.

It is helping all types and levels of teams enhance group functioning, collaboration and capability. It is enabling them to surface underlying issues preventing effective teamwork. It is helping them explore those issues safely through scenario roleplay, powerfully enabled by using personality masks and personality as a metaphor, to generate and practice solutions to their challenges, empowering them to successfully progress.

It is enabling teams to identify and actively practice appreciating the diversity within them. Team members, with their whole person through embodied practice, are being enabled to identify, experience, celebrate and empathise with sources of differences between each other, to recognise how each and all of them make valuable and essential contributions to effective group functioning. It is enabling them to practice in safety, through team scenario roleplay in masks, ways of more effectively working with their differences, to improve their group functioning and progress.

This pedagogy recognises how challenging it can be to do genuinely do, and appreciate in practice, sources of diversity within a team. It is scaffolding team members capability building in this, by using personality masks and Personality as a construct and metaphor, enabling them to more safely explore the challenges and positive value of all the sources of difference within them, as well as experience underlying commonalities. Masks are helping every team member recognise and shift experientially the ways in which their own perceptions, biases projections are shaping the way they are responding to and interacting with their fellow team members, building their understanding and sense of ownership for ensuring effective group functioning toward better team outcomes. Masks are allowing groups to surface and develop underlying ideas of their group identity, towards creating a clear, shared vision of their desired team and/or organisational identity and role.

WAYS OF SUPPORTING LEARNING:

Participants' learning to appreciate diversity, for working in groups and teams is well supported by: ***scenario roleplay practice with masks, the power of masks, lightness and play, simplicity, good scaffolding and structure, user-friendly information and strong facilitator support.***

Scenario Roleplay Practice With Masks: Provocative Propositions:

Participants unanimously value the scenario roleplay they do with the masks, as the most stretching, powerful, lastingly useful, practical element of this pedagogy for their learning. They value the safe space this provides for them, as both observers and role players, to flexibly experientially magnify, explore and practice resolving challenges they face working with others different from themselves. They value practicing and observing diverse ways of more successfully interacting with others and the advantages this can bring for more productive and harmonious interaction. They value how using masks with this, can make this much clearer, easier and more enjoyable for them, empowering them to generate and practice solutions and reflection they might not be able to access without the masks. They are using the scenarios flexibly and creatively in many different ways, to explore team/group work issues and how to resolve them, to help them progress.

They are recognising the growing ability and interpersonal skills being gained and demonstrated by their all their colleagues within this. They are recognising their enhanced ability in adapting their behaviour and approach, to better recognise, negotiate, actively appreciate and do difference, in order to work more effectively as a group/team, recognising and value that each of them bring to the group.

Power of Masks As Enablers: Provocative Propositions:

The masks are acting as powerful enablers for the participants, for both for those wearing the masks and for those watching. They are enabling deep, active learning and provoking thought and reflection, sudden insight and realisation. They are helping participants to immerse themselves fully into the active learning activities. They are providing insight for the participants into their own learning processes. Participants are quickly able to apply the new knowledge they are gaining, from wearing and watching the masks and reflecting on these experiences: e.g. to analysis of their fellow participants and situations and people they know outside the workshop, and e.g. to how they might adapt this approach for the benefit of those whose learning they want to support, in their own workplace contexts.

The impact of the first moment in the beginning of the workshop where the previously unseen masks are revealed, one by one, worn by volunteer participants, is particularly powerful, affective and effective. This surprise revelation is suddenly transporting participants from everyday conversation amongst their colleagues, and not being sure what is going to happen, to immediately putting them into the 'mode' of the workshop; the topic of focus and learning approach. The masks are suddenly and immediately dominating the learning space, powerfully compelling and engaging the learners' collective attention. Participants are finding the masks beautiful, unusual, unfamiliar, extraordinary. The masks very quickly, even instantly for some participants, are provoking a wide range of strongly experienced emotions among the learners: including laughter, fun, enjoyment, aesthetic pleasure, intense interest, fascination, curiosity, excitement, wonder, amazement, surprise, desire to possess, slight discomfort, nervousness, anticipation, and expectation. This is serving to very quickly engage the learners in their learning; in issues and concepts being addressed and the learning activities being done.

Participants are finding the fixed expression of the rigid masks powerful, especially when being worn. They are allowing easy and quick communication of a powerful message, just by the person putting on the mask, enabling observers to instantly get message being communicated. The masks also are playing with their perceptions, especially when being worn, making participants instantly realise how much they are projecting their own perceptions onto others, ascribing particular characteristics to them, based on appearances. They are instantly provoking the learners'

perceptions and imaginations, to building an ever-evolving picture of the person that might be represented by the masks. They seem to be physically changing the wearer's body language immediately (for both observers and wearers), making the transformation seem surprisingly real, causing the participants to experience an abstract Personality construct that they represent as real, actual, present and alive in the room. This is happening for the observers and the wearers, even when the participants are doing little at all except put on the mask and stand still, facing those watching.

Participants find having both non-speaking full masks, for earlier personality embodiment activities, and also speaking half-masks, for later scenario roleplay, particularly helpful. They find not being able to speak in the masks helpful at first, because it makes them express physically the characteristics of the personalities represented, who differ from themselves, through gesture, instead of words. The masks move participants from intellectualising, into their bodies and behaviour. They enable reflection and action: a cycle of reflection and doing, reflection and doing; as opposed to reflecting and writing.

Through seeing and doing gestures of another personality in the mask, they are feeling and increasing their empathy with that person they perceive as different from themselves. The masks are helping them to feel they are 'getting inside the skin' of different personalities. Observers are experiencing simultaneously both the personality (mask) very different from themselves, and the fellow participant they know and like (the wearer), enabling them to feel a greater level of empathy for that different personality, based on the positive feelings they already feel for the wearer. The masks are helping them to experience empathy with their whole body/person (thoughts, emotions, behaviour), helping the participants experientially develop better mutual understanding.

The masks enable participants to 'do difference', more capably and easily. They enable very fast, sudden access for participants, immediate embodiment of difference, into feeling like they are becoming someone else, as if they are now the personality the mask represents. They provoke quickly the imaginary, sensory experience of being in another person's 'headspace', as well as the actions perceived to belong to that person, who they perceive as very different from themselves.

The masks help overcome the participants' usual dislike of roleplay and drama. They help participants who begin reticent and nervous, move rapidly to fully engage with scenario roleplay. They enable the learners to perceive themselves and others as being hidden. They tend to endow

the mask with independent agency, which is liberating for them. They perceive of the mask 'disappearing their own personality', enabling them more easily to embody another. The masks give permission to the wearer, to be able to do things they would normally not be able to do, to embody personalities very different from themselves, often strikingly so for their colleagues who know them. They give permission to express different personality characteristics in terms of thought, emotion and behaviour. They allow greater access to personal resources (thoughts, emotions, behaviour, skills, creative ideas, strategies) normally less easily available to them. For instance, to perform tasks more that they find challenging, such as trying to influence a personality different from their own, by being more like, and empathising with, that particular personality, thus taking more account of that persons' needs, concerns, preferences, etc, in their influencing approach. The mask also helps them to persist in practicing challenging tasks, that they would normally give up on when meeting obstacles (e.g. trying to influence someone with a personality very different from themselves).

Participants are unusually ready 'to have a go' and engage in risky and challenging learning activities. They speak of the mask pushing them out beyond their comfort zone, enabling them to do ridiculous-seeming things they wouldn't normally do, and to do unfamiliar behaviour instinctively and effortlessly. They seem to facilitate extraordinary experience and capability in the wearer, for wearers and observers. They facilitate play and creative experimentation in their approaches to interaction with others.

They do a lot of the work involved in roleplay and portraying character, for wearer and observer. They enable easier and better-quality roleplay, than would be possible by the wearer without the masks. They provide safety, open up a safer place and provide a safe way of surfacing things normally hidden. They enable them to safely explore differences and emotive issues around that.

They also help to open doors and provoke offers, invitations and future opportunities from others, e.g. for future applications of this pedagogy to help their own students, staff and clients.

Participants are helped to begin to get into the personality of the mask by being given specific, predetermined tasks and suggestions, appropriate to each personality mask. This saves them from the distracting effort of having to come up with lots of creative ideas themselves, to focus on the learning objectives at hand. Participants do all the exercises systematically with all four masks to get the maximum learning benefits, that can be derived from both embodying and watching others embody the different personalities.

Single colour masks can also be overlaid with different colours that represent other personality types, to help wearers and observers to perceive the full complexity of personality preferences e.g. via projections.

Lightness & Play: Provocative Propositions:

Fun and laughter are being actively encouraged and nurtured throughout the workshop, as an integral and essential part of this pedagogy. I am encouraging and supporting my participants to approach the exercises, however weighty the material, with lightness and in a spirit of playful experimentation. The learning activities are designed and facilitated as dynamic, interactive, participatory and inclusive.

Simplicity: Provocative Propositions:

Participants value the simplicity of the workshop: in design, learning activities, structure, materials and information provided. They like that any theory is presented simply, that they do not have to 'overthink' and that the workshop uses the familiar space and simple resources already in the learning space.

Good Scaffolding & Structure: Provocative Propositions:

The workshop design I am using to support the learning of my participants, is well-structured and scaffolds their learning very effectively, with earlier exercises gradually building to allow participants to more easily engage with the scenario roleplay with masks they so value at the end.

User-Friendly Information: Provocative propositions:

I provide useful pre-reading before the workshop for those who want it, and give clear simple limited explanation of theory used. I take care that this does not take away from the 'thunder of the first moment' with the masks.

Strong Facilitator Support: Provocative propositions: As a facilitator, I am courageous and self-confident. I am displaying unshakeable belief that this pedagogy works. I am not apologising for this as 'weird' or 'unusual' in any way. I show I'm committed to this work. I am passionate about it and I

am showing my enthusiasm. I am authentic, genuine, congruent and sincere. I am making people feel safe, that they are in good hands and that I and their fellow participants are looking after them. I am taking care of their health in my workshops, by providing antiseptic wipes to wipe masks between use, and encouraging all to use them. I am giving people permission and courage to 'step over the edge'. I am continuing to find new ways to encourage and support those more reluctant to engage in scenario role play with masks, so that all can benefit from the added learning benefits this provides. I am giving encouragement and coaxing them supportively to do so. I am taking a coaching approach and providing support. I am helping the group ease into this work kindly and gently. I am engaging them in group contracting in the beginning of the workshop. I am enlisting key stakeholders as 'cultural architects', to help lead the way and encourage other participants to participate.

LEARNING GAIN: Summary:

Individuals and teams are gaining enhanced *emotional intelligence skills*, for working more effectively with each other.

This pedagogy is developing individual learners and teams with their emotional intelligence skills, enabling them to work more effectively with each other in lots of different ways. They are gaining enhanced self-awareness, ability to understand others and regulate their own behaviour to better work with them, and better social skills.

Ch6: Discussion:

The provocative propositions (PPs) in the 'Applications' theme in the Provocative Narrative (PN) open up the biggest, exciting and most potentially generative shifts in this masks and scenario roleplay pedagogy. These are: *Improving Teamwork, Actively Practicing Appreciation of Diversity, & Using Personality As A Metaphor.*

Improving Teamwork as a key PP Application for this pedagogy was strongly highlighted right across the FG by participants (P1-10) and by the Interview participant (IP), with none of these participants showing any disagreement with the value of this. It was also highlighted in all previous workshops I had done (MW1-6, App2), including, surprisingly, the first one that I had done and experienced as so disastrous, with a group of MBA students at UoW. It was also apparent in reflection on Other Sources of Data (OSD1,3,6,7,15, App2). It is incredible to me how something so blindingly obvious and that has been so strongly and consistently highlighted, from the beginning, as 'the best-of-what-is' already there, has been staring me in the face throughout all this time. Although I have always seen it, e.g. when reflecting on feedback notes after previous workshops, I have not recognised it. It has taken the participants and this AI process to clarify this as both the best of what already is, and the most fruitful of future possibilities.

It is not that I have not been always aiming via this pedagogy to helping develop participants ability to lead and work with others, e.g. in teams, and it was a key element that led to me using sociodrama (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000) as a key influence in the development of it. But I have been approaching this indirectly, and focusing on developing capability in participants as individuals, rather than using this pedagogy to work with groups directly to develop their team capability. In this I have been blinded to what has always been there, because of my psychologist and leadership development consultant background (see Ch1), where the individual and/or 'leader' has primarily the unit of study, especially regarding 'individual differences' in Personality. The current workshop and exercises, especially the way I have approached scenario roleplay, e.g. with participants devising a scenario where an individual protagonist needs to 'influence' an individual whose personality they find 'challenging', have come out of this bias on the individual, from my background and which is blinding me to the richer value that could be offered by this pedagogy.

Now I can start to see a whole new vista of inspiring possibilities, both in terms of how I promote the value of this to others, which could help address some of the isolation issues I highlighted in Ch1,

and how I can redesign learning activities, especially the scenario roleplay, for working directly with teams/groups to help them improve their group capability, prompted by participants ideas. From both my consultant experience and in HE, I can also confer with the IP, seeing that this could make the pedagogy much more useful for wider range of different organisations and HE applications (e.g. with student group working), than my narrowly focusing on individual differences in personality per se, especially when the use of psychometrics is so dominant in that area. I can see now I have been straightjacketing my development of this pedagogy, because of my reaction to the pain of that first MBA workshop I did (see Ch1). My response to that was to retreat into my comfort zone of individually focused and tightly structured psychological theory, which although has been useful to help develop the work, is now restricting its' progress.

This also opens up possibilities for further research departures for potential value of masks as pedagogy. The vast majority of the literature I reviewed in Ch2, both for drama and non-drama contexts, but especially the all the latter, focused on the use of masks to develop individual capability, not group capability. The only two exceptions to this were some mask use in drama contexts, e.g. where masks have been claimed to help encourage collaborative play between actors in an ensemble (Murray, 2010; Rudlin, 2010). But largely this is a largely unexplored area, wide open for further research exploration.

The PP of *Actively Practicing Appreciation of Diversity* was strongly highlighted as especially valuable across the FG and by the IP. It is surprisingly not something that has been highlighted in MW1-6 or OSD1-14, even though it seems as if it has always been there, at least implicitly in my values and intentions, especially in the way I have framed Personality in the workshop (see below), with there being value in all personality preferences/'types', depending on context and perspective. It was also something coming out very strongly in FG and IP 'best-of-what-is' already present in the workshop data, rather than only the 'future possibilities' data, so this is already there, I am just not recognising and giving enough explicit central emphasis to it in my design, facilitation and promotion of the pedagogy. However, when I do, this could be very fruitful. It could make the pedagogy be of greater value to a wider range of learner stakeholders, given the importance given to promoting the appreciation of the value of diversity in organisations and to comply with equality legislation. I see also how I have sometimes been implicitly or explicitly working against this valuable aspect in the workshop design and my facilitation, e.g. when I encourage set-up of a scenario role play as a conflict type situation, where a protagonist has to influence a personality labelled 'difficult'/obstructive, to do something they do not want to do; e.g. when I put stronger emphasis on

reflection on the aspects of particular personalities that participants find most negative, rather than giving more focus on appreciating what may be valuable about those aspects in different contexts, and setting up scenarios that help reinforce and demonstrate their value. I can see now how in the workshop I can change the kinds of questions I frame to encourage more appreciation of diversity in personality, and encourage set-up of e.g. group problem solving task scenarios, where the value of personality aspects labelled as 'difficult' can become experientially apparent and reinforced for learners.

The PP of *Using Personality As A Metaphor*, came out several times in the FG and IP stories. Actively highlighting Personality as a construct, working against 'reification' of any Personality or any Personality model, has been valued here and has helped overcome resistance to engagement in my previous workshops (MW2-6). So that is a good vindication of the effectiveness of taking that approach. However, the implications of this PP for future direction of this pedagogy are even more significant, especially combined with the two Application PP's of *Improving Teamwork* and *Actively Practicing Appreciation of Diversity*. Breaking out of the straightjacket of my psychology background paradigm with this could really open up new possibilities and wider potential impact for the pedagogy. For me this is tremendously liberating, motivating, inspiring, energising, emboldening and fruitfully provocative, all responses very valuable for this pedagogy and objectives, especially RO3. Participants from FG/MW7 and past workshops (MW2-6) workshop recognise how hard it is to practice *actively* doing and appreciating difference, in an embodied way, in scenario roleplay. They also value this challenging, experiential practice for their learning, as being most valuable pedagogically. They recognise how very difficult this is to do in the real world. I think this contrasts with my experience of much diversity training, where this very real challenge is ignored or underestimated. Learning to genuinely do and appreciate people very different from yourself is very challenging for many people, and as such, surely such learning needs to be effectively scaffolded (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Stretching and using personality as a metaphor in combination with this pedagogy, could offer a way of helping scaffold this learning, in a safer, open and less threatening way for the learners, than attempting to tackle initially, in any useful sense beyond 'lip service' to appreciating diversity, other more visible, apparently 'real' manifestations of difference e.g. race, gender, religious dress, etc. This could help learners to engage more readily with practice in this, especially if I take this as suggested by the PN into appreciating diversity with real dysfunctional team scenarios roleplay, when we know (Ch2) that threatening or unpleasant situations are not conducive to quality learning (Race, 2007). The very artificiality of the masks as used in this pedagogy, also helps allow more free, open, safe, fun exploration, reflection and discussion, and

highlights the social construction of 'Personality' and difference in it, and by extension, other forms of diversity.

As IP and FG highlighted, stretching the Personality-mask metaphor beyond the confines of fixed psychological 'science', to include consideration of the group/team or organisation as a 'personality', enables fruitful learning activities to improve team capability, e.g. for analysis of group issues or e.g. group identity formation. It also enables me to address a particular issue that has been hampering me with the work. It has long been a 'thorn in my side', undermining my confidence in my practice, that the particular Jungian-based personality model I can represent with the masks I have available, although widely used in organisations via the MBTI psychometric, has poor 'validity' in terms of psychological 'scientific' research, compared to e.g. one with better 'empirical support' based on a Five Factor Model of personality, e.g. the NEO-PIR. I am perpetually apologising for this in my applications of this pedagogy, especially when the topic is psychological Personality, e.g. in MBA teaching, and it was also the whole focus of one virulent critic for my EAPRIL workshop conference application (ODS12). I have been fruitlessly spending time and effort trying to think how I could make or commission masks based on a better validated personality model, within my limited resources, to help me progress this pedagogy. However, shifting the focus from individual development and psychology to improving group/team functioning, with stretching 'personality' as a metaphor, offers a route out of this impasse, much more valuable for myself, organisations and potential learners. It also frees me up to usefully bring in a wider variety of cheaper, more readily available masks to enrich the pedagogy.

The PP: *Scenario roleplay practice with masks*, was highly valued as the most important way of supporting lasting learning, right across the FG/MW7 and IP stories and in previous workshops (MW1-7). Even with the disastrous first MBA workshop (MW1), this was shared with me as participant feed-forward. I take this (but also see later limitations discussion) as a useful vindication of my consistent privileging of this as most valuable in this pedagogy, with my assumptions and biases privileging experiential, practice-based, embodied, whole-person as optimal forms of learning. However, notwithstanding consistent signs of unanimous agreement with the value of this, this was also one of the most challenging areas with respect to analysis of FG stories and inclusive formulation of the PN (Ch5). My strongly biased view has always been that participants gain the highest learning value from them as participants engaging in the scenario roleplay practice, even while watching, and that has been an integral part of the design from the start. I have deliberately avoided any attempt to encourage, especially as former professional actor, me to embody

personality masks myself during the workshop, however tempting, as it can intimidate non-actors from roleplay engagement and resultant value. Yet some in the FG group were strongly privileging use of professional trained actors, to do the roleplay for participants, particularly those from one function who had recently used a Forum Theatre company in staff development. The FG seemed divided equally on this, with weight shifting back and forth with shifting group power dynamics, including myself in my non-verbal communication (NVQ), however much I tried to be 'neutral'. While overall consensus was that this should not replace participant roleplay, only ever augment, this was a sticking point for trying my best to be most fruitfully inclusive in an AI approach to Dream and a PN. Ultimately, I made the decision (see Ch4), based on my values, wider experience of applying this pedagogy in MW1-7, and later communication with P3 (ODS20-21), to include but de-privilege this idea to a resolution suggested by one participant. This was to create films, made available after the workshop, where actors demonstrated the extremes of the personalities. However, with a group vs individual capability future direction, this could become less useful.

Another noteworthy aspect of this PP is, that although this has been consistently valued in workshops (MW1-7) as the most powerful learning element of this pedagogy, this is not the way masks have been applied in any single pedagogy using masks in non-drama contexts reviewed in Ch2. I would argue that this should make my approach of especial interest, not just to these educators, but to educators more widely seeking ways to address some of my key PP's in their pedagogies and/or achieve the kinds of learning gains these sources in Ch2 have identified.

The PP: *Power of Masks As Enablers*, from the stories included in the analysis is also significant, especially given the importance given to learners engaging in scenario role play for learning, yet the difficulties involved for them to do it, identified in Ch2 and above. A primary reason why I was trying to draw on the benefits claimed by theatre practitioners and by some non-theatre educators for masks, reviewed in Ch2, was to help my learners more fully and easily engage with and derive the type of quality learning gained from scenario roleplay in Ch2. This does seem to be vindicated, which is very encouraging. My learners are also telling stories that echo every single learning benefit identified in all sources for mask use in non-drama contexts reviewed in Ch2: i.e. reflection, self-exploration and self-awareness, self-expression, identity development and expression, exploring diversity issues, analysis of situations from multiple perspectives, problem solving and developing agency, social skills and enhanced engagement and quality of learning. Our collective stories about this pedagogy also echo many of the benefits claimed by theatre practitioners for masks in Ch2, for e.g: provoking fascination and powerful emotions; quicker, fuller and easier transformation;

heightened physical expression; clearer communication; surfacing things normally kept hidden; feeling hidden and/or governed by masks so able to release inhibitions, take risks and do and say things not normally possible. It is notable also these stories from my workshops that echo theatre practitioners are mainly coming from non-actors, most of whom report usually disliking roleplay and 'doing drama'.

The remainder of *Ways of Supporting Learning* PP's from the participants stories, of: *lightness and play, simplicity, good scaffolding and structure, user-friendly information and strong facilitator support*, serve as helpful encouragement that the hard work I have spent developing these in my pedagogy, especially in response to the first disastrous MBA workshop (Ch1), has been worthwhile. Lightness and play is noteworthy, and could be even more of a helpful aspect, if I shift emphasis in future direction of the pedagogy into more potentially dangerous territory, as identified in the *Applications* theme and PP's, into e.g. addressing challenging aspects of team functioning and appreciating diversity within real currently dysfunctional team scenarios. *Lightness and Play* also echoes what some drama and non-drama educators in Ch2 have found valuable about masks e.g. Murray (2010); Rudlin (2010) and Reid-Searl et al (2014). *Strong Facilitator Support* as a PP, is both a vindication of what I'm doing and a helpful guide to moving forward, especially regarding addressing some of my personal issues discussed in Ch1, e.g. to be bolder and more confident to unapologetically assert the value of this work to others, to 1) leave my straightjacketing personal safety nets behind that block progress into more risky but productive applications; and 2) provide a 'safety net' for my learners' learning.

The *Learning Gain* PP of *emotional intelligence skills* is encouraging, as this has long been what I want my learners to gain from this pedagogy, especially the richer, embodied, transformative experiences of empathy, that e.g. FG participants have narrated, the kind that can bring about genuine practice of appreciation of diversity, not just 'lip service' to it. Non-drama pedagogical use of masks reviewed in Ch2 also echoes and claims these types of EI benefits. From the PN I could argue that this pedagogy might go beyond all those to offer even richer, experiential EI gains, especially for depth of empathy and in relation to appreciating the value of diversity, as the learners here are practicing both *doing as* and *doing with*, another person in embodied practice. This also gives me a central focus for promoting the relevance of the learning that can be gained from this pedagogy, given the importance given EI in business contexts, e.g. in staff development programmes and competency frameworks.

Using AI as an inquiry/research methodology to develop pedagogy has offered some significant benefits, commonly claimed about AI, which may also be of use to other educators. For me, personally, I can feel directly the benefits, of following AI Principles and valuing Continuity as an integral part of this pedagogy development process, rather than a more disruptive change methodology that might come from a deficit-based approach, especially to achieve my RO3 and address some of the personal issues blocking me in Ch1. Building a way forward out of what is already narrated as working well in this pedagogy, feels energising, life affirming, motivating, sustainable and gives me agency. I feel enabled to move progress and already progressing, because through recognising that what I need to do so, is already here in what I already have. Formulating PP's and PN using the Anticipatory Principle, amalgamating both best-of-what-is and future possibilities from asking RQ1&2, in a Dream written as if already happening in the present, is both dynamically sustaining and provoking; as I shift between recognition of what I'm doing, and am challenged by the stimulating tension of what I am asserting I am already doing. The PN thus serves as lasting resource of 1) nurturing support, 2) clear guidance and direction and 3) motivating call to action, whenever I choose to read it.

On the other hand, I can identify several potential limitations with both AI and my application of it. Often in practitioner case studies of AI applications (e.g. Watkins et al, 2001), the following of the Wholeness Principle and inclusive bringing together in consensus of multiple 'voices in the system' in one collective Dream, e.g. in organisational change processes, is presented in very unproblematic terms. That has not been my experience at all in practice here, especially when trying to do this in written form in a research report format. I have had challenging struggles and choices to face regarding power relations and ethical issues, about whose voices to privilege and de-privilege and why, in this formulation of a Dream. I also can see this operating through the data gathering process; e.g. as participants, including myself as facilitator, influence and silence other voices with their verbal and non-verbal behaviour in the focus group, which could be a research study critiquing AI process in itself (e.g. using discourse analysis). I have resolved this, unsatisfactorily but practically, by asserting for myself the 'whole system' in this pedagogy change process, thereby already raising power and ethical issues with how I might be negatively treating my participants, their voices and following AI 'Wholeness'. However, I can see why other educators, and my participants reading the report, could find this unsatisfactory.

Perhaps that is why AI practitioners often encourage participants to represent their Dream outputs via non-written media, as a way of addressing this. However, it could be argued that this is just a

way to whitewash the very real power relations issues that are being ignored in the change process, which could have severe implications for any future sustainability of the change envisioned. I myself might well also find this impacting on my future efforts to progress this pedagogy from my application of AI here. On the other hand, given the ever-shifting nature of socially constructed realities and this change process, in AI terms, from the point of view of it being used to help me move forward now, over the short term, perhaps 'sustainability' does not matter in quite the same way.

Ch7: Conclusions:

I think I have achieved all my Research Objectives (RO1-7) at least to some extent through this project. My participants and my process have helped me make a significant shift in the future direction I could focus this pedagogy (RO1), despite my constraints and the research design shifts I had to make in response, even if I have not yet thought through the finer details of how to implement this yet and this has to be done in further Design and Deliver stages. I did originally want to have more in terms of a solid revised workshop design out of this, however the nature and extent of the shift in focus has been remarkable. It also feels inspiring and motivating and satisfying all the requirements of RO3, because of the use of AI and being solidly founded on what is already working well and valued by a variety of learners in the present. I definitely have a hugely enriched understanding of what is perceived by learners to be valuable about this and how it could be perceived as even more valuable (RO2) in the future, which is wonderful, affirmative and generative. Of course, perhaps this could be even richer, and I could feel more certain that these might help make more valuable for business context learners, if I had been able to collect a wider, more diverse range of stories from more participants, especially from non-volunteer *workshop* participants and those working and learning in business contexts. Keeping much fuller more organised electronic notes of my reflections on MW1-6 and OSD1-21 during the process would also have helped with this. Making sure I do all those things in the future much more will only add value to this moving forward.

With RO4, I have had some success, in that in the course of this project I have managed to excite and engage 11 new educators from different disciplines and areas of professional practice with the value offered by this work and a number of UG students, at FU. I have been booked already by 3 of these to bring this pedagogy to their student and staff learners, for helping develop team functioning. I have been offered two external companies as potential contacts for doing further research and experiment with a revised workshop design based on the new proposed direction and application for this pedagogy. I have also engaged others in the work, i.e. the admittedly small handful of European practitioners who valued the pedagogy in the EAPRIL conference workshop. Of course, this is limited, especially with my high hopes regarding engaging UoW educators in co-development of this pedagogy, but it is much more than I started with at the start of this project, so progress against RO4.

I now have a rich, positive, generative, inclusive provocative AI story about all the above (Ch5 & App14), achieving RO5. I can see I could have gone much further with this, beyond what I thought I should produce as part of an MA research report, now that I have an enriched understanding of how AI can be applied. I could e.g. have expressed this in visual media, sculpture, or live or recorded performance, had I had more time, courage, and earlier understanding. I could take this learning forward and do this in the future. Although I would have to be aware of some of the potential pitfalls of this regarding the masking of certain ethical and power relations issues this might entail. The PN does include a set of principles and ideas to follow for future workshop design and further research directions, achieving RO6. I might have liked to have achieved a more condensed user-friendly format for these within the timeframe, but at least I could go on to produce this in the future from the PN.

I have achieved a research project, containing all I specified for RO7. It is nothing close to what I wanted and think I am capable in terms of potential, which is disappointing, but at least it has been achieved, working with very challenging circumstances, so at least it has been achieved, and the process of achieving that has been very valuable learning. One issue is the tension between the requirements of RO7, and the other RO's 1-6, in somewhat working against and undermining the benefits being gained, in that it has required me to abandon an AI approach and adopt a deficit-based approach to change, especially as part of an MA. I can see that perhaps an AI approach might not sit well with that application, or perhaps even with traditional research outputs, and might be better applied to other forms of inquiry-change processes than this particular MA project. Although on the other hand, perhaps I am once again being straitjacketed by my psychologist background perceptions of what it is 'allowed' in research and pedagogical practice, and need to take more courageous confidence to take more of a leap in future; food for further analysis and reflection.

Recommendations:

- 1) Redesign and promotion of workshop based on what has been identified in the PN, e.g. designing it for team capability building with real teams, enabling them to practice doing and appreciating value of diversity, using and stretching personality as a metaphor. All while keeping and adapting for this new focus, all the elements and exercises that are already perceived in PN as valuable in supporting learning, drawing on participants idea for future extensions of these, as incorporated in the PN.

- 2) Work with the staff FU participants who have booked or offered opportunities for workshops with their learners or contact organisations, to test out in practice the new workshop design.
- 3) Gather more stories, using a similar AI approach, from those experiences, from as many voices involved in those workshops, to further define the pedagogy and open up further future directions
- 4) Identify other avenues for dissemination of the learning from this and from carrying out 1-3; both academic e.g. through conference papers and a journal article, and especially in forms more palatable and accessible to an HR staff development or business management audience, e.g. set up a blog on this pedagogy and other forms of social media promotion.

Ch8: Reflection:

There is so much I could say here, and so many ways to take this section. However, a key learning from this is the value of taking an appreciative approach to my learning, so I will approach it from this. What has been very valuable has been to go through an AI process in practice, beyond the rhetoric I have learnt about AI and spouted myself e.g. to MBA learners. Doing this has enabled me to get a first-hand knowledge of just challenging and problematic it can be to try and apply AI principles to a change process, which I can take forward in any future applications I might use it in, and in my teaching about AI to different groups of learners. My instinct about how valuable AI as a process might be to me personally has also been borne out in practice, given my propensity to be derailed by negative emotions and an often crippling hyper-critical, undermining, deficit-based approach to my learning and development. AI has been proved to me as very valuable in this regard, generating a lot more positive, useful, sustaining energy than a more deficit based approach might do, however habitually comfortable. I was really made aware of that in the difference of emotional state and creative flow that was generated when formulating the AI narrative from my interpretation of the data vs my taking a more deficit-based approach to try and write the discussion to meet my perceptions of the MA research project requirements. It was also notable the impact that taking an AI approach had to the data gathering process: it was incredible how positive and encouraging the energy and bonding was in the room among the research participants, several of whom had never met each other before. This came from both doing the workshop and was sustained by the AI data gathering approach, which are recommendations I suppose for both. On the other hand, I cannot help the deficit-based habit creeping in here, to question again, as I did several times during the research process, was I just getting exactly what I wanted to hear, by the way I shaped the gathering of the data. But then on the other hand, of course it was, that is the whole point of using AI.

Finally, regardless of how challenging the whole process has been at times, it has been an incredibly rich and valuable learning experience, it has really fundamentally transformed my thinking of all this, regardless of my disappointment with the quality of the outputs at this point in time, which is really fantastic. I have a way forward and hope, whereas I started this research project feeling disillusioned, lost and hopeless, so choosing to focus my research project on this masks project, using an AI approach, has been invaluable, to me, if not yet to others. Though I can feel confident that it has also been valuable to at least some people already, my very generous research

participants, and all those who have engaged with it previously in UoW and FU, who shared of themselves so generously to help develop this pedagogy.

Appendix 1 (App1): References nb methods refs

- Adler (2006). The arts and leadership: now that we can do anything, what will we do? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5, 4, 486-499
- Arden, J. (1967). *Theatre at Work*, ed. Marowitz, C. and Trussler, S. London: Methuen.
- Arrighi, G. (2010). *The Neutral Mask: Its Origins and its Applications to the Creative Processes of the Actor*. VDM: Saarbrucken.
- Baldwin (2003). *Michel Saint-Denis and the Shaping of the Modern Actor*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Baldwin, J. (2010). *Michel Saint Denis: Training the Complete Actor*. In: Hodge, A. (ed.). *Actor Training*. London: Routledge, pp 81-98
- Banister et al, 1994
- Barrault (1962) cited in Wiles, D. (2007). *Mask and Performance In Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baylis, N. (2009). Making visible the invisible: corporeal mime in the Twenty-First Century. *New Theatre Quarterly*, 25, 3, 274-288.
- BBC (2015). News Online (- 16th Feb 2015. Retrieved 22/07/2017 URL: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-scotland-north-east-orkney-shetland-31486442>
- Biggs, J. & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching*
- Boal (2002). *Games for Actors and Non-Actors*. 2nd ed. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Brook, P. (1987). *The Shifting Point*. London: Methuen.
- Brookfield, S. (1986). *Understanding and facilitating adult learning*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Bushe (2011)
- Bushe (2012)
- Callery, D. (2001). *Through the Body: a Practical Guide to Physical Theatre*. London: Nick Hern books.
- Chase, M. (2015). Personal correspondence, Sept 2014.
- Chase, M (2017). *Mask: Making, Using & Performing*. Stroud: Hawthorn.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education*. 7th Ed. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cooperrider & Srivasta, 1987
- Cooperrider & Whitney, 2001
- Copeau (1931) cited in Rudlin, J. (1986). *Jacques Copeau*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Copeau as cited in Felner, M. (1985) *Apostles of Silence*. Associated University Presses: London

Cousins

Daste (1945) as cited in Rudlin, J. (2010) Jacques Copeau: the Quest for Sincerity. In: Hodge, A. (ed.). Actor Training. London: Routledge, pp 43-62.

Decroux (1974) cited in Arrighi, G. (2010). The Neutral Mask: Its Origins and its Applications to the Creative Processes of the Actor. VDM: Saarbrucken.

Dunn, L., Morgan, C. O'Reilly, M. & Parry, S. (2004). The Student Assessment Handbook: New Directions in Traditional & Online Assessment. London: Routledge

Eldredge, S. (1975). Masks: Their Use and Effectiveness in Actor Training Programs. PhD. Diss, Michigan State University.

Eldredge, S. (1996). Mask Improvisation for Actor Training and Performance. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Eldredge, S.A. & Huston, H.W. (2002). Actor training in the neutral mask. In: Zarrilli. P.B. (2002) (ed). Acting Reconsidered (2nd ed.). London: Routledge, pp. 140-147.

Evans, M. (2009). Movement Training for the Modern Actor. London: Routledge

Evans, M. (2014) Playing with history: personal accounts of the political and cultural self in actor training through movement, Theatre, Dance and Performance Training, 5, 2, 144-156.

Felner, M. (1985) Apostles of Silence. Associated University Presses: London

Feral, J. (1989a). Mnouchkine's workshop at the Soleil. Drama Review, 33, 4, 77-87

Feral, J. (1989b). Building up the muscle: an interview with Ariane Mnouchkine. Drama Review, 33, 4, 88-97.

Fo, Dario. (1987). The Tricks of the Trade. London: Routledge.

Gardner, H. (1993). Frames of Mind: the Theory of Multiple Intelligences. Basic Books

Gardner, W.L., Coglisier, C.C., Davis, K.M., & Dickens, M.P. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1120-1145

Gaulier (2007) cited in Murray, S. (2010). Jacques LeCoq, Monika Pagneux and Philippe Gaulier: Training for Play, Lightness and Disobedience. In: Hodge, A. (ed.). Actor Training. London: Routledge, pp 215-236.

Grantham, B. (2000). Playing Commedia: a Training Guide to Commedia Techniques, London: Nick Hern Books.

Gregory, R. L. (1998). Eye and Brain: the psychology of seeing. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional Intelligence. London: Bloomsbury

Hall, P. (2000). Exposed by the Mask. New York: Oberon Books

- Hall, T & Stahl, S. (2006). As cited in Warren, D. (2016). Course & Learning Design & Evaluation. In: Porkorny, H. & Warren, D. (2016) (eds). *Enhancing Teaching Practice in Higher Education*. London: Sage.
- Harrington, K., Sinfield, S. & Burns, T. (2016). Student Engagement. In: In: Porkorny, H. & Warren, D. (2016) (eds). *Enhancing Teaching Practice in Higher Education*. London: Sage.
- Henry (2000). Drama's ways of learning. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 5, 1, 45-62.
- Heron (1992) as cited in Postle (1993). Putting the heart back into learning. In: Boud, D., Cohen, R. & Walker, D. (1993) (eds). *Using Experience for Learning*. Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.
- Heyman I., Innes. G., Goodhand, K. and Luders, E. 2014 *The Hidden Educator -The use of High Fidelity Silicone Masks in Health and Social Care Education. Innovate to Stimulate conference, Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen.*
- Huffaker, J.S. & West, E. (2005). Enhancing learning in the business classroom: and adventure with improv theatre techniques. *Journal of Management Education*, 29, 6, 852-869
- Hughes, S. (2009). Leadership, management and sculpture: how arts based activities can transform learning and deepen understanding. *Reflective Practice: International & Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 10, 1, 77-90
- Hughes, S. (2011). The leadership mask: a personally focused art based learning enquiry into facets of leadership. *Reflective Practice: International & Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 12, 3, 305-317
- Hutchinson, S. & Lawrence, H. (2011). *Playing with Purpose*. Farnham: Gower.
- Jenkins, R. (2002). Dario Fo: the roar of the clown. In: Zarrilli. P.B. (2002) (ed). *Acting Reconsidered* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge, pp. 140-147.
- Johnstone, K. (1979). *Impro: Improvisation and the Theatre*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Kelm, 2015
- Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Leabhardt, T. (1995). As cited in Arrighi, G. (2010). *The Neutral Mask: Its Origins and its Applications to the Creative Processes of the Actor*. VDM: Saarbrücken.
- Lashewicz, B., J. & Smyth, M. (2014) Mask making in human services education: a case for student engagement. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 34, 2, 182 – 198.
- Leabhart, T (2004). Jacques Copeau, Etienne Decroux, and the 'Flower of Noh'. *New Theatre Quarterly*, 20, 4, 315-330.
- Leabhart, T. (1989). *Modern and Post-Modern Mime*. London: MacMillan.

- Leach, R. (2010). Masks as self-study. Challenging and sustaining teachers' personal and professional personae in early-mid career life phases. *Teachers & Teaching: Theory & Practice*, 16, 3, 329-352
- LeCoq, J. (2002). *The Moving Body: Teaching Creative Theatre*. Translated from *Le Corps Poetique* by David Bradbury. London: Bloomsbury Methuen.
- Ludema et al (2000)
- McCarthy, J.F. & Carr, D.S. (2015). Igniting passions and possibilities through the arts: conflict, collaboration and leadership through live stage performances. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 9, 1, 33-41
- Mnouchkine (2010) cited in Richardson, H.E. (2010). Ariane Mnouchkine and the Theatre du Soleil: Theatricalising History; the Theatre as Metaphor; the Actor as Signifier. In: Hodge, A. (ed.). *Actor Training*. London: Routledge, pp 250-267
- Mnouchkine (2007) cited in Wiles, D. (2007). *Mask and Performance In Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marshall, L. & Williams, D. (2010). Peter Brook: Transparency and the invisible network. In: Hodge, A. (ed.). *Actor Training*. London: Routledge, pp 184-198.
- Murray, S. (2010). Jacques LeCoq, Monika Pagneux and Philippe Gaulier: Training for Play, Lightness and Disobedience. In: Hodge, A. (ed.). *Actor Training*. London: Routledge, pp 215-236.
- Nagle, B., McHale, J., Alexander, G. & French, B.M. (2009). Incorporating scenario-based simulation into a hospital nursing education program. *The Journal of Education in Nursing*, 40, 1, 18-25
- Peisley, A. (2016). Blog post for Theatre, Dance & Performance Training (TDTP) Available at: <http://theatredanceperformancetraining.org/2016/05/masks-for-leadership-development-in-a-business-school/>
- Postle (1993). Putting the heart back into learning. In: Boud, D., Cohen, R. & Walker, D. (1993) (eds). *Using Experience for Learning*. Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.
- Race, P. (2007). *The Lecturer's Toolkit*. London: Routledge
- Reid-Searl, K., Bowman, A., McAllister, M., Cowling, C. & Spuur, K. (2014). The masked educator- innovative simulation in an Australian undergraduate Medical Sonography and Medical Imaging program. *Journal of Medical Radiation Sciences*, 233-240
- Richardson, H.E. (2010). Ariane Mnouchkine and the Theatre du Soleil: Theatricalising History; the Theatre as Metaphor; the Actor as Signifier. In: Hodge, A. (ed.). *Actor Training*. London: Routledge, pp 250-267
- Roy, D. & Dock, C. (2014). Dyspraxia, drama and masks: applying the school curriculum as therapy. *Journal of Applied Arts & Health*, 5, 3, 369-375.
- Rudlin, J. (1986). Jacques Copeau. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Rudlin, J. (1994). *Commedia dell'Arte: An Actor's Handbook*. London: Routledge.
- Rudlin, J. (2010) Jacques Copeau: the Quest for Sincerity. In: Hodge, A. (ed.). *Actor Training*. London: Routledge, pp 43-62.
- Saint Denis, M. (1982). *Training for the Theatre*, ed. Suria Magito Saint-Denis. New York: Theatre Arts Books.
- Saint Denis, M. (2008). *Theatre: the Rediscovery of Style and Other Writings*. Ed. Baldwin, J. London & New York: Routledge.
- Schon,
- Sternberg, P. & Garcia, A. (2000). *Sociodrama: Who's in your Shoes*. 2nd ed. Westport: Praeger.
- Taylor, & Ladkin, (2009). Understanding arts-based methods in managerial development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8, 1, 55-69
- Taymor, 1999. Interview with Richard Schechner, *The Drama Review*, 45, 36 –
- Trepal-Wollenzier, H.C. & Webster, K.L. (2002). The use of masks in counselling. *Journal of Clinical Activities: Assignments & Handouts in Psychotherapy Practice*.
- Vervain, C. (2004). Performing ancient drama in mask: the case of Greek New Comedy. *New Theatre Quarterly*, 20, 3, 245-264
- Vervain, C. (2012). Performing ancient drama in mask: the case of Greek Tragedy. *New Theatre Quarterly*, 28, 2, 163-181.
- Watkins et al, 2001)
- Wiles, D. (2007). *Mask and Performance In Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilshire, T. (2007). *The Mask Handbook: A Practical Guide*. London: Routledge.

Appendix 2: Sources of Data (and pedagogy development activity):

Key:

Mask workshops: MW1 – 7, MWMT

Other data sources: ODS1-21

Masks Pedagogy Development Activities: MPDA 1-11

TW/PAD/PAM/SRPS/POM/LP/S/GS&S/UFI/SFS/AI/SRP+FT

NB – Sources of data includes some sociodrama project and workshops activity – this is because had such a fundamental influence and continual cross-feed into development of the masks pedagogy, especially re the key part at the end of scenario roleplay exploration with masks.

NB – Mask Pedagogy Development Activities includes workshops I did as a participant. This is because my reflections and learning from these were key feed into development and cross comparison of the work with others.

List of Mask Workshops (also key sources of data) (MW1-7):

MW1 - MASK WORKSHOP 1 - MBA Personal & Prof practice module workshop 1 (Feb 2015) + design & promotion materials NB, Exploring leadership style and approaches. rushed, doing what would do with actors, lack of structure, lack of clarity re constructive alignment e.g. between LOs and Learning Activities (e.g. actor embodiment, creative play, lack of structure, no clear scenario set up)
TW/PAD/PAM/SRPS/POM/LP/S/GS&S/UFI/SFS/AI/SRP+FT

MWMT - MASK WORKSHOP MINI TASTER - Ed Dev team awayday (Summer 2015)
TW/PAD/PAM/SRPS/POM/LP/S/GS&S/UFI/SFS/AI/SRP+FT

MASK WORKSHOP 2 - Staff Development Workshop with UoW staff (Nov 2015) + design and promotion materials + participant feedback form and verbal feedback – NB – Reflection on leadership style and approaches. shift to more on reflection on leadership style. More structure. Move towards scenario roleplay like sociodrama work
TW/PAD/PAM/SRP/POM/LP/S/GS&S/UFI/SFS/AI/SRP+FT

MASK WORKSHOP 3 - MBA Personal & Prof practice module workshop 2 (Mar 2016) + design & promotion materials + participant feedback, written & verbal - NB – shift to Personality Differences when leading and managing others. Personality & Jungian Personality Model, Structure, Theory, Scenario Roleplay at end.
TW/PAD/PAM/SRP/POM/LP/S/GS&S/UFI/SFS/AI/SRP+FT

MASK WORKSHOP 4 - Staff Development Workshop with UoW staff – (Mar 2016) + design & promotion materials + participant feedback, written & verbal same structure and approach as 3. Participants more discussion and reflection, more reluctant to move to scenario roleplay, though did
TW/PAD/PAM/SRP/POM/LP/S/GS&S/UFI/SFS/AI/SRP+FT

MASK WORKSHOP 5 - EAPRIL conference workshop (Nov 2016) + design & promotion materials + participant feedback, verbal + my reflection notes afterwards (Nb – New scaffolding embodiment exercise innovation, to help participants get quicker to be able to roleplay in scenarios.
TW/PAD/PAM/SRP/POM/LP/S/GS&S/UFI/SFS/AI/SRP+FT

MASK WORKSHOP 6 – FU Bus Ent UG 3rd yr students + IP tutor workshop (April 2017) + design & promotion materials + participant feedback, verbal + my reflection notes afterwards Same design as 5
TW/PAD/PAM/SRP/POM/LP/S/GS&S/UFI/SFS/AI/SRP+FT – NB – all except S/UFI

MASK WORKSHOP 7 – FU workshop for focus group participants Same design as 5 & 4
TW/PAD/PAM/SRP/POM/LP/S/GS&S/UFI/SFS/AI/SRP+FT – NB all except SFS?

Other Sources of Data:

- ODS1** - WBS L&T grant for (what became) sociodrama project (2013-14)
ODS2 - WBS L&T grant for sociodrama project final report (July 2014, 2013-14)
ODS3 - Mask – original Masks WBS L&T grant (2014-15)
ODS4 - Mask - Box of cards with ideas for workshop (through 2014 – 2015)
ODS5 - Mask – WBS L&T day poster – (Summer 2015 - 2014-15)
ODS6 - Sociodrama – workshop with BBUS404 staff and subsequently with students. (2014-15 – Oct 2014?)
ODS7 - My email reflections to team afterward BBUS404 student workshop (2014-15 – Oct 2014?)
ODS8 - Mask – emails and call with woman from Vamos & MAG re her workshop in business context (Autumn 2015?)
ODS9 - Mask – reminder and revised blurb for MBA Personal & Prof Practice workshop 2 – (Mar 2016)
ODS10 - **Mask - Blog in Theatre, Dance & Performance Training journal Blog** (May 2016)
ODS11 - Mask – Design/blurb for L&T symposium (Summer 2016, 2015-16) – NB didn't actually do workshop
ODS12 - **Mask - EAPRIL conf application - comments on application** (confidentiality? Ethics?) (July 2016)
ODS13 - **Sociodrama - MBA residential (2015 – 16)**
ODS14 - **Mask – talk given to research group at FU (January 2017) – feedback, questions, challenges + my experience/reflection on that session**
ODS15 - Mask – email to Course Leader of a business entrepreneurship degree describing proposed masks workshop for his course
ODS16 - **Mask – FU focus group (May 18, 2017) recording & transcript**
ODS17 - **Mask – FU focus group – my experience/reflection on workshop (May 18, 2017)**
ODS18 - **Mask – FU focus group – my notes observations and reflection on their responses**
ODS19 - **Mask – FU IP interview (July 2017)**
ODS20 - **Mask & sociodrama - Meeting with P3 (July 2017)**
ODS21 - **Mask & sociodrama - Emails x 2 from P3 (July 2017)**

MPDA – Masks Pedagogy Development Activities:

- MPDA1** - Mask – (me as participant) Vicky workshop 1 (mix of masks) (Jan, 2015? (so me using lots her approach with MBA 1, 2014 – 2015)
MPDA2 - Mask – (me as participant) Vicky workshop 2 (neutral mask) (Summer 2015?, 2014 – 2015)
MPDA3 - Sociodrama - Staff Development Workshops via HR with UoW staff – sociodrama (2014-15 x1)
MPDA4 - Mask – Mask Action Group meeting with other practitioners, Cardboard Citizens, London, + facebook group (summer 2015)
MPDA5 - Mask – (me as participant) Nottingham Trent symposium: 'What are masks for?' – (Oct 2015)
MPDA6 - Mask – (me as participant) Workshop with Guy from Aston x 1 (early 2016?, 2015 – 2016)
MPDA7 - Mask – (me as participant) Vicky workshop 3 (Nov 2015)
MPDA8 - Mask – (me as participant) Commedia workshop (May 2016)
MPDA9 - Sociodrama - Staff Development Workshops via HR with UoW staff – sociodrama (2015-2016 x 2)
MPDA10 - BPS SGCP at UoW – sociodrama workshop (2015 – 2016)
MPDA11 - **Forum Theatre workshop – Southampton University, Health & Social Care, Nursing Training (May 23, 2017)**

Chronology of masks for learning investigation related activity:**2013 – 2014**

- WBS L&T grant for (what became) sociodrama project (2013-14)
 WBS L&T grant for sociodrama project final report (July 2014, 2013-14)

2014 – 2015

- Mask – original Masks WBS L&T grant? (2014-15)
 Mask - Box of cards with ideas (through 2014 – 2015)
 Mask – (me as participant) Vicky workshop 1 (mix of masks) (Jan, 2015? (so me using lots her approach with MBA 1, 2014 – 2015)

MASK WORKSHOP 1 - MBA Personal & Prof practice module workshop 1 (Feb 2015) + design & promotion materials

Mask – Mask action group meeting with other practitioners (summer 2015)

MASK MINI TASTER WORKSHOP Mask – Ed Dev team awayday (Summer 2015)

Mask – WBS L&T day poster – (Summer 2015 - 2014-15)

Mask – (me as participant) Vicky workshop 2 (neutral mask) (Summer 2015?, 2014 – 2015)

Sociodrama - Staff Development Workshops via HR with UoW staff – sociodrama (2014-15 x1)

Sociodrama – workshop with BBUS404 staff and subsequently with students. (2014-15 – Oct 2014?)

My email reflections to team afterward BBUS404 student workshop (2014-15 – Oct 2014?)

2015 – 2016

Mask – emails and call with woman from Vamos & MAG re her workshop in business context (Autumn 2015?)

NB – can't use actual quotes/feedback, only reflection and report – no ethics or consent cover

Mask – (me as participant) Nottingham Trent symposium: 'What are masks for?' – (Oct 2015)

Mask – (me as participant) Workshop with Guy from Aston x 1 (early 2016?, 2015 – 2016)

MASK WORKSHOP 2 - Staff Development Workshop with UoW staff (Nov 2015) + design and promotion materials + participant feedback form and verbal feedback

Mask – (me as participant) Vicky workshop 3 (Nov 2015)

Mask – reminder and revised blurb for MBA Personal & Prof Practice workshop 2 – (Mar 2016)

Mask – presentation slides for MBA Personal & Prof Practice workshop 2 – (Mar 2016)**MASK WORKSHOP 3 - MBA Personal & Prof practice module workshop 2 (Mar 2016) + design & promotion materials + participant feedback, written & verbal****MASK WORKSHOP 4 - Staff Development Workshop with UoW staff – (Mar 2016) + design & promotion materials + participant feedback, written & verbal****Mask - Blog in Theatre, Dance & Performance Training journal Blog (May 2016)**

Mask – (me as participant) Commedia workshop (May 2016)

Mask – Design/blurb for L&T symposium (Summer 2016, 2015-16) – NB didn't actually do workshop

Mask - EAPRIL conf application - comments on application (confidentiality? Ethics?) (July 2016)

Sociodrama - Staff Development Workshops via HR with UoW staff – sociodrama (2015-2016 x 2) **NB – can't use actual quotes/feedback, only reflection and report – no ethics or consent cover**

Sociodrama - MBA residential (2015 – 16)

BPS SGCP at UoW – sociodrama workshop (2015 – 2016)

2016 - 2017**MASK WORKSHOP 5 - EAPRIL conference workshop (Nov 2016) + design & promotion materials + participant feedback, verbal + my reflection notes afterwards (Nb point out design evolving and new exercise additions – Blue show us how x you are, move that x in a y way)**

Mask – talk given to research group at FU (-----) – feedback, questions, challenges + my experience/reflection on that session

Mask – email to Course Leader of a business entrepreneurship degree describing proposed masks workshop for his course

MASK WORKSHOP 6 – FU Bus Ent UG 3rd yr students + IP tutor workshop (April 2017) + design & promotion materials + participant feedback, verbal + my reflection notes afterwards

MASK WORKSHOP 7 – FU workshop for focus group participants

Mask – FU focus group (May 18, 2017) recording & transcript

Mask – FU focus group – my experience/reflection on workshop (May 18, 2017)

Mask – FU focus group – my notes observations and reflection on their responses

Forum Theatre workshop – Southampton Uni?? (May 23, 2017)

Mask – FU IP interview (July 2017)

Mask & sociodrama - Meeting with P3 (July 2017)

Mask & sociodrama - Emails x 2 from P3 (July 2017)

Appendix 3: Workshop Design:

Appendix 3: Workshop design and process for: 'Exploring personality preferences, for leading and working with others, via masks and scenario role play':

- 1) Volunteers, one by one put on and stood facing group in each full mask representing a set of 4 Personality Types based on the Jungian based 'Insights' Personality model ('Cool Blue', 'Fiery Red', 'Sunshine Yellow' & 'Earth Green') (see App2, ODS10). They discussed what negative and positive perceptions might be. Then details about each Personality type according to the Insights model were shared and discussed.
- 2) Each of the 4 Personality Masks was placed in a corner of the room. Participants were then asked to move to the position in the space relative to: a) which Personality Type was most like them personally, b) which they found most easy to work with, and c) which was most challenging for them to work with.
- 3) In groups of 3-4, they did an exercise where they each embodied each mask in turn, by putting on the mask, and used a question framing model + handouts to prompt each other to silently demonstrate different characteristics appropriate to that Personality,+ perform actions (e.g. pick up a chair), in ways appropriate to the same. This was followed by reflection on those aspects of personality and implications.
- 4) As a plenary group, they chose a mask, e.g. 'Cool Blue', that most of the group found most challenging to work with, then devised a scenario where a protagonist needed to influence this Personality Type to attend an event that, given their personality preferences, they would least like to attend. Participants then volunteered to roleplay in the scenario. The group then explored this scenario, using a sociodrama-derived approach, where they could stop and restart the action, swapping in and out different participants and doing role reversal, asking the rest of the group for coaching guidance, etc so that different participants could practice in turn both embodying the Personality-Mask being explored and/or the Protagonist who was trying to adapt their approach to best influence this Personality-Mask, based on the Personality-Masks preferences.
- 5) Appreciative reflection on the process and what was learnt (which actually with the FU participant group became the beginning of the FG).

Appendix 4: Focus Group Protocol:

FU Focus group protocol:

Intro

Purpose -

Consent form!!!!

Explanation about AI:

AI focus, 'rules of the game' & rationale – park till after focus group

AI principles – Constructionist, Poetic, Simultaneity, Anticipatory, Positive, Wholeness

'way we know is fateful'; 'our choices (of stories) determine what we find'; 'inquiry is change'; 'create and share detailed image of desired future'; 'positive, most alive, generative when at our best'; 'involve whole system'

Outline structure and process of focus group: Sharing perceptions, in turn and together. Me facilitate

- 1st what most valuable?
- 2nd what we'd dream for it to be?
- 2nd How get more of that in future workshop?

AI questions:

(DISCOVERY) WHAT WAS VALUABLE & BEST ABOUT THE WORKSHOP & Masks for L&T APPROACH? (what is giving life here?)

BEST EXPERIENCE:

Best experience during the workshop?

Most alive, most involved, most excited, most fun, most interested, most in 'flow'? What made it that way?

- Masks – themselves, use of them?
- Sociodrama scenarios?

VALUE:

What value most about workshop? What found most valuable?

For you personally, for your work, relationships, etc

(DREAM) WHAT WOULD WE DREAM IT TO BE LIKE? (based on what we already find valuable about this approach)

THREE WISHES:

3 wishes for an evolved version of this workshop (using this masks as pedagogy approach), what would they be? *(NB coming out of what most value already – continuity)*

COMMONALITIES:

What do we have in common with our dreams for this? What common elements to these wishes?

(Provocative propositions – positive images of our ideal workshop (using this masks as pedagogy approach)

If we expressed these as 'provocative propositions' what could these be?

Provocative proposition:

Present tense, as if already happening?

Provocative? Grounded? Bold, affirmative?

Provides guidance? Balance of continuity, novelty, transition?

(DESIGN) HOW COULD WE EVOLVE THE WORKSHOP TO BUILD IN EVEN MORE OF THIS?**How change it so we get more towards what we seek with provocative propositions?**

Design?

- Structure?
- Activities?
- Materials? (e.g. Handouts, visual aids)
- Masks?
- (Insights model? Colours. Types)

Facilitation?

NEXT STEPS**Prompts:**

What we did in workshop:

- Introduction to each mask and (Insight) characteristics (volunteer putting on in front of rest of class)
- Relating these to yourself and people you know (moving to that position, reflecting, explaining to others)
- Explore wearing and moving as masks (can you show me how x you are? Can you do x in a x way?)
- Sociodrama role play scenarios (try to influence mask to attend and event he/she wouldn't prefer)
- Reflection (aloud with group)

AI ASSUMPTIONS:

- In every 'system' (group, society, org, person), something works
- what we focus on becomes our reality
- reality is created in the moment and there are multiple realities
- act of asking questions of a 'system' influences that 'system' in some way
- people more confidence and comfort to journey into future (unknown) when carry forward parts of the past (known)
- if carry forward parts of past, they should be best parts
- language we use creates our reality
- important to value differences
-

Appendix 5: Falmouth University (FU) Ethics Form:

APPLICATION FOR RESEARCH ETHICS APPROVAL

Version 4 - FINAL – 27/01/15

All researchers should be familiar with the University's Research Ethics Policy and associated procedures, available [here](#). No element of a research project which falls under the scope of the Policy should begin before written approval has been given.

All research projects are subject to ethics approval. This form enables researchers to either:

- 1) declare a project out of scope. The form incorporates a short cut for this.
- 2) provide more detail on ethical considerations. Research ethics approval is required for research projects that:
 - directly involve people in research activities, through their physical participation, eg. interviews, questionnaires, surveys, observational research, requiring the active or passive involvement of a person;
 - indirectly involve people in the research activities, through their provision of or access to personal data and/or tissue
 - involves people on behalf of others (eg. legal guardians of children and the psychologically or physically impaired and supervisors of people under controlled environments (eg. prisoners, school pupils).

There are special arrangements for research in the health and when it involves animals, and guidance should be sought direct from the Committee in these cases.

Convening an event, such as a conference or workshop, only requires research ethics approval where research takes place, eg. leading to an identifiable research output, and only that specific part of the event where the research is taking place.

Please note that all events (seminars, conference, workshops, etc) should be discussed with your Director of Department taking into consideration any professional ethics or reputational concerns.

IF YOU ARE UNSURE, YOU SHOULD ASSUME RESEARCH ETHICS APPLIES. IN THIS CASE SEEK GUIDANCE FROM THE COMMITTEE BEFORE CONTINUING.

Part A – Overview of the project		
1	Title of the project	Developing masks as pedagogy for learning about Personality preferences, using Appreciative Inquiry (AI).
2	Briefly summarise the project’s aims, objectives and methodology	<p>This project is a research project done as the final part of the lead researcher’s student work on the MA in Higher Education at the University of Westminster.</p> <p>The aim of the project is to collaboratively explore and develop the use of theatrical masks as pedagogy, to develop learner capability, for managing the impact of personality preferences, to more effectively lead and work with others. It is to use Appreciative Inquiry (AI) and AI process cycle stages of ‘Discovery’- ‘Dream’ – ‘Design’ – ‘Deliver’ as a methodology, with groups of staff and students from both Falmouth University and the University of Westminster, to collaboratively explore, as partners and co-creators, what is engaging us as participants in our learning with this pedagogical approach and how it might be further developed.</p> <p>I want to find out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What specifically is perceived as ‘giving life here’ (Watkins, Mohr & Kelly, 2011) and is engaging and valuable for us as participants in the workshop design and activities using masks and sociodrama, and how and why. • How we can build in more of this into each iteration of this workshop (through the AI process cycle stages of Discovery, Dream, Design and Delivery/Destiny). • What we as participants think staff tutors can do to further enhance their/our capability to use this pedagogical approach. <p>The outcomes will be: 1) an improved workshop design that enhances learner engagement and capability to manage the impact of personality preferences and 2) enhanced Falmouth University and University of Westminster staff and student knowledge and capability in how to use this ‘masks and sociodrama’ approach in their teaching and learning practices.</p> <p>The research process will consist of the following stages:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>At Falmouth University:</u> I will facilitate a workshop with a group of staff and student volunteers from Falmouth University, using masks and sociodrama to help learners develop their capability to manage personality preferences when leading and/or working with others (In AI terms, this will correspond to the AI cycle stage of ‘Delivery’) This will be followed by a focus group with

		<p>participants from the workshop, where we will explore, through an AI approach, what worked well with the workshop and how we could develop this ‘masks as pedagogy’ approach, especially with regard to how we might use it with different groups of learners, particularly those who may not come from a creative industries background e.g. in a business management context. (This will correspond with the AI process cycle stages of ‘Discovery’, ‘Dream’ and ‘Design’). From that focus group I will then carry on individually with this redesign of the workshop to incorporate our learning from that focus group into that workshop design (This will continue the AI ‘Design’ stage).</p> <p>2) <u>At the University of Westminster</u>: I will repeat the above process (consisting of the AI cycle stages of Delivery – Discover – Dream – Design), with a group of staff and student volunteers working in a business management learning context in the Westminster Business School.</p> <p>In AI terms, this research project will consist of AI cycle stages of: Delivery – Discover – Dream – Design - Delivery – Discover – Dream – Design.</p>																								
3	Start and end dates	23/09/2016 – 21/08/2017																								
4	Principal Investigator	Title: Name: Andy Peisley Department: FTI																								
5	Other key investigators	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="667 1171 735 1238">Title</th> <th data-bbox="738 1171 842 1238">Name</th> <th data-bbox="845 1171 938 1238">Post</th> <th data-bbox="941 1171 1058 1238">Role in project</th> <th data-bbox="1061 1171 1241 1238">Organisation</th> <th data-bbox="1244 1171 1441 1238">Department</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Title	Name	Post	Role in project	Organisation	Department																		
Title	Name	Post	Role in project	Organisation	Department																					
Part B – Does the project require research ethics approval?																										
6a	Does any part of the project constitute research, ie. a process of investigation leading to new insights, effectively shared (eg. identifiable research output)? If you answer No to this question please provide a rationale here (max 100 words)	X <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If Yes or don’t know, continue to 6b. If No, the project is out of scope. Go direct to 18a.																								
6b	Does your research involve participants of any type, ie.	x <input type="checkbox"/> Yes																								

	<p>humans or animals, directly or indirectly? Review the questions in Part C as a guide</p>	<p>If Yes or don't know, continue to Part C. If No, the project is out of scope. Go to direct to 18a.</p>
<p>Part C – Details of the research</p>		
<p>7</p>	<p>Give a brief reflection/overview of the ethics issues in this project.</p>	<p>I do not expect any ethical issues to be raised by the above research process. This is because of the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I will make transparently clear to the staff and any student participants at both universities, the aims, purpose and nature of the research and that their participation in the research is entirely on a voluntary basis. They are also in control of the extent to which they want to participate e.g. if they only want to be involved in one focus group and then engage in no further research activity, that is fine, and e.g. they can withdraw at any stage of the process from the research. They are also free to not take part in the research after a workshop and before the focus group, if they wish to withdraw from the research at that point • The workshops are offered as optional, voluntary, personal development activity and as part of this research and are extra-curricular and not part of any assessed course. • The particular research methodology and underpinning values of AI (which I will explain and reinforce throughout the process) emphasise a commitment from all participants to openness, collaboration, inclusiveness of different views and perspectives, and a focus on the positive and life-affirming, generative aspects of what is being raised and developed through the research and how to build more on this (rather than focusing on elements that are not working well or engaging in any activity that causes those involved any psychological or physical harm) (Cousin, 2009; Watkins, Mohr & Kelly, 2011). The research design also encourages participants as collaborative co-creators to influence the design and delivery of the subsequent parts of the process and to finds ways in which these can more fully accommodate their concerns and needs and encourages them as participants to engage willingly in the activity involved.
<p>8</p>	<p>Who will the participants be? Identify specifically any vulnerable groups or individuals and address any special measures you intend to take to accommodate them</p>	<p>Staff and student adult volunteers from Falmouth University and the University of Westminster.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>How will participants be recruited and how many will be involved?</p>	<p>Participants will be contacted face to face and via email and asked if they would like to participate in the project. They will</p>

		<p>be given a participant information sheet (see attached) telling them clearly about the project, and what would be involved regarding them if they choose to participate in it. The form will include telling them about their right to withdraw at any time, the way in which their data will be handled, etc (see attached participant information and consent form for detail about this)</p>
10	<p>What will participants be asked to do?</p>	<p>In the <u>2 workshops</u> I will be inviting participants to:</p> <p>Look at, reflect on, discuss, put on, and do some gentle physical movement while wearing, some theatrical masks based on Jungian Personality Types. Consider some information about theory/research relevant to these sets of Jungian personality preferences.</p> <p>Use these masks as a stimulus and vehicle for role play exploration of different strategies for working with these Personality 'Types'.</p> <p>I am inviting participants to engage in the above activities, but participating is purely on a voluntary basis. Participants are free not to engage in any of the above activities at any time during any of the iterations of the workshop.</p> <p>In the <u>focus groups</u> we will be asking:</p> <p>What is working well in this workshop in terms of engaging us in our learning and how and why?</p> <p>How we could modify the approach in the future so that the workshop has even more of what is working well in it?</p>
11	<p>What potential risks to the interests of participants do you foresee and what steps will you take to minimise those risks? A participant's interests include their physical and psychological well-being, their commercial interests; and their rights of privacy and reputation</p>	<p>I do not foresee any likely risks to the participant volunteers, given what I have said about the process and research approach in the sections above. I am an experienced workshop facilitator and have run these workshops before with a range of different learners with no previous issues. I will however stay mindful and alert to any potential sensitivities and remind participants that they do not have to do any learning activity in the workshops that they do not feel comfortable with and are free to stop or withdraw from this at any time. In the focus groups I will stay alert and mindful to any issues, although I do not foresee any likely difficulties around this, given the nature of the questions being explored in the focus groups, and given the key focus in AI process on maintaining and nurturing free collaboration and inclusivity with regard to all voices present and keeping the focus on the positive, life generative aspects and 'what is giving life here'.</p>
12	<p>Will you be obtaining personal information from any of the participants? E.g. name, personal opinions, address, recorded images or audio, date of birth, notes and observations.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>I will be gathering information from the participants in the focus groups – by gathering what they say and produce in the focus groups and using this to inform the next iteration of the workshop. But this information will be anonymised at an early</p>

		stage (i.e. at the information gathering stage), to make sure that individuals cannot be identified from any data that is reported in any outputs from the research, and personal identification of particular individuals to what they say is not required or relevant to the aims of the research. (please also see attached participant information sheet re this)
13	What potential risks to yourself or other members of the research team do you foresee and what steps will you take to minimise those risks? Eg. does your research raise issues of personal safety for you or others involved in the project, especially if taking place outside working hours or off University premises	I do not foresee any likely risks regarding this.
14	What potential risks to the environment do you foresee and what steps will you take to minimise those risks, eg. does your research involve plants or soil	I do not foresee any likely risks regarding this.
15	Will payments or in-kind contributions be made to participants?	<input type="checkbox"/> x NO <i>If YES, please state amount and whether payment is for out-of-pocket expenses, or a fee</i>
16	If the project is to receive financial support (real or in-kind) from outside the University, please give details, including any restrictions that have been imposed upon the conduct of the research. Please discuss this with RIO. Financial propriety, protection of commercial rights and reputation are important for you, the University and other third parties (eg. sponsors, participants etc.)	This research is not receiving any financial support
17	Will any restrictions be placed on the publication of results?	<input type="checkbox"/> x NO <i>If YES, please state the nature of the restrictions, (eg. details of any confidentiality agreement)</i>
18a	Declaration of Principal Investigator if activity is out of scope	I confirm that the form is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief and it does not fall under the scope of the Research Ethics Policy.

		Signature: Date:
18b	Declaration of Principal Investigator if activity is in scope	<p>I confirm my responsibility to deliver the project in accordance with the University's Research Ethics Policy and Guidelines on Good Research Practice and, where externally funded, with the terms and conditions of the research funder. In signing this form I am also confirming that:</p> <p>a) The form is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.</p> <p>b) There is no potential material interest that may, or may appear to, impair the independence and objectivity of researchers conducting this project.</p> <p>c) I undertake to conduct the project as set out in the application unless deviation is agreed by the University and to comply with any conditions.</p> <p>d) I agree to keep all ethics issues in the project under review and to re-submit a new application for ethics approval should any new issue arise or significant change occurs.</p> <p>e) I understand and accept that the ethical propriety of this project may be monitored by the University.</p> <p>f) I have included the following documents:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> An information sheet (compulsory)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A consent form (compulsory)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Copy of the full proposal/application (compulsory)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other relevant information</p> <p>Signature: Andy Peisley</p> <p>Date: 1/11/2016</p>
19	Support from Director of Department	<p>I have reviewed the project with the applicant and confirm it either does not fall under the scope of the Research Ethics Policy or I support it.</p> <p>Full Name: Tracy Pritchard</p> <p>Signature:</p> <p>Date:</p>
20	REC use only	

Appendix 6: UoW Ethics Form:

OFFICE USE: ____ - ____ - ____

University of Westminster
University Research Ethics Committee

Research Ethics Application Form

PART A**Section 1 – PROJECT AND APPLICANT DETAILS**

1.1 Project Title: Developing masks & sociodrama as a pedagogical approach, for increasing learner engagement.

1.2 Applicant Details

Name: Andy Peisley

University Email Address:

peislea@westminster.ac.uk

Contact Address: LAPD, Westminster Business School, Marylebone Campus, University of Westminster.

Telephone Number: 07933 039 844

Faculty: WBS

Please check the relevant box:

Undergraduate

Postgraduate x

MPhil/PhD Student

Staff x

I confirm I have read the *University's Code of Practice Governing the Ethical Conduct of Research*

YES x

NO

1.3 Supervisor/Dean of Faculty/Faculty Research Director details

Please note that all applicants with a supervisor(s) must ensure that the supervisor signs the declaration at the bottom of this page if completing Part A only or in **Section 10.3** if completing Part B

All **staff** must ensure that their Dean of Faculty, or Faculty Research Director (or nominee), as appropriate, signs the declaration at the bottom of this page if completing Part A only or in **Section 10.3** if completing Part B

Name:

University Email Address:

Faculty:

Telephone Number:

NOW PLEASE COMPLETE THE REMAINDER OF PART A (Part A is a self-assessment form used to ascertain whether you have ethical implications in your work. Part A is not an Application for Consideration by

University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) unless specified when submitting. Part B is the Application for Ethical Approval and when submitting, it should have a Cover Sheet and Part A attached).

PART A (Continued)

Section 2 – Project Details

2.1 Please provide a description of the background with references to relevant literature (250 words maximum):

I work in WBS, where we teach students about the implications of psychological personality preferences for leading and working with others in different modules and courses. When we teach about this we tend to do this through knowledge transmission of personality theory, then giving learners some form of personality questionnaire and asking them to reflect on the 'results' in relation to their experiences of working with and leading and managing others. There are some limitations with this approach. One is that some learners do not strongly engage deeply with their learning about this and struggle to understand how this (mainly language based) learning might be practically applied by themselves in the workplace beyond employee assessment and selection. Another limitation is that those that do engage are able to start reflecting intellectually on their own and others' behaviour and to recognise some manifestations of personality preferences, but tend not to go beyond this, e.g. to skills practice and physical experimentation in how they might alter their own behaviour to take account of personality preferences to more effectively lead and work with others. Attempts to encourage this e.g. through role play activities, with students in this business school context, are often met with reluctance and resistance because of e.g. inhibition, self-consciousness and shyness.

To address this, over the last 2 years I have been introducing the use of theatrical masks and sociodrama techniques (Sternberg & Garcia, 2000) into curriculum design for WBS students and for UoW staff CPD workshops. Theatrical masks have been successfully used in drama learning contexts, as part of a long tradition of mask use for actor training (Rudlin, 2010; Lecoq, 2000) to help learners to more quickly and readily overcome their inhibitions and fully engage with creative role play practice and exploration of persona (Callery, 2001). Masks have also been used in other educational contexts, e.g. for learning in counselling (Trepal-Wollenzier & Wester, 2002), psychotherapy (Landy, 1986), drama therapy & psychodrama (Landy, 1986) and for leadership development (Hughes, 2009). Sociodrama (Moreno, 1943) has been used for learning in a wide variety of contexts (Sternberg & Garcia) including higher education (Telesco, 2006; Blatner, 2006).

After some initial challenges with introducing this approach in WBS, then reflective practice and subsequent workshop redesign on the basis of positive learner feedback and staff observation, recent attempts to use this novel 'masked sociodrama' approach for learning in this business school context seem to be more successful. However there is still much to gain in terms of understanding what is working well about this approach, in order to develop it further.

So, I want to gain a richer understanding of what is perceived to be working well to engage participants in their learning through this approach, and how and why, and for us to use this developing understanding to make it more effective and to enhance staff capability in using it.

2.2. Please provide a brief description and the aims of your study (250 words maximum):

The aim of the project is explore and develop how to enhance learner engagement through this 'masks and sociodrama' approach, in order to develop learner capability to manage the impact of personality preferences, to more effectively lead and work with others. It is to use Appreciative Inquiry (AI) with a group of staff and student participants, as a means to collaboratively explore as partners and co-creators what is engaging us as participants in our learning with this pedagogical approach and how and why. It is to use Alas a simultaneous research and change

process to collaboratively bring about change amongst this particular group of staff and student participants, which will also further develop this masks and sociodrama pedagogical approach and our staff tutor capability in using it, through the research and co-creation process.

I want to find out:

- What specifically is perceived as 'giving life here' (Watkins, Mohr & Kelly, 2011) and is engaging and valuable for us as participants in the workshop design and activities using masks and sociodrama, and how and why.
- How we can build in more of this into each iteration of this workshop (through the AI stages of Discovery, Dream, Design and Delivery/Destiny).
- What we as participants think staff tutors can do to further enhance their/our capability to use this pedagogical approach to increase learner engagement.

The outcomes will be: 1) an improved workshop design that enhances learner engagement and capability to manage the impact of personality preference and 2) enhanced staff knowledge and capability in how to use this 'masks and sociodrama' approach in their teaching and learning,

2.3. Please outline the design and methodology of your study [attach extra information as necessary] (400 words maximum in total):

The methodology is Appreciative Inquiry (AI), with its' underpinning epistemology of social constructionism and 'the new mentalism' (Cousin, 2009, pg 171) and the six AI principles of Constructionism, Anticipatory, Simultaneity, Poetic, Positive and Wholeness (Watkins & Mohr, 2011). The rationale for choosing this approach is: to avoid a deficit-model approach to problem solving in the research and development of this masks and sociodrama approach, especially in its' relatively infant stages development in this business school context; to better encourage our positivity, creativity, energy, motivation and 'flow' (Csikszentmihalyi, 2008) as participants and co-creators for achieving the research aims and outcomes; and also as an additional gain, to facilitate, through our use of this as a research/change approach, the development of our capabilities as participants in using AI as a valuable research, change and co-creation methodology. With regard to this last reason for this particular choice of AI as a research methodology for this study and context, this is also because AI is already seen as something important for us to continue to develop in WBS (where most of the participants are likely to be from) and in HE generally as an approach e.g. as an a valuable approach for collaboratively bringing about positive change in teaching and learning with staff and students working as partners (Healey, Flint & Harrington, 2014), e.g. for developing particular courses on which we work in WBS e.g. the MBA and its transformation and imminent revalidation, etc.

The research will consist of developing a workshop using masks and sociodrama, through two and a half AI process cycles (of the '4 D' phases of: 1) Discovery, 2) Dream, 3) Design, 4) Delivery/Destiny)).

(NB: for the last D phase in the '4 D' AI cycle, different AI practitioners use either the term 'Delivery' or 'Destiny' or both interchangeably for this same AI phase – I am here using throughout this document a combined term for this last 4D phase, as in 'Delivery/Destiny', or one of these terms e.g. 'Delivery', as different aspects of these descriptors seem variously more relevant and appropriate for this particular project at different points in my description of the research, even if they actually refer to the same phase in AI process.)

The research will begin with me facilitating a 2 hour workshop using this pedagogical approach to help participants explore the implications of personality preferences for leadership and managing others. Participants will consist of a group (min 4, maximum 25) of UoW staff and student volunteers who are interested in participating in the research and workshop. They will be recruited through a variety of means, e.g. by direct email and approach to staff and students who have attended or registered interest in previous workshops I have run employing this masks and sociodrama approach, along with more general invitations to contact me to express interest in this research e.g. faculty newsletters and contact lists, MBA alumni networks.

This initial workshop will be followed immediately afterwards by a focus group session, with any of the participant volunteers who are willing to participate and to give their written consent to take part in the research project participants (AI Discovery phase). I will inform participants when I initially contact them that this workshop will also form part of a research project, inform them of the nature of this research and invite them to participate in this research on a voluntary basis (e.g. through the focus group afterwards), through a written participant consent form and information sheet (see separate attached documents).

I want to ask participants (including myself):

- What elements of the workshop and this pedagogical approach most engaged them in their learning, and how and why? What examples and stories from their experience of this could they describe?
- What did they find to be most positive, useful, enjoyable, life-affirming, and generative about and in the workshop and how and why? ('what gives life here'(Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005)).
- How do they think we could improve the workshop design, to build on and bring in even more of these elements that they found positive, engaging and valuable, to further enhance learner engagement in this workshop? (AI Dream and Design phase).

(NB – for draft focus group questions, see separate attached document)

From this I will use this focus group data to inform the redesign of next iteration of the workshop, to try and make it an even more positive and engaging learning experience for participants (AI Design phase). Then I will run the redesigned workshop again, again with a group of volunteer participants (consisting of anyone who was a participant in the previous workshop, plus any additional volunteers who would like to participate) (AI Delivery/Destiny phase).

I will then repeat the above cycle of workshop, focus group, redesign, workshop, focus group and redesign (AI Discovery, Dream, Design phases). That is, two complete cycles.

Then I will run a final workshop and focus group (AI Delivery/Destiny, Discovery, Design).

So in summary the AI research process for this project will consist of the following stages:

Delivery (Delivery/Destiny)	Consisting of: the first workshop, Workshop 1
Discovery, Dream, Design, Delivery	Consisting of: the 1 st focus group after the first workshop, exploring with participants what is working well and how, and how we might build this more into the next iteration of the workshop, Workshop 2. Subsequent redesign by me and any other participants who want to contribute to this. The running of the revised form of the workshop, Workshop 2
Discovery, Dream, Design, Delivery	Consisting of: the 2 nd focus group after the 2 nd workshop, exploring with participants what is working and how and how we might build this more into the next workshop, Workshop 3. Subsequent redesign by me and any other participants who want to contribute to this. The running of the revised form of the workshop, Workshop 3
Discovery, Dream	Consisting of: the 3 rd focus group after the 3 rd workshop, exploring with participants what is working well and how, and how we might build this more into any future workshops. Further discussion of this in the final dissertation

research report.

I do not expect any ethical issues to be raised by the above research process. This is because of the following reasons:

- I will make transparently clear to the staff and any student participants the aims, purpose and nature of the research and that their participation in the research is entirely on a voluntary basis. They are also in control of the extent to which they want to participate e.g. if they only want to be involved in one focus group and then engage in no further research activity, that is fine, and e.g. they can withdraw at any stage of the process from the research.
- The workshops are offered as optional, voluntary, personal development activity and as part of this research and are extra-curricular and not part of any assessed course.
- The particular research methodology and underpinning values of AI (which I will explain and reinforce throughout the process) emphasise a commitment from all participants to openness, collaboration, inclusiveness of different views and perspectives, and a focus on the positive and life-affirming, generative aspects of what is being raised and developed through the research and how to build more on this (rather than focusing on elements that are not working well or engaging in any activity that causes those involved any psychological or physical harm) (Cousin, 2009; Watkins, Mohr & Kelly, 2011). The research design also encourages participants as collaborative co-creators to influence the design and delivery of the subsequent parts of the process and to find ways in which these can more fully accommodate their concerns and needs and encourages them as participants to engage willingly in the activity involved.

2.4. Timescales

Start Date (DD/MM/YY): 26/09/2016

Estimated duration of work: 09/2016 – 08/2017 – 11 months

Section 3 - RISK OF HARM				
NOTE 1: Where indicated below applicants should check if the research will require ethical approval from a National Research Ethics Committee via the <u>Integrated Research Application System (IRAS)</u> - nres.queries@nhs.net - http://www.hra-decisiontools.org.uk/ethics/				
NOTE 2: The University of Westminster holds a Human Tissue Authority Licence – This licence is specifically for tissue stored at 115 New Cavendish Street in accordance with the terms of the licence – Advice must be obtained from the University Human Tissue Authority Officer				
RISK OF HARM (to self, colleagues, participants, environment or animals)		Yes	No	N/A
1	Will any pain or more than mild discomfort result from the study?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Could the study induce any psychological stress or anxiety or cause harm or negative consequences beyond the risks encountered in normal life?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Will the study involve prolonged or repetitive physical or psychological testing of human participants that may put someone at risk, e.g. use of treadmill?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Will the study involve raising sensitive topics (e.g. sexual activity, drug use, revelation of medical history, bereavement, illegal activities, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Does your work involve any "relevant material" containing human cells (e.g. blood, urine, saliva, body tissues but NOT established cell-lines) from living or deceased persons (Such work must take account of the Human Tissue Act)? – See Note 1 and 2 above.	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Will DNA samples be taken from human participants (Such work must take account of the Human Tissue Act)? – See Note 1 and 2 above.	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Does your study raise any issues of personal safety for you or other researchers or participants involved in the project (Especially relevant if taking place outside working hours or off University premises)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Does your study involve deliberately misleading the participants (e.g. deception, covert observation)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Does your work involve administration of a food or non-food substance of a different type from or in abnormally higher or lower amounts than normal or one that is known to cause allergic reaction(s) or potential psychological stress?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Does your study involve issues relating to personal and/or sensitive data?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PARTICIPANTS (and/or their records/associated data)		Yes	No	N/A
Does your work involve any of the following:				
11	Human participants in a health and/or social care setting (e.g. patients, those attending day centres, community care, rehabilitation centres, etc., including in the NHS, other public, private and/or voluntary sectors)? – See Note 1 above.	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Human participants who may be deemed vulnerable (e.g. children, people in poverty and/or with physiological or psychological impairments, persons attending rehabilitation centres, persons in easily identifiable positions that could be subject to victimisation, etc.)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13	Expectant or new mothers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14	Refugees/Asylum seekers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15	Minors (under the age of 18 years old)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16	Participants in custody (e.g. prisoners or arrestees)? – See Note 1 above.	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17	Participants with impaired mental capacity (e.g. severe mental illness, brain damage, sectioned under Mental Health Act, lowered or reduced sense of consciousness)? – See Note 1 above.	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18	Animals (or animal tissue).	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
INFORMATION TO PARTICIPANTS		Yes	No	N/A
19	Will you provide participants with a Participant Information Sheet prior to obtaining informed consent which can be taken away by the participant?	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20	Will you describe the procedures to participants in advance, so that they are informed about what to expect?	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21	Will you obtain informed consent for participation (normally written)? OR in the case of using personal data previously acquired was consent given for the reuse of the data for other research purposes?	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22	Will you tell participants that they may withdraw from the research at any time and for any reason without any impact on their care, service provision etc.?	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23	Will you give participants the option of omitting questions they do not want to answer?	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24	Will you tell participants that their data will be treated as confidential and that, if published, it will not be identifiable as theirs?	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25	Will you offer feedback to participants at the end of their participation, upon request (e.g. give them a brief explanation of the study and its outcomes)?	x <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

26	Has external funding or collaboration been applied for/received, which requires institutional ethical consideration or approval?	<input type="checkbox"/>	x <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------	--	--------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------

What to do next:

- **If you have answered NO to questions 1-18 (inclusive) and YES to questions 19-25 (inclusive)**, you do not need to complete the Full Research Ethics Approval Form (Part B). Please keep this form for your records, and do not submit to UREC unless you require ethical consideration of your study, regardless of ethical implications, by an external body (question 26 has been answered YES). *Some Faculties require you lodge a copy of Part A (or a local version of this) with the Faculty Registry/Office, please check with your Faculty Research Ethics Advisor/Co-ordinator. A list of Faculty Ethics Advisors is available from the Secretary, UREC: research-ethics@westminster.ac.uk.*
- **If you have answered YES to any of the questions 1-18 (inclusive) or NO to any of the questions 19-25** the Full Research Ethics Approval Form (Part B) **MUST** be submitted including Cover Sheet, Part A and Part B of the application form plus any required supplementary documents to the Secretary of the University Research Ethics Committee.
- If you are applying for external Ethical Approval, please send a *copy* of the Conditions/Approvals letters to the Secretary (this may include the original ethical application(s)).
- All Applications (dated, signed and authorised) and supplementary information or External Approvals should be sent to the Secretary in *electronic format with a version number, document name and date and the Principal Investigator (or Undergraduate/Postgraduate Taught Student) name. On receipt your application will be issued a unique reference number*
- All new Applications should be submitted to the Secretary a minimum of 10 working days in advance of the Committee meeting date.

For Use in Academic Year: 2015/16

Author: Huzma Kelly, Academic Registrar's Department V1.1. Updated August 2015

Appendix 7: Invite & FAQ for FU Workshop and Focus Group:

Invitation to participate in workshop + research project focus group.

FAQ information sheet:

What is this?

This is an invitation to ask if you would like to participate in a workshop, plus an optional research project focus group after it, at Falmouth university. If, once you have read the info below, you would like to participate, I am asking you to contact me now via email, to let me know that you are interested.

Then after we have gathered together a group of potential participants, I will find a time that is suitable for the workshop and focus group, during the next few months, for as many of the group as I can to attend.

My contact details are:

Andy Peisley, SL & Course Co-ordinator PGCHE/MA in Creative Education, FTI, Falmouth University

Email: andy.peisley@falmouth.ac.uk

01236 254 452 (Ext: 4452)

What is the workshop called?

'Learning to manage diversity in personality preferences, using masks and sociodrama.'

What is the research project called?

'Developing masks as pedagogy, for learning to manage diversity in personality preferences, when leading and working with others.'

Workshop:

What is the workshop about?

- *Exploring different personality 'types', based on Jungian Psychology and the Insights personality model derived from that.*
- *Exploring, through action, how these play out in our lives and work, in ourselves and our interactions with others (e.g. when leading and working with work colleagues, supporting student learning, with family and friends, etc).*
- *Trying out different strategies for how we might manage these more effectively, and reflecting on our learning from that.*
- *Using a set of theatrical masks (see photos and links at the end of this doc), based on basic Jungian personality 'types', + sociodrama techniques, as a vehicle to help us do this, in an experiential and embodied way*

Why are we doing this? What are the potential benefits? What's in it for me?

- *Development of our abilities to manage different sets of personality preferences, through practice and action, in a safe and supportive environment. Each of us have different sets of personality preferences, that can sometimes be challenging to manage, when we interact in our lives and work with other people who express different different personality preferences from ourselves (e.g. fellow work colleagues, students, family and friends, etc).*
- *Development of our understanding of psychological personality preferences, and how these might be playing out in our interactions with others in our work and lives, then practicing and experimenting with different strategies for how we might deal with these, to make our working and personal lives and relationships easier, more harmonious, effective and productive.*

- *Development of our abilities in an engaging, enjoyable, experiential way, in a supportive and safe workshop environment, with like-minded staff colleagues.*
- *First-hand experience, of how using masks and sociodrama techniques might be used in different ways, as a pedagogical approach to support learning, for different groups of learners.*
- *An opportunity to reflect on and share, with other colleagues, ideas for how we could use masks and this kind of pedagogical approach, to help support learning in your own teaching and learning practice.*

What will I be asked to do?

You will be invited to attend a 1.5 hour workshop where you voluntarily engage in each of the workshop activities. These will consist of you:

- *looking at and handling the masks and learning the meaning of these in terms of Jungian personality characteristics and the Insights model*
- *reflecting on how these might relate to yourself and/or other people you know*
- *putting on, moving as, and interacting with other participants in these masks, to explore and gain empathetic understanding of the characteristics of these personality 'types'*
- *playing with different strategies for interacting with the personality 'types' that you might find most challenging to interact with, by creating and exploring example scenarios, using the masks and sociodrama to help us do this*
- *Reflection on and discussing what you have learnt from this, that you can take forward to help you in your lives and work*

Participation in any/all of these workshop activities is entirely voluntarily (and should be enjoyable and engaging for you, based on all the previous times I have run this workshop, with diverse groups of learners). You do not have to do any of these workshop activities, during the workshop, if you feel uncomfortable with any of them at any time during the workshop.

Research project focus group

What is the research project about?

This is a research project that has developed out of 'masks as pedagogy' I have been using in my teaching, and as part of a research project, that I started doing with staff and students in the University of Westminster Business School. There I was drawing on my experience as an actor and actor trainer working with masks + my work as a psychologist working in leadership development in different industries and on business management courses in HE, to develop the use of masks + sociodrama in teaching and learning in different (non-theatre) contexts. I am now wanting to develop this research further, as the final part of my MA in Higher Education degree, at the University of Westminster.

We will be trying to find out:

- ***What is valuable about this masks + sociodrama approach for teaching and learning?***
- *(For us as learners, as teaching and learning practitioners, for different potential groups of learners in different teaching and learning contexts, etc)*
- ***What could be done to build in even more of what is valuable about this, into the design and delivery of this workshop and pedagogical approach?***

We will be doing this through a methodology called Appreciative Inquiry (AI), during a 1.5 hour long focus group. This focus group will (ideally) follow immediately after the workshop, with some/all of the participant volunteers who have attended the workshop, and who are also willing to take part in the focus group, as part of this research project.

What is Appreciative Inquiry (AI)?

Appreciative Inquiry (AI) is a research method and a positive, strengths-based approach to bringing about change. It arose with the positive psychology movement and has gained increasing popularity and traction since

it was initially developed by Cooperrider & Srivasta (1987) in the early 1980's. It has now been applied in many different societal, work and research contexts worldwide, in order to bring about positive change.

It is unusual, in that AI aims to overcome some of the limitations of the more usual 'deficit model' research and change methodologies, where we assume, and try to identify, and focus on 'the problems', and try to 'fix' these, to make things better.

Instead, in AI, we deliberately keep the focus primarily on what is best about, and already working well, in any human 'system', and then use AI principles, process and methods, to build on that 'positive core' to make that 'system' even better. We focus on 'what is giving life here' and what is most positive, nurturing and life-enhancing about this 'system', and how to get more of this into the 'system' to make it even better.

While there is variety of approach and terminology amongst AI practitioners, generally we seek to do the above through the AI four stages of 'Discovery', 'Dream', 'Design' & 'Delivery/Destiny', and the AI principles: Constructionist, Poetic, Simultaneity, Anticipatory, Positive, Wholeness. (see links at end of doc for follow up link, if interested, to more info about AI)

Why are we doing this research project and focus group? What are the potential benefits? What's in it for me?

- *We will discover what is most valuable for us, as participants and learning and teaching practitioners, in this particular 'masks + sociodrama pedagogy'. We will discover how we could adapt this pedagogical approach in the future, in order to enhance its' value for ourselves and other practitioners.*
- *We will deepen our understanding, through experience, of AI as a unique research method and a change methodology, and how it can be applied to: 1) research projects, 2) develop curriculum and our teaching and learning practice, and 3) bring about positive changes in our workplaces and lives.*
- *These outcomes above offer potential benefits for: students and staff colleagues here at Falmouth and in other universities, the wider research community, other organisations with which we work, and our families and friends.*

What will I be asked to do?

You will be invited to voluntarily attend a 1.5 hour AI focus group (no more than 10 people), made up of colleagues who have also attended the previous workshop with you. In this you will engage in a (partial) AI research process, comprising of the AI stages of 'Discovery', 'Dream' & (some aspects of) 'Design'.

This will consist of you:

- *Reading and signing the Participant Information and Consent Form, to give your informed consent to take part in this research project (see attached doc)*
- *Listening to some information about the AI process and principles we will be following in the focus group*
- *Answering questions asking us to focus on what we find is valuable and working well here in this masks as pedagogy approach (AI 'Discovery' stage).*
- *Generating ideas for how we might improve the design and delivery of this approach (AI 'Dream' and some 'Design' stages). Generating ideas 1) generally for ourselves and how we might develop what is working well in this approach for our own and others' pedagogical practice, and 2) specifically ideas for the next version of this workshop, which will take place later in this academic year, with a group of staff at the University of Westminster.*

I, as lead researcher, will then use the outputs from this 1st focus group to finalise a revised design of the workshop, which I will share with workshop and focus group participants, just in case anyone would like an opportunity to see this design at this stage and/or to offer further additional input. Then the revised workshop + the AI focus group process (AI Delivery, Dream, Design stages), will be done with staff at the University of Westminster. The revised version of the workshop and other outputs generated from that, will then be made available to all participants from both Falmouth University and the University of Westminster involved in the project. The final research report will also be made available to all participants at the end of the project (after the end of August).

I hope all the above helps you with understanding this workshop and research project and helps you in deciding whether you would be interested in participating or not. Please feel free also to ask me any further questions via the email contact details at the start of this document.

If you are interested in participating in this, please contact me by email.

Best wishes

Andy

Further links and information:

A couple of blog posts I have written about this work:

A blog post for the Journal of Theatre, Dance & Performance Training blog (with some pictures of the masks):

<http://theatredanceperformancetraining.org/2016/05/masks-for-leadership-development-in-a-business-school/>

A blog post for the FTI blog:

Actually this one hasn't been released yet, but I can make available as soon as it does get released by FTI, and/or the text of this on request.

Mike Chase masks (we will be using some of Mike's masks for the workshop):

<http://www.mikechasemasks.com/>

Info and further links about Appreciative Inquiry (AI):

<https://appreciativeinquiry.case.edu/>

Appendix 8: Participant Information Sheet & Consent Form:

PARTICIPATION INFORMATION SHEET

Developing masks as pedagogy for learning to manage diversity in Personality preferences, using Appreciative Inquiry (AI).

Researcher(s): Andy Peisley, Falmouth University

Supervisor: Pauline Armsby, University of Westminster

You are being invited to take part in a research study on developing masks and sociodrama as a teaching and learning approach.

This research is being undertaken as part of the researcher's studies for the MA/PG Certificate in Higher Education programme at the University of Westminster, and is taking place with staff and students from Falmouth University and The University of Westminster.

Masks and sociodrama have been used in various learning contexts, e.g. theatrical and counselling training contexts, as methods to make it easier for learners to engage in learning, role play and skills practice. Over the last two years the researcher for this project has been using masks + sociodrama at Westminster Business School (WBS) at the University of Westminster (UoW), and at Falmouth University to help groups of staff and student learners learn about personality preferences and how they might more effectively manage these when leading and working with others in the workplace.

This current research involves a mix of staff and student volunteers participating in a workshop that uses this 'masks + sociodrama' teaching and learning approach, then in a focus group afterwards sharing our views about this approach and how to develop it further. This is for us all to gain a better understanding of what is working well in this approach and how we could develop it further through this research process. The research process we are using is called Appreciative Inquiry (AI), which is an approach to inquiry and change, where we work collaboratively as a group through the research process, to maintain a positive focus on what is working well already and how we can develop this to get more of that in the future, rather than focusing on what is lacking and/or not working well and how we can 'fix' it.

The study will involve you:

- 1) Participating in a workshop, which uses masks and sociodrama as teaching and learning methods to help participants deepen their understanding of personality preferences and how to manage the impact of these when working with and leading others.
- 2) Participating in a focus group immediately after the workshop, where we will be taking an appreciative (AI) approach to exploring our views as participants, on what is working well in this masks and sociodrama approach and how we can develop the approach to build in even more of that into the design and delivery of it in the future.

The complete Appreciative Inquiry (AI) process for this research will involve a cycle of 2 iterations of the workshop and 2 focus groups, where the researcher will work with what has been discussed by staff and student participants in the 1st focus group at Falmouth University and use that as a basis for improving the design and delivery of the subsequent workshop. The 2nd revised workshop and focus group will then be run at the University of Westminster, and used as a basis for developing the design and delivery of this approach, and our capability for using it for our teaching and learning, at both universities and in other learning contexts.

In the workshop the researcher will be inviting participants to:

Look at, reflect on, discuss, put on, and physically move while wearing, some theatrical masks based on Jungian Personality 'Types'.

Use these masks as a stimulus and vehicle for role play exploration of different strategies for working with these Personality Types.

I am inviting participants to engage in the above activities, but participating is purely on a voluntary basis.

Participants are free not to engage in any of the above activities at any time during any of the 2 iterations of the workshop. Participants are also free to withdraw from the research at any time (please see also notes below on this).

In the focus groups we will be asking:

What is working well in this workshop in terms of engaging us in our learning and how and why?

How we could modify the approach in the future so that the workshop has even more of what is working well in it?

Please note:

- Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary.
- You have the right to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.
- If you are a UoW or Falmouth student participant, this research study and the activities it involves will not form a part of any of your formal studies at the university.
- You do not have to answer particular questions at any part of the research process (i.e. in the focus groups or workshops) if you do not wish to do so.
- Any responses that you have made in focus groups or offered to the researcher outside the focus groups, will normally be made anonymous outside those focus groups, unless indicated above to the contrary, and will be kept confidential unless you provide explicit consent to do otherwise.
- You have the right to ask for your data to be withdrawn as long as this is practical, and for personal information to be destroyed. With regard to the practicalities of this, this will depend on when you choose to withdraw your data – any views and opinions that you give in focus groups that may identify you personally will be anonymised soon after the focus group you are in has taken place, so once that has been done, then after that point it will no longer be practical to identify and withdraw any data you have provided.
- I will be audio recording the focus group, purely for the purposes of taking notes from it afterwards, rather than having to take these notes during the focus group. The notes taken from any audio recording will be anonymised, and then the recordings will then be destroyed.
- No individuals should be identifiable from any collated data, written report of the research, or any publications arising from it.
- All computer data files will be encrypted and password protected. The researcher will keep files in a secure place and will comply with the requirements of the Data Protection Act.
- All hard copy documents, e.g. consent forms, focus group transcripts, etc. will be kept securely and in a locked cupboard, wherever possible on University premises. Documents may be scanned and stored electronically. This may be done to enable secure transmission of data to the university's secure computer systems.
- If you wish you can receive information on the results of the research. Please indicate on the consent form if you would like to receive this information.
- The researcher can be contacted during and after participation by email: andy.peisley@falmouth.ac.uk or by telephone (07933 039 844).
- If you have a complaint about this research project you can contact the project supervisor, Pauline Armsby by e-mail (p.armsby@westminster.ac.uk) or by telephone (0203 506 6023).

CONSENT FORM

Title of Study: Developing masks as pedagogy for learning about Personality preferences, using Appreciative Inquiry (AI).

Lead researcher: Andy Peisley, Falmouth University

I have been given the Participation Information Sheet and/or had its contents explained to me. Yes No

I have had an opportunity to ask any questions and I am satisfied with the answers given. Yes No

I understand I have a right to withdraw from the research at any time and I do not have to provide a reason. Yes No

I understand that if I withdraw from the research any data included in the results will be removed if that is practicable (I understand that once anonymised data has been collated into other datasets it may not be possible to remove that data). Yes No

I would like to receive information relating to the results from this study. Yes No

I wish to receive a copy of this Consent form. Yes No

I confirm I am willing to be a participant in the above research study. Yes No

I note the data collected may be retained in an archive and I am happy for my data to be reused as part of future research activities. I note my data will be fully anonymised (if applicable). Yes No

Participant's Name: _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

This consent form will be stored separately from any data you provide so that your responses remain anonymous.

I confirm I have provided a copy of the Participant Information Sheet approved by the Research Ethics Committee to the participant and fully explained its contents. I have given the participant an opportunity to ask questions, which have been answered.

Researcher's Name: _____

Appendix 9: Eg of First Pass Coding:

Me: What was the sort of best bit, what were people's best bits of the whole workshop, what was your favourite, the bit that you thought was most useful, most interesting, most enjoyable, most life-affirming, anything like that, which would be..give me some of your best moments

P5: yeah, when you stood up first (pointing to participant) and you put on that mask, and you were actually a totally different person. And her whole body language, that brought it..straight away
(lots of yes's in agreement across group)

instant transformation of mask wearer (in others eyes and body language)

Instant transformation into different body language

Transformation into different personality seems real.

P6: yes very suddenly you realised that this was quite a powerful...(lots of yes's in agreement across group)....message you can do, by just putting on a mask

Suddenly. Sudden realisation

Can do powerful message just by putting on mask

Me: that first moment

P6: Yeah (and general agreement across group)

First moment of seeing mask on someone

Amazement. Amazed (link with other reactions like surprise, unexpected?)

P4: Yeah that was amazing (and general agreement across group)

Me: Any others? Best moments?

P10: I loved the movement...the moving around (general agreement across group). Not having to do a questionnaire, was something that I really liked. I didn't feel like I had to over-think (laughs) I could just be... (expressing relief in tone – laughs) that was just quite nice!....

Movement.

Learning through movement.

Not having to do questionnaire.

Not having to over-think

P5: yeah (and general agreement across group) that was just great, to do that

Me: So the exercise with suggestions

P5: yeah (emphatic and enthusiastic) ...just...(to P10) talk about questionnaires, you know, up to these lines where you make a mark and then that's the one that maps up best to like a gesture, like 'I caught a fish, this big' (demonstrates it)...So gesture, you know, really speaks to me (enthusiastic general agreement from other participants across group) yeah.. but..and just to go back to your earlier question, I really concur with whoever it was said, the way you built it up was...excellent...really thought that...(enthusiastic general agreement from other participants across group)

Gesture speaks to them

Gradual build in design. Scaffolding.

P6: I like the way that when you, you, you put a mask on and you ask someone to do something, slightly ridiculous (laughter across group in recognition) and you do it..and you can see immediately what they are trying to convey, you get the message straight away (enthusiastic general agreement from other participants across group)

Mask allows people to do slightly ridiculous things.

Do things wouldn't normally allow self to do

Instantly get message being communicated

Can see immediately

Straight away. Instant. Immediate

Me: So that kind of communication between the two of you, it's demonstrating it and it's visual and it's instant...and it's physical

Demonstrative

Visual

Instant

Physical

P6: (*nodding*) yeah (*and some others*)

P2: And the masks are so effective themselves, that they almost don't have to do very much with their bodies, and already they are embodied in that personality type

Masks effective themselves

Don't have to do much themselves with bodies

Masks allow immediate embodiment/inhabitation(?) of personality type

P5: yes I found you in the red mask, really menacing (P2 and others general laughter), you are just such a lovely little pixie in real life (*loud general laughter across group*)

Emotional response. Arouses powerful feelings and responses

Emotional response to Personality (concept/construct being learned about?)

Laughter. Fun. Enjoyment.

(mask enabling people to dare to say things wouldn't normally say – licence?)

P4: It's quite affirming too, because the mask you put on that you related most to was so easy to do,

Mask most like you, easy to do

and yet the others were really quite testing,

Personality/Mask least like you harder to do

Difficult to do difference

so it was almost like, well I thought I knew where I was but the minute

Immediate

you had to do something in that colour you were..actually this is dead easy or my god this is the hardest thing I've done so, so it's quite affirming actually properly having to put it on and then properly do something as that person..it's almost like, yeah you thought you were Yellow, and tick, you are...so that was quite nice.

Affirmation.

Acts as a check/benchmark for self-identification/self-awareness

Acts as a check and confirmation of self knowledge/awareness/insight.

Me: best moments? Other best moments? Was there a particular moment where something clicked for you..Which was the most valuable...?

P1: I think I enjoyed the role playing most..

Enjoyed role play (*when said normally didn't earlier*)

Value/learning vs enjoyment

but I think perhaps the most valuable moment was seeing it played out actually,

Value of seeing Personality scenario played out (*values sociodrama/end bit*) for learning (*vs enjoyment*)

in terms of actual learning (*some general agreement from other participants across group, particularly P10*)...Experiencing, I really, the funnest bit was just having fun and putting the masks on and all the rest of it,

Wearing and doing actions as mask most fun

Fun

but actually in learning, I think the stuff you put on the sheets was actually really useful as well, the things that worked for that personality type and that don't...

Information in handouts

Info re strategies for personality in handouts

and I think that's really interesting

Interesting

P4: yes possibly more of that..

More of the sociodrama section

Appendix 10: E.g. of 2nd Pass Coding condensing codes

What could make work even better? What could make it even more valuable? How and why?

<p>Pre- and facilitator determined, list of specific tasks. Specific tasks. Level of specificity? Do tasks (systematically) in four different ways Type of exploration – systematic, comprehensive (all 4), structured, specific tasks (Level of structure (?)) Structured tasks. Predetermined tasks Level of invention/creativity (required/desirable) (from participants) Provide Tasks/actions matched/appropriate to personality type/mask Suggestions of appropriate actions per personality Suggestions desirable – nice to have Suggestions sometimes. Some suggestions (unwanted? Unnecessary) Difficult/Effort to invent tasks Unnecessary for participant to invent all tasks (for useful learning and reaching LO's?) Valuable effort/difficulty/struggle vs unnecessary effort/difficulty Role and level of imagination (engaged/required)</p>	<p>Provide more specific predetermined tasks & suggestions, appropriate to each personality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do all tasks systematically in all four different ways/personalities • Provide Predetermined tasks • So less level of invention/creativity required, to free focus on doing as & being mask/personality • Difficult to invent tasks • Provide (predetermined) tasks/actions and/or suggestions appropriate to each different personality/mask • Some suggestions • Unnecessary for participants to invent all tasks (reaching desired LO's focus/purpose of workshop) • Role and level of imagination/invention required?
<p>Systematically doing all 4 masks Do tasks (systematically) in four different ways Type of exploration – systematic, comprehensive (all 4), structured, specific tasks</p>	<p>Do all exercises with all 4 masks</p>
<p>Doing it with real people participants know Desire to take mask away from workshop, after workshop, into 'real life'/'real world' Bring examples of real people they know into scenario role play exploration in class Explain background in detail of person they know (so role can be played) Explain personality traits of person they know (so role can be played) Use real people they know as roles in the scenarios (psychodrama vs sociodrama) Psychodrama vs sociodrama Extra resources/additional activities - Bring or draw a picture of someone you know (to explore working with that person via role play?) Provide description of person with personality they find very difficult (by mail, bring in or anonymously) Anonymity – provide description of real person anonymously Provide anonymity for person (because known colleague) Share descriptions of person with personality they find difficult via writing it on slip of paper, putting in and pulling out of a hat</p>	<p>Do scenarios with known people</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Psychodrama' (approach) • Real/known people in scenario roleplay • Scenarios with known people • Use real people in roleplay • Explain background and detail (so role can be played) • Provide description (by mail, bring in, or anonymously) • Provide anonymity (safety) • Bring or draw picture • Pull out descriptions of personality they find difficult anonymous and randomly out of hat • Bring example & description of someone they have found inspirational too, into scenario • Most would be easily able to find eg's of someone they found difficult and someone they found inspirational • Could find examples in break in workshop • Real examples focus of first bit of workshop

<p>Make it easy for people to share (provide safety, safety to share/disclose (experiences)) Bring descriptions to workshop of difficult (workplace) scenarios (where had to 'deal with' someone), put into hat, choose randomly from hat Asks which masks would play people in this example (real) scenario Bring description to workshop of person they've found inspirational Bring inspirational example person/personality too into scenario (to help better the interaction/situation) Having/recalling real example person in mind Most would have examples of people they find both positive and negative Real examples would form part of focus in first bit of workshop Issue with not having knowledge of Personality yet (at start of 1st workshop) to categorise personality of example persons</p> <p>Bring examples to 2nd (part of workshop) instead Bring examples to 2nd vs 1st workshop</p> <p>Difficulty/issue of different perceptions of personality (type) of examples, from example person themselves, or participants/other people</p> <p>Independent Learning activity in coffee break (between halves of workshop), where think of 1 example person of someone you find inspirational and 1 example person of someone you find difficult Difference of views re independent learning activity in break between workshop halves. Thinking of 2 examples of people you know, not something hard for learners to do</p> <p>Extra resources/additional activities - Bring or draw a picture of someone you know (to explore working with that person via role play?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But issue of not having the knowledge of the personality model and types to categorise yet? • Bring examples instead to second part of workshop after break • Difficult issue of different perspectives of personality of example from others, or from person themselves
<p>Facilitate participants to apply learning from workshop to current personal experience (mentally and intentionally/deliberately)</p> <p>Split workshop in two halves, with break for independent learning activity in between Learning activity between halves of workshop, where reflect, applying learning to current real life In break think of and Bring back examples of 1 person you find inspirational and 1 person you find difficult to 1st workshop</p>	<p>Apply (to real life outside workshop) & return</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply to real workplace in between workshop halves • Bring back that to next workshop • Apply & return • Activity: reflect between halves of workshop: apply learning to workplace and real life, bring back example of 1 person you find inspirational, and one you find difficult

Appendix 11: E.g. Page of Codes to Categories

Improving Teamwork: Focus on Teamwork

Practicing Appreciation of Diversity: Appreciating Difference, Doing Difference, Facing Challenge of Doing & Appreciating Difference.

Personality As A Metaphor: Focuses on 'Personality' to understand difference, Avoids 'reifying' personality Avoids privileging one type of personality over another(V), (PS)Overcomes dislike of self-categorisation of personality. Identify opposite personality, Embody and do difference (in form of different personalities), Reflect on past (experiences of diversity) via personality

Range of other applications: E.g. Dealing with bullying in schools. Helping young people with problems at school: handling anger, building confidence, social skills.

WAYS OF SUPPORTING LEARNING: Scenario Roleplay Practice With Masks, Power of Masks, Lightness & Play, Simplicity, Good Scaffolding & Structure, User-Friendly Information, Strong Facilitator Support

Scenario Roleplay Practice With Masks:

Scenario role play (with masks) (VK), Most useful. Longer duration (F) Give break (F).

Safe (space) (general) (VK).

Active Participation (VK). Doing Roleplay (VK), Watching Roleplay (VK), Mask Hot Seat (F), Team Tasks (F). Card sort games (F).

Use trained professional actors (F).

Adapt scenario to workplace context (e.g. journalism) of participants. Do scenarios with known people (F)

Power of Masks: Mask is an enabler (for wearer, for observer). Deeper learning. Insight into own learning process. How/why masks enable. Play with perceptions. First masks reveal moment (VK). Not being able to speak (VK). Through gesture (VK). Provide safety (mask) (VK). Overcomes dislike roleplay & drama. Endowed 'magic' agency.

Provide more specific predetermined tasks & suggestions, appropriate to each personality (F). Do all exercises with all 4 masks (F). (Use masks with moveable expression (F).) Overlay single colour/personality masks with other colours (F). Use projection mapping to overlay mask with other colours (F)

Lightness & Play: fun, laughter, dynamic, interactive, participatory (K all)

Simplicity: Simplicity (K). Simplicity of exercises. Avoids clutter. Avoids use of props & costumes

Good Scaffolding & Structure: Scaffolding. Structure.

User-Friendly Information: Information in handouts. Pre-reading. Simple theory explanation

Strong Facilitator Support: Courageous. Self-confidence. Display strong belief that this works. Avoid apologising for this as weird. Commitment to the work. Authentic. Genuine. Congruent. Sincere.

Passion & enthusiasm. Provide safety. Make people feel safe. You are in good hands, someone will look after you. Protects health (mask wipes). Give people permission. Give people courage to 'go over the edge' Give encouragement & coax. Coach & provide support. Enlists key stakeholders

LEARNING GAIN: Emotional Intelligence Skills

Emotional Intelligence Skills: Self-awareness. Journey in self-awareness. Map the journey. Self-regulation. Empathy. Understanding of others

Extra: Use film. Use visual capture (film/photography/drawing)

Appendix 12 (App12): E.g. page of themes, categories, higher level codes

Themes Categories Codes Sort

Overall tone of focus group and their responses – open, enthusiastic, really positive in affirmations about what they had just done, expressing enjoyment, enthusiasm, warmth, group togetherness and bonding, positivity, some wonder at what had just occurred

Guiding research questions for coding process:

What is valuable about this approach for learning? And how and why?

What is working here? What works? And how and why?

What gives life (to learning) here? And how and why?

What works for non-actor/Drama learners? What works for learners in business context? Workplace context? And how and why?

Codes from both Q1 and Q2 to combine and sort

	Potential storyline: Focus & purpose (what) Personality, Appreciation of value of difference – purpose; why - better Teamwork/collaboration) Fosters understanding others, self awareness , How - scenario roleplay, how do scenario role play (and rest of above), Masks. Key design principles & features while doing all above	
	Q1 codes – what valued	Q2 codes – what could make even better
		Lose nothing just extend
(achieves Better) Teamwork	Teamwork	More focus on teamwork & collaboration
(Practicing) appreciating diversity	Doing appreciation of difference (NB – axial) Tackle difficulty doing and appreciating difference	Keep & More focus on appreciating value of difference Keep focus on appreciating difference(V) (PS)
(Via metaphor of) Personality	Focus on Personality (to understand difference) Reflect on past via personality Identify opposite personality Embody and do difference Avoids ‘reifying’ personality Overcomes dislike of self-categorisation of personality Avoids privileging one type of personality over another(V) (PS)	Keep & Highlight personality as central core and focus (V)(PS) Keep avoids ‘reifying’ personality(V) (PS) Keep overcomes dislike of self-categorisation of personality (V) (PS) Keep avoids privileging one type of personality over another(V) (PS) Activity: which objects/surroundings match which personality? Activity: Apply (to real life outside workshop) & return Activity: Take partner to workplace to

		<p>guess workplace personalities</p> <p>Extend personality metaphor from individual to team & organisation</p>
<p>Supported by Scenario role play (with masks)</p>	<p>Scenario role play (with masks) Provides safety (general)</p>	<p>Keep & more scenario roleplay Keep participants doing scenario roleplay (V) Keep participatory(V) (PS) Longer duration Give break</p> <p>Keep watching scenario roleplay (V) Keep Learning by watching masks in scenario roleplay (V) Keep providing safety (V) (PS)</p> <p>Use trained/professional actors</p> <p>Do scenarios with known people (NB to address P focus)</p> <p>Possible team task (NB to address teamwork focus) Card game (NB to address teamwork focus)</p> <p>Ask mask how they might respond in situation (hot seat?)</p> <p>Adapt scenarios to discipline/professional practice e.g. interviewing for journalists</p>
<p>Mask enables</p> <p>Enabled by power of mask (what, how, why)</p>	<p>Mask enables (for wearer, for observer) axial Deeper learning Insight into own learning process</p>	
<p>How/Why mask enables</p>	<p>How/why mask enables axial Plays with perceptions First masks reveal moment Masks endowed 'magic' agency? Provides safety (mask) Overcomes dislike roleplay & drama Not being able to speak Through gesture</p>	<p>Keep providing safety (V) (PS) Take account of people who don't like role plays</p> <p>Keep first moment masks reveal (V) Keep not being able to speak (in early activities) (V) Keep gesture (V)</p> <p>Provide more specific predetermined</p>

		<p>tasks & suggestions, appropriate to each personality Do all exercises with all 4 masks</p> <p>Use masks with moveable expression Overlay single colour/personality masks with other colours Use projection mapping to overlay mask with other colours</p>
(Lightness & Play)	Design Features (overall) Play (Game)	<p>Keep fun(V) (PS) Keep laughter(V) (PS) Keep dynamic(V) (PS) Keep interactive(V) (PS) Keep participatory(V) (PS)</p>
Simplicity of Design	Structure & Design	Keep scaffolding
Good scaffolding	Simplicity	<p>Keep simplicity Use props? (vs simplicity)</p>
User-friendly information	Information in handouts	<p>Keep & more pre-reading More theory explanation</p>
		<p>Use film Use visual capture (film/photography/drawing)</p>
Develops emotional intelligence	<p>Develops self-awareness Journey through workshop Mapping the change/journey</p>	<p>Keep develops self-awareness(V) (PS) More mapping the journey Use mapping tools</p>
	Develops understanding of others	Keep develops understanding of others(V) (PS)
	Builds empathy with difference	Keep empathy (V)
	Develops self-regulation	

What would make it even better?

Lose nothing just extend
 More scenario roleplay
 Longer duration
 Give break
 Ask mask how they might respond in situation (hot seat?)
 Provide more specific predetermined tasks & suggestions, appropriate to each personality
 Do all exercises with all 4 masks
 Do scenarios with known people
 Apply (to real life outside workshop) & return
 Take partner to workplace to guess workplace personalities
 More focus on appreciating value of difference
 More focus on teamwork & collaboration
 More mapping the journey

Use mapping tools
Use visual capture (film/photography/drawing)
Card game
Keep simplicity
Use masks with moveable expression
Use trained/professional actors
Use props?
Activity: which objects/surroundings match which personality?
Extend personality metaphor from individual to organisation
Adapt scenarios to discipline/professional practice
e.g. interviewing for journalists
more pre-reading
More theory explanation
Overlay single colour/personality masks with other colours
Use projection mapping to overlay mask with other colours
Use film
Highlight personality as central core and focus
Keep & Highlight personality as central core and focus (V)(PS)
Take account of people who don't like role plays
Possible team task
Keep first moment masks reveal (V)
Keep not being able to speak (in early activities) (V)
Keep gesture (V)
Keep watching scenario roleplay (V)
Keep Learning by watching masks in scenario roleplay (V)
Keep participants doing scenario roleplay (V)
Keep empathy (V)
Keep providing safety (V) (PS)
Keep develops understanding of others(V) (PS)
Keep develops self-awareness(V) (PS)
Keep avoid privileging one type of personality over another(V) (PS)
With
Keep focus on appreciating difference(V) (PS)
Keep fun(V) (PS)
Keep dynamic(V) (PS)
Keep interactive(V) (PS)
Keep participatory(V) (PS)
Keep laughter(V) (PS)
Keep avoid reification of personality(V) (PS)
Keep avoid people not wanting to be categorised(V) (PS)

Appendix 13: E.g.'s of thematic analysis memos

Ideas and notes for coding process 050817

- Is mask enabling because it really does or because participants believe it to do so? Does it actually matter for learning purposes? Also, Well actually of course it is about belief (unless you believe in magical powers, unlike me), the mask doesn't have any 'magical powers' itself beyond what participants endow it with, so power of mask and the person facilitating workshop, and participants, is to provoke beliefs about its power, which then empower wearers to achieve all those things more easily and instantly than they might have done anyway
- NB – from the above – one of my assumptions – don't believe in magic, atheist. Someone who did might have different interpretation.

Poss Categories structure:

Mask and masked roleplay empowers

What Mask enables and empowers – head space, instant, access to personal resources normally inaccessible
How/Why it enables – fixed expression, overcomes dislike of roleplay, endowment of magic in mask, hides
End result of that?

NB – projection of perceptions – links with Wilshire and other theatre mask practitioners talking about how mask works on (and can be used to manipulate better) audiences' perceptions

Themes/reporting interpretation:

Hard to separate what mask is enabling from what masked role play is enabling – because masks are to be worn and used in action on people, not just looking at objects without being worn and embodied

NB – Focusing on Personality, using (abstract) masks, to understand and value difference. Is this important e.g. compared to learning to value diversity by focusing on e.g. differences/diversity in gender, culture, race, etc. As more universal, more accessible, less divisive, less loaded and controversial, overcoming barriers, providing a safer, less controversial and more positive (rather than negatively) charged space & learning environment and class climate in which to learn? In safe space, so can go further with practice in time available? Yet still can learn to tolerate and do difference and valuing and empathise with it – learning that then can be extended and applied outside workshop, to appreciating diversity and difference to self, in other characteristics/ other types of difference? Helping to scaffold learning to value diversity better, enabling greater skills development and capacity building in less time?

Appendix 14: Full Version of Provocative Narrative:

Appendix: Full version of AI Analysis Provocative Narrative.

Provocative Narrative: 'What is perceived as valuable about this pedagogy?':

Provocative Narrative: Summary:

APPLICATION: This pedagogy is most impactful for *improving teamwork*, by participants *actively practicing appreciation of diversity* through *Using Personality as a metaphor*. It is also a flexible approach, suitable for a *range of possible applications*. **WAYS OF SUPPORTING LEARNING:** Learning is well supported by: *scenario roleplay practice with masks, the power of masks as enablers, lightness and play, simplicity, good scaffolding and structure, user-friendly information and strong facilitator support*. **LEARNING GAIN:** The gain for learners is enhanced *emotional intelligence skills*, for working more effectively with other people.

APPLICATION: Summary:

In terms of applications, this pedagogy is most impactful for *improving teamwork*, by participants' *actively practicing appreciation of diversity* in an embodied way, through the use of *Personality as a metaphor*. It is also a flexible approach, suitable for a *range of possible applications*.

Improving Teamwork: Provocative Propositions:

Although this pedagogy is being found very useful for helping people at an individual level; e.g. to explore individual psychology, help with intrapersonal and interpersonal issues and develop their personal 'soft' skills; it is having its biggest impact when applied to a team context; e.g. for helping teams to resolve team issues and challenges they are facing, to break down interpersonal barriers, and to foster collaboration and improve their group functioning. It is helping teams identify and address gaps in team capability. It is helping dysfunctional teams to tackle group dynamics issues and deal with underlying conflicts or 'elephants in the room', that are not surfacing or being acknowledged or surfacing, in a safe and supportive way.

It is being used to help a range of different teams, at all levels, at different stages of team development. It is useful for new teams, providing them with some useful tools, skills experiences and knowledge, to help them form and proceed as more effective teams. It is even more useful for helping teams that having been together for a long period, who are stuck in **Tuckman's** 'Storming' stage, or otherwise dealing with problems in their group functioning that are preventing them from moving forward successfully. It is helping moving teams through the 'fake team' stage, into a more 'real team' who function with a greater degree of honesty and effectiveness. It is helpful used at Board level, e.g. as part of a productive away-day activity, for Boards who often lack opportunities to do teambuilding workshops and want to improve their functioning as a team.

Actively Practicing Appreciation of Diversity: Provocative Propositions:

This pedagogy, regardless of application, in design and facilitation of the learning activities, focuses on celebrating the positives and value of differences, and finding ways to work effectively with those differences, taking an appreciative approach to diversity. It is opening up peoples' awareness to how specifically we may be different, and how it is important and useful to be respectful and mindful of those differences. It is facilitating groups/teams and individuals to identify and experience viscerally, what is positive and contributory about each and every personality and the reasons why, especially in relation to working together in groups/teams. It is carefully avoiding privileging one type of personality over another, in any absolute fixed sense, helping participants to experience the advantages offered and the contributions that can be made, by each different personality, to group and team tasks. It is enabling them to experience aspects they previously perceived as negative about different personalities, particular those very different from themselves, in a positive light, helping people to feel, think and act more positively towards each other. It helps them to recognise specifically the ways in which those most different from themselves, can be very valuable and fill useful gaps in team and individual functioning.

Participants are arriving at these realisations through this pedagogy, about the value of difference in an experiential, embodied way, through action involving their whole person, to produce stronger levels of empathy. They are doing this through doing difference, in a sustained way, through embodying a personality different from themselves enabled by masks, experiencing, with all their senses involved, the world, situations, individual and group tasks and people from that perspective, in terms of feeling, thoughts, and behaviour. They are doing this through actively appreciating difference, through witnessing and experiencing interactions with people very different from themselves, experiencing the positive advantages and contributions that different forms of difference can offer a team/group and individuals within it. This means these realisations they are having about the value of difference, are going beyond just being intellectual and theoretical, but are experienced in a deeper, more engaging, more visceral, physical, interactive and emotional way. They are also reflecting on these experiences they are having of appreciating difference through scenario roleplay with masks, relating these to actively appreciating the value of people they are currently working with in groups/teams, those they have worked with in the past, and other people and situations with which they are already familiar in their own lives. They are also reflecting on how these experiences of doing and actively appreciating difference might be useful and applied to future scenarios that they are likely to experience, as individuals, and particularly when working in groups/teams. They are gaining an increased appreciation of people who are different from themselves, with whom they are currently working, with whom they have worked with in the past, and with whom they might work with in the future.

Personality As A Metaphor: Provocative Propositions:

This pedagogy is enabling participants to actively practice appreciation of the value of diversity and difference, by using Personality as a metaphor for difference. It is recognising and addressing how challenging it can be for diverse participants to actively practice doing, appreciating, and empathising with difference, in personality, let alone with regard to other more visible perceived aspects of difference, e.g. in race, gender, sexual orientation, disability, etc. Using abstract, fixed expression, non-naturalistic personality masks and 'personality' as a metaphor for difference, is helping avoid some of the potential tensions and obstacles to learning that can be unhelpfully heightened too early, e.g. in pedagogy that addresses this area through focusing on other differences perceived as more visible, physical, tangible and potentially 'real'. 'Personality' by its nature is an abstract psychological construct. Aspects of 'Personality' are framed, and perceived and easily accepted by participants as, aspects of difference that we all nonetheless potentially share in common to varying extents. Useful conflicts, tensions, and challenges involved in negotiating and working with difference are still raised, faced, and overcome actively and experientially through this pedagogy. For example, when participants are engaged in actively doing and appreciating difference while interacting with others, while working towards achieving mutual agreement and better group outcomes, e.g. in masked roleplay and scenario roleplay with masks. However, learners feel able to do this more safely, enjoyably and lightly, and can more easily go further in their practice and engagement in deeper, active learning, within a given time frame, when personality as a metaphor for difference is being used. Participants learning to actively appreciate diversity is thus helpfully scaffolded, allowing them to become more fully engaged in the active, experiential practice of appreciation of diverse characteristics, in a deeper, more transformative, 'whole person', embodied way.

Using personality as a metaphor extends to deliberately and carefully avoiding the promotion of fixed, absolute views and claims for Personality and 'reification' of Personality or any psychological personality model. 'Personality' and the personality 'types' represented by the masks, are actively, critically framed in this pedagogy as a social construct, rather than as 'scientific fact'. The personality model that is being used, e.g. a Jungian based personality model, is qualified as just one 'model', with caveats highlighted. Personality is framed as more nuanced and open than fixed types. The artifice of the masks to represent personality, helps to constantly underline, heighten and play with that; with participants experiencing the masks as both seemingly alive and present, yet simultaneously obviously constructed. Participants value that the personality masks highlight how much they themselves are actively constructing their perceptions of difference themselves during the workshop; as they become aware how they are continually projecting 'alive', diverse characteristics onto the appearances of these fixed expression, artificial abstract masks, as worn by other participants. They also value that this pedagogical approach towards difference in personality overcomes their dislike of being categorized, labelled, and fixed regarding personality in any absolute sense, which they find is often a common barrier with other learning approaches to 'Personality'. They also nonetheless value learning

about a particular theoretical personality model, and that they are not having to 'overthink' to do this, and/or have to do a questionnaire.

This pedagogy avoids prescribing fixed, set, absolute recommendations of ways in which particular personalities-masks 'should' be optimally 'handled'. While offering some suggestions when particular learners could benefit from this, it focuses on facilitating learners to develop and test out their own creative strategies for developing mutual understanding and interacting successfully with each other, via the safe medium of the masks and masked scenario roleplay.

This pedagogy uses a range of different masks to help participants appreciate and work successfully with diversity, not just masks representing dimensions of a particular personality model. Masks representing more defined personality 'types' from particular personality models, are tending to be used at the start to help learners find a way in to appreciating and working with individual differences, providing them with anchor points, scaffolding their learning and giving them a helpful way in to this work. Later a range of other masks, less predefined according to a particular personality model are being used, allowing groups and teams to flexibly explore other issues, tensions, conflicts and challenges that they are facing, have faced, or could face, in their collaborative working as a team.

The 'personality'-mask as metaphor is also being extended to represent larger bodies than individuals, e.g. to groups/teams and organisations. Participants are encouraged to reflect on the characteristics of their team/group and/or organisation through the metaphor of personality, using diverse masks, to explore their perceptions and experiences regarding the type of mask their group/team or organisation is, has been, and could be, and the implications of that for them as individuals working within them. This gives them a safe way of surfacing what they think about team or organisation, and what they would like it to be.

Range of other applications: Provocative Propositions:

Although this pedagogy has its greatest impact when applied to working group and teamwork, it is also being used for a range of other potential applications, e.g. dealing with bullying in schools, and helping young people with problems at school, with handling their anger, and building their confidence and social skills.

WAYS OF SUPPORTING LEARNING: Summary:

Participants' learning to appreciate diversity, for working in groups and teams is well supported by: ***scenario roleplay practice with masks***, the ***power of masks, lightness and play, simplicity, good scaffolding and structure, user-friendly information*** and ***strong facilitator support***.

Scenario Roleplay Practice With Masks: Provocative Propositions:

Participants value the scenario roleplay with masks as the most useful element of this pedagogy. They value it as the 'pith' of it all, where the message is reinforced and where all the learning comes together. They recognise that the earlier embodiment exercises that they do in masks are necessary to enable them to reach the point where they can engage in this learning activity. They value the enjoyment, fun, play, lightness and learning they are gaining from those. However, they agree that the scenario roleplay they do in the masks, although the most challenging and stretching, is very powerful and giving them the most lasting value to take away after the workshop.

They enjoy the added complexity this activity brings, through seeing and viscerally experiencing personality being played out in scenarios, in different aspects of differences in personality being exposed more fully, challenged, tested and stretched. They are intensely interested in experiencing aspects of personality difference being played out to extremes. They are experiencing in an experiential way, what does and does not work when working with different kinds of people.

They are recognising the learning they are gaining through watching others play different personalities in the scenarios. They are enjoying the opportunities they have to watch and reflect on the roleplay interaction within the scenarios. They value the opportunities this gives for those who are more anxious about scenario roleplay, to be relieved of the anxiety of having to roleplay if they do not want to, and to nonetheless keep

learning. They are recognising the enhanced value it brings to their learning and skills development when they do engage with the testing challenges of doing, and working with, different people from themselves in the scenario roleplay, as opposed to e.g. the possibility of the roleplay being exclusively being done for them by professional, trained actors. They value the safe space provided by the scenario roleplays with masks, for practice, play and experimentation with different interpersonal approaches, for working with difference in groups. They are feeling increased empathy for personalities different from themselves, by watching colleagues whom they know and like already, simultaneously also displaying the behaviour of those personalities, through the masks, in the scenario roleplay.

They are valuing the reflection and discussion each roleplay is surfacing and the learning they are gaining from that. In these reflections, they are linking what they are experiencing in the roleplays to people they have known and valued in the past, and encouraged to do this by different reflective activities: e.g. identifying excellent managers who had different personalities different from themselves, but who were talented at working with difference and appreciated its value. They then are taking that reflection into further action and experimentation, by embodying those positive past examples through the masks in scenario roleplay, experimenting with those positive approaches and the value they can bring to working with others and to the team.

They value the experience of engaging as a plenary group together in watching, roleplaying and reflecting on the scenarios as a collective experience. They also value doing this in smaller groups, where it can help those more reticent to engage in roleplay, when lots of other similar activity is going on in the room at the same time and they are not the sole object of focus.

They are roleplaying with masks a range of different scenarios, free to devise those that are most useful for the group to explore at that time, in a flexible and creative way. They are working on group problem solving activities, e.g. in assembling flat pack furniture as a team. They are forming groups that include mask representatives of all dimensions of a specific personality model, to explore the value that diversity can bring to the teamwork. They are adapting scenarios to their own particular work contexts, disciplines and areas of professional practice, e.g. to how to interview different types of people effectively in journalism. They are exploring both hypothetical and real team problems, group conflicts and challenges they want/need to tackle. They are roleplaying past meetings they have had, and future scenarios they might face soon as a team, exploring how they could handle these more effectively. They are analysing what aspects of personality-masks might be needed to make a group task more successful, sending in and pulling out different masks to explore what might work best. They are pushing particular personality-masks to extremes, to explore the impact that might have on group functioning, and experimenting with ways they could address that. They are making use of devices such as card sort games or pulling out examples from a hat, to e.g. generate and select different scenarios to roleplay, and different combinations of personalities in teams. They are bringing examples of particular personalities they have found challenging to work with in teams, to explore how they could work better with those personalities, as individuals and teams.

They value any extended time they are given to engage in scenario roleplay with the masks within the workshop, especially if a break is provided. If time is limited, they prefer other earlier exercises to be shortened so that they can prioritise their learning time on this activity. When there are longer breaks between multiple sessions, they are engaging in reflective activities between sessions, where they apply the learning gained to their interactions with others in their teams, reflecting on how they are dealing with different personalities in their workplaces.

They are recognising the growing ability and interpersonal skills being gained and demonstrated by their all their colleagues within the workshop. They are recognising their enhanced ability in adapting their behaviour and approach, to better recognise, negotiate, actively appreciate and do difference, in order to work more effectively as a group/team. They are identifying what is valuable about all of their differences, for effective group functioning and working in teams.

Power of Masks As Enablers: Provocative Propositions:

The masks are acting as powerful enablers for the participants, for both for those wearing the masks and for those watching. They are enabling deep, active learning. They are provoking thought and reflection, sudden

insight and realisation. They are helping participants to immerse themselves fully into the active learning activities. They are providing insight for the participants into their own learning processes. Participants are quickly able to apply the new knowledge they are gaining, from wearing and watching the masks and reflecting on these experiences: e.g. to analysis of their fellow participants and situations and people they know outside the workshop, and e.g. to how they might adapt this approach for the benefit of those whose learning they want to support, in their own workplace contexts.

The impact of the first moment in the beginning of the workshop where the previously unseen masks are revealed, one by one, worn by volunteer participants, is particularly powerful, affective and effective. This surprise revelation is suddenly transporting participants from everyday conversation amongst their colleagues, and not being sure what is going to happen, to immediately putting them into the 'mode' of the workshop; the topic of focus and learning approach. The masks are suddenly and immediately dominating the learning space, powerfully compelling and engaging the learners' collective attention. Participants are finding the masks beautiful, unusual, unfamiliar, extraordinary. The masks very quickly, even instantly for some participants, are provoking a wide range of strongly experienced emotions among the learners: including laughter, fun, enjoyment, aesthetic pleasure, intense interest, fascination, curiosity, excitement, wonder, amazement, surprise, desire to possess, slight discomfort, nervousness, anticipation, and expectation. This is serving to very quickly engage the learners in their learning; in issues and concepts being addressed and the learning activities being done.

Participants are finding the fixed expression of the rigid masks powerful, especially when being worn. They are allowing easy and quick communication of a powerful message, just by the person putting on the mask, enabling observers to instantly get message being communicated. The masks also are playing with their perceptions, especially when being worn, making participants instantly realise how much they are projecting their own perceptions onto others, ascribing particular characteristics to them, based on appearances. They are instantly provoking the learners' perceptions and imaginations, to building an ever-evolving picture of the person that might be represented by the masks. They seem to be physically changing the wearer's body language immediately (for both observers and wearers), making the transformation seem surprisingly real, causing the participants to experience an abstract Personality construct that they represent as real, actual, present and alive in the room. This is happening for the observers and the wearers, even when the participants are doing little at all except put on the mask and stand still, facing those watching.

Participants are finding having both non-speaking full masks, for earlier personality embodiment activities, and also speaking half-masks, for later scenario roleplay, particularly helpful. They find not being able to speak in the masks helpful at first, because it makes them express physically the characteristics of the personalities represented, who different from themselves, through gesture, instead of words. The masks move participants from intellectualising, into their bodies and behaviour. They enable reflection and action: a cycle of reflection and doing, reflection and doing; as opposed to reflecting and writing.

Through seeing and doing gestures of another personality in the mask, they are feeling and increasing their empathy with that person they perceive as different from themselves. The masks are helping them to feel they are 'getting inside the skin' of different personalities. Observers are experiencing simultaneously both the personality (mask) very different from themselves, and the fellow participant they know and like (the wearer), enabling them to feel a greater level of empathy for that different personality, based on the positive feelings they already feel for the wearer. The masks are helping them to experience empathy with their whole body/person (thoughts, emotions, behaviour), helping the participants experientially develop better mutual understanding.

The masks enable participants to 'do difference', more capably and easily. They enable very fast, sudden access for participants, immediate embodiment of difference, into feeling like they are becoming someone else, as if they are now the personality the mask represents. They provoke quickly the imaginary, sensory experience of being in another person's 'headspace', as well as the actions perceived to belong to that person, who they perceive as very different from themselves.

The masks help overcome the participants' usual dislike of roleplay and drama. They help participants who begin reticent and nervous, move rapidly to fully engage with scenario roleplay. They enable the learners to perceive themselves and others as being hidden. They tend to endow the mask with independent agency,

which is liberating for them. They perceive of the mask 'disappearing their own personality', enabling them more easily to embody another. The masks give permission to the wearer, to be able to do things they would normally not be able to do, to embody personalities very different from themselves, often strikingly so for their colleagues who know them. They give permission to express different personality characteristics in terms of thought, emotion and behaviour. They allow greater access to personal resources (thoughts, emotions, behaviour, skills, creative ideas, strategies) normally less easily available to them. For instance, to perform tasks more that they find challenging, such as trying to influence a personality different from their own, by being more like, and empathising with, that particular personality, thus taking more account of that persons' needs, concerns, preferences, etc, in their influencing approach. The mask also helps them to persist in practicing challenging tasks, that they would normally give up on when meeting obstacles (e.g. trying to influence someone with a personality very different from themselves).

Participants are unusually ready 'to have a go' and engage in risky and challenging learning activities. They speak of the mask pushing them out beyond their comfort zone, enabling them to do ridiculous-seeming things they wouldn't normally do, and to do unfamiliar behaviour instinctively and effortlessly. They seem to facilitate extraordinary experience and capability in the wearer, for wearers and observers. They facilitate play and creative experimentation in their approaches to interaction with others.

They do a lot of the work involved in roleplay and portraying character, for wearer and observer. They enable easier and better-quality roleplay, than would be possible by the wearer without the masks. They provide safety, open up a safer place and provide a safe way of surfacing things normally hidden. They enable them to safely explore differences and emotive issues around that.

They also help to open doors and provoke offers, invitations and future opportunities from others, e.g. for future applications of this pedagogy to help their own students, staff and clients.

Participants are helped to begin to get into the personality of the mask by being given specific, predetermined tasks and suggestions, appropriate to each personality mask. This saves them from the distracting effort of having to come up with lots of creative ideas themselves, to focus on the learning objectives at hand. Participants do all the exercises systematically with all four masks to get the maximum learning benefits, that can be derived from both embodying and watching others embody the different personalities. Single colour masks can also be overlaid with different colours that represent other personality types, to help wearers and observers to perceive the full complexity of personality preferences e.g. via projections.

Lightness & Play: Provocative Propositions:

Fun and laughter are being actively encouraged and nurtured throughout the workshop, as an integral and essential part of this pedagogy. I am encouraging and supporting my participants to approach the exercises, however weighty the material, with lightness and in a spirit of playful experimentation. The learning activities are designed and facilitated as dynamic, interactive, participatory and inclusive.

Simplicity: Provocative Propositions:

Participants value the simplicity of the workshop: in design, learning activities, structure, materials and information provided. They like that any theoretical material is 'dumbed down', 'easy to get their head around', 'not too complex', or 'overly intellectual'. They like that they do not have to 'overthink', e.g. to understand aspects of personality theory or models, which makes it less intimidating for them. They value the location and learning environment feeling natural and familiar. They value that exercises utilise what resources there may be already existing in the room, rather than any distracting clutter or complicated learning resources being brought into the learning space. They also value that apart from the masks, no other learning resources that relate to theatre and drama, that might put off learners 'who are not into doing drama' are brought into the space, e.g. theatrical props and costumes.

Good Scaffolding & Structure: Provocative Propositions:

The workshop design I am using to support the learning of my participants, is well-structured and scaffolds their learning very effectively. It is enabling a gradual build of the picture of what they are learning through the

structuring of the learning activities. Earlier exercises, where participants are embodying masks through physical tasks and movement and gesture without words, is appreciated as necessary and helpful for enabling them to successfully engage with later more complex activities involved in scenario role play practice and exploration with the masks. The effective scaffolding is helping participants move from feeling reticent and nervous at the start, to engaging fully with the scenario roleplay practice in later parts of the workshop.

User-Friendly Information: Provocative propositions:

I am providing optional pre-reading prior to the workshop, to help those of my learners who would prefer that I did this, to give them a grounding and a context for the work. This pre-reading is explaining relevant theoretical material, such as the particular personality model that the masks are based on, which we are using in the workshop as a metaphor to investigate diversity and individual differences. The limited amount of theoretical material that I share in this pre-reading, and any presented in the workshop, is presented in very simple, clear, easy-to-understand and user-friendly form. I am adjusting the sophistication of my theory explanation to what I am actively discovering about the particular groups and individuals within them, whose learning I am supporting. I taking care to ensure that any pre-reading I am providing does not take away from the ‘thunder of the first moment’, and the value being gained from that by participants, at the beginning of the workshop when they first encounter the masks.

Strong Facilitator Support: Provocative propositions: As a facilitator, I am courageous and self-confident. I am displaying unshakeable belief that this pedagogy works. I am not apologising for this as ‘weird’ or ‘unusual’ in any way. I show I’m committed to this work. I am passionate about it and I am showing my enthusiasm. I am authentic, genuine, congruent and sincere. I am making people feel safe, that they are in good hands and that I and their fellow participants are looking after them. I am taking care of their health in my workshops, by providing antiseptic wipes to wipe masks between use, and encouraging all to use them. I am giving people permission and courage to ‘step over the edge’. I am continuing to find new ways to encourage and support those more reluctant to engage in scenario role play with masks, so that all can benefit from the added learning benefits this provides. I am giving encouragement and coaxing them supportively to do so. I am taking a coaching approach and providing support. I am helping the group ease into this work kindly and gently. I am engaging them in group contracting in the beginning of the workshop. I am enlisting key stakeholders as ‘cultural architects’, to help lead the way and encourage other participants to participate.

LEARNING GAIN: Summary:

Individuals and teams are gaining enhanced *emotional intelligence skills*, for working more effectively with each other.

Emotional Intelligence Skills: Provocative Propositions:

This pedagogy is developing individual learners and teams with their emotional intelligence skills, enabling them to work more effectively with each other in lots of different ways.

It is shifting and developing their self-awareness. It is giving them a richer perception of what might be their own personality preferences and position on particular personality models. It is acting as a check and affirmation of their self-awareness, self-knowledge and self-insight, as individuals and teams. It is helping them recognise how their own learning preferences may be shaped by different aspects of individual or group ‘personality’. They are able to quickly apply the new knowledge they are gaining, within the workshop, learner group and to situations and people they know outside it. It is helping individuals and teams who are unsure of their own identity, develop their understanding of what this might be. It is helping them reflect on their development in terms of ‘personality’ as individuals and groups/teams. It is helping them map the journey that they are taking in growing self-awareness through their engagement with this pedagogy. As well as the individuals and teams mapping the change in their awareness, in an embodied way, within the learning activities, they also are making records of the progress they have achieved, by methods of visual capture e.g. pen & paper drawing and/or more advanced tools such as photography and video recording.

It is developing their ability to understand and empathise with people different from themselves, to understand more fully where those people are coming from and what works for them and what doesn’t. It is

developing their individual and group ability to self-regulate their own behaviour, to adapt their behaviour based on their growing mutual understanding they are developing for each other. This is helping individuals and teams to work more harmoniously and effectively together.