2. CHAPTER ONE

2.1 THE INQUIRY CONTEXT: THE DRAMATISTIC APPROACH

The Dramatistic Approach (Bordow & More 1991:60) is an organisational inquiry method which uses dramatic or theatrical metaphors to draw out aspects of interpersonal communication. The main proponents of the Dramatistic Approach are Goffman (1959) and Mangham (1979, 1988 and with Overington 1987). The approach has been contextualised within an inquiry based paradigm (Bordow & More 1991:60) which maintains that meaning about the world emerges from interpersonal processes of meaning negotiation. Meaning is thus ever changing and ever developing, rather than being fixed.

The term 'Dramatistic' has been taken from the writing of Kenneth Burke (1945) who refers to the 'dramatistic model' of human behaviour. This model addresses the proposition that meaning evolves from interpersonal processes as people relate to each other as 'actors'. Burke (1968:446) uses the term 'actor', as a derivative of the verb 'to act'. He suggests that for every instance in life, which he calls an 'act', there is a 'scene', an 'agent', an 'agency' and a 'purpose'. In this sense he sees people as 'actors' (metaphor) rather than 'as if they are actors' (simile). He is suggesting that people are always 'acting' in the sense of being involved in instances of life. He argues that meaning about the world is derived from these instances of 'acting'.

Mitchell (1978:90) \(^1\), has contrasted Burke's (1945) writing with Ichheiser (1949). Mitchell suggests that while Burke (1945) is proposing 'that people are acting',

\(^1\) Inquirer's note: The contrast between 'metaphor' and 'simile' (Macquarie 1988) becomes confused when writers such as Mitchell (1978:85) use the term 'dramatic metaphor' to describe Ichheiser's (1949) work, which quite clearly is referring to behaviour as like acting rather than being acting; writers such as Morgan (1986:12) use the term 'organisational metaphors' to suggest an image which is used to articulate our understanding about organisations. It would seem to this writer that in the relevant research the word 'metaphor' is being used to indicate a device which assists in understanding behaviour, and is inclusive of both metaphor and simile as formally defined.
Ichheiser’s (1949) proposition is that ‘people’s behaviour is better understood if it is thought of as acting’. This is a contrast between metaphor and simile:

The metaphor : ‘people are acting’
The simile : ‘people’s behaviour is better understood if it is thought of as acting’

Goffman (1959) draws from the writings of Mead (1934), Burke (1945) and Ichheiser (1949). He adopts a position that behaviour is like acting rather than is acting. He acknowledges (1959:78) that all the world is not a stage, but that the crucial differences between life and the stage are not easy to specify. Goffman (1959:78) refers to the term ‘script’ and describes instances in ‘Psychodrama’ (Moreno 1934) wherein clients in therapy act out part of a play about themselves without the use of a written script.

‘Their own past is available to them in a form which allows them to stage a recapitulation of it ....

....For in learning to perform our parts in real life we guide our own productions by not too consciously maintaining an incipient familiarity with the routine of those to whom we will address ourselves. And when we come to be able properly to manage a real routine we are able to do this in part because of ‘anticipatory socialisation’, having already been schooled in the reality that is just becoming real for us’.

Goffman (1959:78-79)

Goffman’s (1959) use of the term ‘script’ suggests that a ‘script’ is a socialised social routine.

Mangham (1979) draws from the writings of Schank and Abelson (1977) and like Goffman (1959) adopts a position that behaviour is like acting rather than is acting. His
choice of a theatrical metaphor is not for reasons of people being actors, but for reasons of theatre being able to offer ...

'...a general framework for understanding conduct in organisations which can grasp both individual and group conduct, which can locate the situational constraints on joint actions and can achieve this without resort to ad hoc additions from other metaphoric frameworks. Further, this approach allows us to inquire into the symbolic construction of meaning with research skills which theatre goers bring to their appreciation of the drama ...This model fosters the kind of approach to organisations, that promises to equip people working in organisations, and people studying them, with a way of acting which frees them from the absurd belief that our world is made by forces over which we humans exercise no control'.

Mangham and Overington (1987:25-6)

Mangham (1979), like Goffman (1959), makes reference to a term 'script' which he defines as ...

'...relatively predetermined and stereotyped sequences of action which are called into play by particular and well recognised cues and circumstances, of which we acquire knowledge through the process of socialisation'

Mangham (1979:38)

and later (Mangham 1988:28) 'well established patterns of behaviour'. His definition is based on Schank and Abelson (1977) who suggest ...

'a script is a structure that describes appropriate sequences of events in a particular context. A script is made up of slots and requirements about what can fill these slots. The structure is an interconnected whole, and what is in one slot affects what can be in another. Scripts handle stylised everyday situations. They are not subject to much change, nor do they provide the apparatus for handling totally novel situations. Thus, a script is a predetermined stereotyped sequence of actions that defines a well-known situation'.

Schank and Abelson (1977:41)
Both Mangham (1979, 1988) and Schank and Abelson (1977) suggest definitions of ‘script’ which parallel Goffman’s (1959) definition of a ‘script’ being a socialised social routine.

In the Dramatistic Approach, the ‘script’ is not presented as real, it is presented as notional. It is an allusion to apparent repetitive behaviour, which because of its apparent repetitiveness, makes it seem like a ‘script’. In using the word ‘script’ it is not being suggested that the same words are used in a repetitive fashion, but that the routine is repetitive.

The term ‘script’ is not exclusive to the Dramatistic Approach. Berne (1964, 1972), also employs the term in a theory of personality. Although both sets of theorists draw on a similar pedigree, there is no evidence of cross referencing between Goffman (1971) and Mangham (1979, 1988) and Berne (1964, 1972).

Berne’s (1964, 1972) notion of ‘script’ underpins the Transactional Analysis Approach in interpersonal psychology. He draws on Mead’s (1935) study of games in social living, and from this concept of games he builds a notion of ‘script’ wherein he defines ‘script’ as a ‘life plan’ which determines much of behaviour.

‘Each person decides in early childhood how he will live and how he will die, and that plan which he carries in his head wherever he goes, is called his ‘script’. His trivial behaviour may be decided by reason but his important decisions are already made; what kind of person he will marry, how many children he will have, what kind of bed he will die in, and who will be there when he does. It may not be what he wants but what he wants to be.’

Berne (1972:31)
Berne distinguishes between ‘trivial behaviour’ and ‘important decisions’, and as such is suggesting that ‘script’ is much more than socialised social routines. For these routines Berne (1964, 1972) uses the terms ‘procedure’, or ‘ritual’.

Bower and Bower (1976) and Nelson-Jones (1986), both rely on Berne’s (1964, 1972) notion of ‘script’, yet they give examples of ‘script’ which are more in keeping with notions of ‘script’ as proposed by the writers in the Dramastic Approach.

Nelson-Jones (1986:27) has applied the term ‘script’ to stereotypic behaviour associated with gender and with responses in conflict situations; Bower and Bower (1976:88) have used ‘script’ to explore socialised non assertiveness.

For the purposes of this inquiry Bower and Bower (1976) and Nelson-Jones (1986) are treated as theorists of the Dramatistic Approach.

The major difference between Berne’s (1964, 1972) notion of ‘script’ and that of the Dramatistic Approach theorists, is that Berne (1972) maintains that a ‘script’ is conscious, while Goffman (1959), Mangham (1979, 1988 and with Overington 1987), Bower and Bower (1976) and Nelson-Jones (1986) maintain that a ‘script’ is essentially unconscious and the consciousness raising about ‘script’ is where one would benefit from this approach. Berne (1972) makes a comparison to Adler’s (1963) writing, and suggests ....

‘The only exceptions which a script analyst would take to these (Adler’s) statements are

1. that the life plan is usually not unconscious
2. that the person is by no means solely responsible for it; and
3. that the goal and the manner of reaching it (the actual transactions word or word) can be predicted much more precisely than even Adler claimed.'

Berne (1972:59)

Elsewhere, Berne (1972) appears to contradict this assertion in discussing the need for the therapist to make the client conscious or 'aware of their script', as well as the therapist being aware of their own 'script'.

'The sooner the therapist recognises the role he is expected to play, and can foresee the script drama which the patient in his own good time, will try to bring to a climax, the sooner he can do something about it, and the more effective he will be in helping the patient out of his 'script' world and into the real one.

Berne (1972:349)

There is a contradiction within Berne's (1972) argument wherein he is suggesting both consciousness and unconsciousness of the 'script'.

Schank and Abelson (1977) have also suggested consciousness-raising about unworkable 'scripts', prior to rewriting them. Similarly Adler et al (1983), and Devito (1986) have advocated that consciousness raising about 'script' encourages one to contemplate the ways in which they relate with other people in specific situations. This position is in keeping with other behaviour theorists who suggest that many parts of our behaviour are driven from the unconscious [Luft in Cathcart and Samovar (1970), Peck (1990), Ichheiser (1949)].

In this inquiry, the notion of 'script' is conceptualised in the following terms:

1. a 'script' is a routine for social interpersonal behaviour
2. the 'script' is acquired through socialisation
3. the 'script' is often unconscious
Given that the 'script' is unconscious, a main thrust of the Dramatistic Approach is consciousness raising, yet little is written about this process.

Schank and Abelson (1977) make the distinction between a workable and an unworkable 'script'. Much of the writing about 'script' refers to examples which are dysfunctional or unworkable, yet the bulk of 'scripts' which people use, are functional. A functional 'script' rarely poses a problem for people.

For example: One rarely considers their ability to introduce themselves to others.

It is a taken for granted skill. In its absence, in shyness, the 'script' dysfunctionality becomes conscious. A shy person often reflects that they are not good at meeting people and in being conscious of the 'script'.

The bulk of writing about dysfunctional 'scripts' leads this writer to conclude that consciousness raising is mainly aimed at raising awareness of dysfunctional 'scripts' and establishing a platform to encourage changing the dysfunctional 'script'. Both Egan (1976:14) and Bower and Bower (1976:87) have suggested that an effective 'script' can be 'rewritten'. The word 'script' itself is one which alludes to a notion of rewriting, if we think about a dramatic script. The potential for rewriting can often underestimate the emotional energy involved in such a change.

The process of consciousness raising in the Dramatistic Approach must work in a way to recognise this emotional energy and that requires it to be an empowering process.

'Empowering' is a term which means 'to give power or lawful right to' [Macquarie Dictionary (1988:335)] yet in its context in individual psychology it takes on more of a meaning of the individual claiming power, or reclaiming power.
Heron (1989), in discussing the process of empowerment, suggests that the facilitator empowers the participants. It would appear to this writer, that the paradigm underpinning this assertion is that the facilitator is powerful and the participants powerless. An alternative premise is evident in Peck (1990) which suggests that the individual already has power, power from birth, which has over the years been eroded. Empowerment in this sense is a reclaiming of power. This premise also reflects what Egan (1976) is suggesting when he writes:

‘However, the time comes when each of us realises that he or she is responsible for his or her own behaviour.’

Egan (1976:14)

and what Bolton (1979) is referring to when he writes that Assertiveness is:

‘a way of being in the world which confirms one’s own individual worth and dignity.’

Bolton (1979:125)

and later alludes to empowerment by suggesting that...

‘assertion helps people develop the power of choice over their actions.’

Bolton (1979:137)

For many, this move to making choices for and about themself, involves a change in the belief system they hold about themself.

For example: the belief I am what I am - can become: I can change what I am.

Individuals in an organisation, can also acquire a new way of thinking about that organisation.

For example: Individuals in an organisation may believe that they are only responsible for their own actions - this can change to: I am responsible to others in the organisation.
This new way of thinking about self or the organisation has been labelled by Ferguson (1980:26) as a 'Paradigm Shift'. Ferguson is making reference to Kuhn (1962), who formulated the term Paradigm, as a term meaning a belief system held by a number of people. The process of 'rewriting' a 'script' involves a shift in belief systems.

Bower and Bower (1976:89) call 'script' rewriting, 'success rehearsal', suggesting that the functional 'script' is rehearsed a number of times until it becomes a natural responses in the situation. This would suggest that the process of consciousness raising also needs opportunities for rehearsal of the new 'script'.

While little is written about the process of consciousness raising, there are examples of consciousness raising for 'scripts' which provide an insight into the appropriate process. These examples rely on introducing the notion of 'script' into discussions about interpersonal problems. [Bower and Bower (1976), Adler et al (1983), Devito (1986) and Nelson-Jones (1986), Mangham (1979, 1988 and with Overington 1987)]

For example: In becoming aware of Active Listening, an individual is invited to listen to their own listening words and evaluate them against a set of categories which are non-active listening. Adler et al (1983:160)

In becoming aware of one's Non Assertiveness, an individual is invited to contemplate their responses to given scenarios. This will help to make them conscious of their more frequent 'scripts'.

Devito (1986:399)

This method has several problems associated with it. A person who is experiencing a problem in interpersonal communication may have difficulty in discussing the problem due to an absence of words to describe situations which are innocuous. This can be exacerbated if in addition there is a fear of making comment about certain topics. Egan
(1976:75) calls this 'immediacy' and relates it to the emotional closeness parties have to the topic or other people associated with the topic. The greater the immediacy the greater the inhibition in talking about a topic.

In an organisational setting the problem of immediacy is magnified because of hierarchical power which influences parties in the relationship, and discussion can be stifled because of the fear of reprisals from commenting about organisational relationships. I call this problem 'a problem of articulation'. Simply having the word 'script' is a starting point for solving problems of articulation. Naming the notion enables people to talk about an other wise innocuous aspect of interpersonal communication. Griffin (1987) has demonstrated, that discussion about any issue is made easier, once names are given to aspects of the issue. Calling an aspect of interpersonal communication, a 'script', gives people a basis by which to discuss that topic.

In the organisational setting, where the problems of articulation are magnified, additional processes need to be introduced in order to encourage people to talk about the organisation communication problems. It would appear to this writer, that no or few such processes have been documented. Bordow and More (1991:72-87) introduce popular ways of investigating organisational communication. In this they include several methods which link to paradigm approaches [Bordow and More (1991:48-71)]. Despite having established the Dramatistic Approach in the Interpretive research paradigm [Bordow and More (1991:60)] there is an absence of techniques for the approach in their section on popular ways of investigating organisational communication [Bordow and More (1991:72-87)].
Throughout 'Organisations as Theatre', there is reference to the notion of 'script', however no suggestion as to how one would work in this approach, other than using the Dramatistic language of 'script' as a notion which underpins thinking in the organisation.

This inquiry introduces the process of 'Human Sculpture' as a process which enables discussion about the notion of 'script' in the organisational setting. This inquiry proposes that 'Human Sculpture' is a technique within the Dramatistic Approach. Participants in a 'Human Sculpture' are encouraged to talk about the sculpture they have formed, and thus metaphorically to talk about themselves and their relationship with others in the organisation.

The primary inquirer will work in an organisational setting, in the capacity of action-research leader. The methodology is detailed in the following chapter.

'Human Sculpture' uses a metaphor of sculpture to facilitate discussion about the notion of 'script'. Metaphor has advantages related to the immediacy risk of the situation. In using metaphor to describe a situation, one does not talk directly to the set of beliefs associated with that issue, but indirectly. There is a reduction of immediacy to the subject. By using metaphors participants are talking about something inanimate rather than other people in the group. One of the drawbacks of using a metaphor to discuss organisational situations, as Morgan (1986) suggests, is that metaphors produce a 'one-sided insight, by highlighting certain interpretations, and forcing others into the background' [Morgan (1986:83)]. Despite this one-sidedness, Morgan suggests that the study of these varying images, and the contemplation of alternative images can create new ways of understanding about organisations and management. Morgan (1989) referring to Edwards 1979) has suggested that 'right-brained' methods in an organisational setting, provide a different perspective and can help people break out of their usual stereotypes and beliefs. These, he suggests, often shape the way people

---

¹ Mangham and Overington (1987) Organisations as Theatre: A social psychology of dramatic appearances
think about their organisation, and hence how they behave in it. The term 'Right-Brain' activities, is an allusion to research on the functioning of the human brain by Roger Sperry (1973) which explored the implications of the functioning of the creative right and analytic left hemispheres of the brain. These approaches have been described by Rickards (1988) as using methods which:

'...involve distracting the dominant 'left-brain' with its intense focus inside a set of assumptions so that more 'right-brain' contributions can be made ...the left brain can be distracted by various diversionary tactics, and it does not matter which specific mechanism is used ... the exact type of exercise is not so important as the principle of distracting the over active left brain which is reinforcing the assumptions and mind sets involved in the state of mental stuckness.'

Rickards (1988:17)

In referring to 'right-brain' consultancy approaches as 'intuitive approaches', Lippitt and Lippitt (1986:120) have equated them in quality to the more traditional rational or structured approaches.
3. CHAPTER TWO

3.1 INQUIRY METHODOLOGY

The Dramatistic Approach has been contextualised within the Interpretive research paradigm [Bordow and More (1991:60)]. Kuhn (1962:10), in his explanation of scientific discoveries, formulated the term ‘paradigm’, to describe the framework of beliefs to which a group of people subscribe, and on which that group of people base their construction of reality. His work suggested that through critical reflection of their paradigm, scientists often prompted new ‘scientific discoveries’ and sometimes ‘scientific revolutions’.

Ferguson (1980), quoting Kuhn (1962), defined paradigm as:

‘a framework of thought (from the Greek paradigm, ‘pattern’). A paradigm is a scheme for understanding and explaining certain aspects of reality.’ Ferguson (1980:26)

and suggested that the term not only applied to Science, for which it was coined, but through Kuhn’s writing, had been applied to many disciplines.

In scientific research, the traditional paradigm has been described as being distinguishable by the following assumptions, drawn from the premises of John Stuart Mill, summarised by Hamilton (1976).

1. That science’s aim is the discovery of general laws that serve for explanation and prediction.
2. That concepts can be defined by direct reference to empirical categories ‘objects in the concrete’.
3. That there is uniformity of nature in time and space.
4. That the laws of nature can be inductively derived from data.
5. That large samples suppress idiosyncrasies and reveal ‘general causes’.

Guba (in Lincoln 1985:81)
Lincoln (1985) has called this paradigm the 'positivist paradigm' and advocates that it is distinguishable by ontological and epistemological beliefs as follows ... 

Ontology : Realist

'There is a single, tangible reality 'out there' fragmentable into independent variables and processes, any of which can be studied independently of the others; inquiry can converge on that reality until, finally it can be predicted and controlled.'

Epistemology : Dualist/Objectivist

'The inquirer is able to maintain a discrete distance from the object of the inquiry, either disturbing it nor being disturbed by it.'

Lincoln (1985:135)

Burrell and Morgan (1979 in Bordow and More 1991:46) use the label 'functionalist paradigm' for the same set of beliefs. Bordow and More (1991:48) use the label 'empirical paradigm'. In this inquiry the term 'positivist' can be read to equate with 'functionalist' or 'empirical'.

The traditional approach to scientific research, has several disabling characteristics because of its reliance on the positivist paradigm.

1. Researchers make generalisations resulting from the research, in such an absolute way that there is no room for grey areas.
2. Human behaviour is reduced to inanimate behaviour, and this is demeaning of it.
3. The people being researched cannot give their construction of meaning about the research, and this type of research is disempowering.
4. Researchers suggesting there is an ultimate truth which derives from their research, are acting unethically.

Guba and Lincoln (1990:136)
A scientific research in the organisational setting is flawed through the third of these disabling characteristics, because the lack of empowerment of the participants reduces the likelihood that the research outcomes will be accepted by them.

The positivist paradigm, applied to scientific research in an organisational setting, has invited a model of management consultancy wherein the consultant claims to be the ‘expert’ who analyses the organisation and recommends changes.

Not all consultancy models operated from this paradigm.

Schein (1969) described a type of consultancy which moved away from the ‘expert’ model to one which was more collaborative. He underpinned his model with an acknowledgment of the ability of the people within an organisation to be knowledgeable about the process of their own organisation. Schein’s (1969) “Process” consultancy advocated

‘a set of activities on the part of the consultant which help the client perceive, understand and act upon process events which occur in the client’s environment.’

Schien (1969:9)

He added that the consultant

‘seeks to give the client ‘insight’ into what is going on around him, within him and between him and other people’.

Schien (1969:9)

Similarly Kurt Lewin’s 1945 model of action research (Corsini 1984) had as one its core notions that

‘when the client collaborates in collecting data, those data will have greater credibility, the client will be more willing to work on understanding them, and the client will be a more active participant in deriving the implications for action or change’.

Lippitt and Lippitt (1986:117)
This model involved procedures of data collection from group participants and returning this data by way of influencing the ongoing action process of the group. Several contemporary examples of management consultancy, have the hallmarks of action research.

Kanter (1983:182-7) links the notion of empowerment to the ability to be involved in the problem solving and decision making of the company. Peters and Austin (1985) suggest similar ideas arising from their inquiry into employees being invited in different ways toward ownership in the output of the organisation. They summarised these examples by suggesting that they all reflected the employee

'being part of a charged-up group with a pragmatic goal, sufficient resources and a fair time frame in which to achieve it, but no handed-down-from-on-high approach to getting there. The chance to set yourself apart as a winner'.

Peters and Austin (1985:229)

Kreigler etal (1988) talked about similar experiences in Australian society and particularly focussed on participant decision making.

'Participant decision making practices are likely to ensure that decisions reached pay heed to all the capabilities of, and risks faced by the organisation, and also ensure that a wide range of views are canvassed, and thus increases the likelihood that decisions will be in line with the values and interests of the majority of organisations members ... participative decision-making will also increase members understanding of, and member commitment to, the decision taken'.

Kreigler etal (1988:28)

All of these people have suggested that when there is an expectation that employees can tackle their organisation's problems, and a willingness to work with the solutions
proposed by such a process, then there is a greater commitment to the decision taken. This is described as ‘ownership’ to the outcomes of the inquiry. [Lippitt and Lippitt (1986)]

Kemmis and McTaggart (1988:5) and Grundy (1982:24) use the term ‘Action Research’ in an educational context, defining it as the processes of participants being involved in the collection and analysis of data about themselves. Grundy (1982:24) has extended this application with her definition of three forms of action research.

1. Technical Action research
2. Practical Action research
3. Emancipatory Action research

Emancipatory action research typifies the human inquiry in which the participants are most empowered.

Guba and Lincoln (1990:151) use the term ‘action research’ to describe a scientific research based on the naturalistic paradigm. The naturalistic paradigm is an alternate set of beliefs to the ‘positivist’ or ‘functionalist’ paradigm. These beliefs can be summarised as:

**Ontology : Subjectivist**

‘There are multiple constructed realities that can be studied only holistically; inquiry into these multiple realities will inevitably diverge (each inquiry raising more questions than its answers), so that prediction and control are unlikely outcomes, although some level of understanding can be achieved.

**Epistemology : Subjective/Collaborative**
‘The inquirer and the ‘object’ of inquiry interact to influence one another; especially is this mutual interaction present when the ‘object’ of inquiry is another human being.’

Lincoln (1985:85)

Burrell and Morgan (1979 in Bordow and More 1991:46) use the label ‘interpretive’ paradigm to describe the same set of beliefs. Guba and Lincoln (1990:151) call this research approach ‘human inquiry’.


Reason (1988) in referring to Heron (1971, 1981) proposes a co-operative inquiry model which operates through four steps:

1. A coming together of co-researchers wherein there is agreement as to what it is they are researching and how they propose to investigate
2. Researching the topic as proposed.
3. Living the topic and opening themselves up to the ramifications of this research.
4. Reflecting on their experience, by which they revise and develop aspects of the research question.

Reason (1988:4)

Reason (1988) suggests that this type of inquiry is
‘a way of doing research in which all those involved contribute both to the creative thinking that goes into the enterprise - deciding what is to be looked at, the methods of inquiry, and making sense of what is found out - and also contribute to the action which is the subject of the research. Thus in its fullest form the
distinction between researcher and subject disappears, and all who participate are both co-researchers and co-subjects'.

Reason (1988:1)

Reason (1988) supports his model using Rowan’s (1981) pictorial demonstration of the cycle of the inquiry (Figure 1).

Figure 1

ROWAN’S CYCLE OF INQUIRY
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Reason (1988:6)

Guba and Lincoln (1990:151) propose a similar model which they call a constructivist approach to the naturalistic paradigm. They suggest that action research requires that all participants in the inquiry be involved in the construction of mutual meaning about the inquiry data.

This, they suggest, bypasses the problem of academic ‘arrogance’ (Guba and Lincoln 1990:152) which they describe as the tendency for many researchers to research from a position that only they (and not the research participants) can interpret data.

In contrast to Reason’s (1988) model, they are suggesting collaboration only at the step of interpreting the data.
Kemmis & McTaggart (1988) propose an inquiry model suggesting that:

'Action Research develops through the self-reflective spiral: a spiral of planning, acting (implementing the plan), observing (systematically), reflecting and then replanning further implementing, observing and reflecting'.

Figure 2:

KEMMIS & McTAGGART'S INQUIRY MODEL

Kemmis & McTaggart (1988: 11)

This model (Figure 2) reinforces the importance of the cycle, and does not place as much emphasis on the collaboration. Grundy (1982: 23), however, working from a similar definition of 'action research' to Kemmis and McTaggart, is more reinforcing of the need for all participants to be part of the interpretation. This is particularly the case for Emancipatory Action Research.
Bawden (1989:17), working with a series of cycles between the “Real World” and the “Conceptual World”, adds another dimension to the reflective cycle process, by incorporating two sets of cycles:

The participant cycle and the facilitator cycle.

The facilitator’s cycle suggests that the facilitator develops through different cycles related to the inquiry process (Figure 3).

**Figure 3:**

**BAWDEN’S DUAL CYCLE INQUIRY MODEL**

The understanding of the practice by the facilitator/inquirer is improved

The understanding of the situation in which the practice is practised is improved

The situation in which the practice is practised is improved

The practice of the facilitator/inquirer improves

Bawden (1989:17)

This cycle works in parallel to the participant or co-researcher cycle (Figure 4). The co-researchers are entrenched in the practice about which there is an inquiry. In an organisational inquiry, they are employees of the organisation.
These models are characterised by their cyclic nature and in this regard are similar to the Experiential Learning Cycle (Kolb 1984). His model (Figure 5) is structured with a cycle of action, reflection and learning.

Each of these models of action research have influenced the conceptual framework of this human inquiry. Before elaborating on how they have influenced the framework, I want to put forward a case for writing about the inquiry in the first person.
Reason (1988:6), emphasises the importance of communication as part of the inquiry cycle. He cites Rowan (1981) in defining Communication as:

'I must start telling people what it means, and how I have understood what I have been through: what we have actually accomplished or achieved ...
I, or others may write papers, give lectures, go to conferences, go on the radio, on television, in the popular press or whatever, whether individually or collectively.'

Rowan (1981:98)

Later, Reason (1988:38) suggests a range of approaches to communication, which includes both a range of writers and one person writing with the endorsement of the others. In the case of thesis writing, he suggests a 'primary researcher' writing their view of the project in consultation with other members of the project.

Action research invites inquiry into the modes of communication for research, and in particular thesis writing. Thesis writing has traditionally been based on the 'positivist'
paradigm. By writing in the third person it was implied that the inquirer was an observer to the inquiry process, rather than a participant in it.

Writing in the third person is viewed by this inquirer as tantamount to endorsing the basic assumptions which the Post Positivist Inquiry Paradigm is seeking to challenge. Hence, this writer would argue that it is an incongruous device for post positivist inquiry. The use of the first person is more appropriate.

There are two main arguments for preferring the writing device of the first person over that of the third person, for post positivist inquiry.

The first argument supporting writing in the first person is that this emphasises the self-reflective nature of post positivist inquiry. Action Research has been described by Kemmis & McTaggart (1988:11), as ‘developing through a self-reflective spiral’. It is a personal process, and much of the emergent theory arises from the changes in the understanding the inquirer has about the subject. The inquirer is as much part of the subject, as are the other participants. No claim is made that the inquirer is separate from the object of the inquiry, hence there is no need to create a pseudo separateness using the third person.

The second argument supporting writing in the first person is that this emphasises the personal nature of post positivist inquiry. Reason and Marshall (1987) in speaking about the traditional inquiry paradigm, suggest an important outcome of this model was its contribution to the field of knowledge. They describe this as ‘writing for them’. The third person emphasises this writing for ‘them’ and suggests ownership of the research findings by the general population. Reason and Marshall (1987) go on to say, that in addition to writing for ‘them’, the researcher in post positivist research is also writing for ‘us’, the co-researchers to the study, and for self: ‘me’.
‘The motivation to do research is personal and often expresses needs for personal development, change and learning’.


The notion of ‘writing for me’ is reinforced in the suggestion that Action Research (Kemmis & McTaggart 1988) also invites the keeping of a personal journal in which one’s progress and reflections are recorded.

A journal is usually written in the first person.

The device of writing in the first person in this thesis emphasises those parts of the research that reflect personal development, personal change and personal learning.

There are precedents for the use of first person in writing up research (Heron and Reason (1985), Reason (1988), and Griffin and Boud (1988:209).

The case being put forward then, is not for the exclusive writing in the first person. What is being advocated is the use of the first person personal pronoun as a variation to the devices of the traditional research paradigm, to indicate personal truths, personal journal, personal reflections and non generalisable issues.

There are nine cycles to the inquiry:

Cycle 1 : The time I first experienced ‘Human Sculpture’.
Cycle 2 : Using ‘Human Sculpture’ with my first group of post-graduate students.
Cycle 3 : Using ‘Human Sculpture’ with subsequent groups of post-graduate students.
Cycle 4 : Using ‘Human Sculpture’ in an organisational setting.
Cycle 5 : Subsequent usage of ‘Human Sculpture’ in organisational settings.
Cycle 6: Presenting ‘Human Sculpture’ to a peer group of post-graduate students at Bath University, England.

Cycle 7: Working with the staff of the Hunter Caravan Program, Newcastle, Australia, using and evaluating ‘Human Sculpture’.

Cycle 8: Working with the staff of the Warrawong Children’s Centre, Wollongong, Australia, using and evaluating ‘Human Sculpture’.

Cycle 9: Working with the staff of Barrack Heights Children’s Centre, Wollongong, Australia, using and evaluating ‘Human Sculpture’.

In Cycle 1, the conceptual framework is based on the Kolb (1984) experiential learning cycle, with the addition that each experience was placed in a context.

I saw a need for placing each action in context because the co-researchers with whom I was working, had expectations about the work, and these expectations influence the way they understand the comments made. Similarly, I was influenced by my current reading about ‘script’ or ‘human inquiry’.

In cycle two, the conceptual framework continued to be influenced by Kolb (1984). At this stage of the inquiry I was not working within a formal model of inquiry. I was adhering to a model of experiential learning. Nevertheless, I had begun asking questions about ‘Human Sculpture’ and communicating my growing understanding about ‘Human Sculpture’. In this regard, in hindsight, it would appear I was inquiring with a model more attuned to Rowan (1981), particularly with regard to my making sense of the project by encountering it and communicating about it.
By cycle 3 my communication about ‘Human Sculpture’ had become ordered into three categories of learning.

a) Learning about ‘Script’.

b) Learning about ‘Human Sculpture’

c) Learning about facilitation of ‘Human Sculpture’

As I published about ‘Human Sculpture’, in writing and in the spoken word, I found enormous value in the words I used to describe ‘Human Sculpture’. In particular, when speaking about ‘Human Sculpture’, the words were newly thought out ideas. In communicating them, and opening them to critical reflection, I formulated my own learning. I found that by answering questions about ‘Human Sculpture’ and listening to my answers, I could see an ever changing thesis about the work.

In cycle 4 and 5, the context of my inquiry had changed to the organisational setting. My process of reflection had also begun to fall into two categories:
Reflection which took place without prompting and was part of everyday processing of information. This was in essence the out loud thinking of participants to the workshop and my own journal writing following workshops.

Guided Reflection, was reflection influenced by an agenda. The agenda was either the group agenda or my personal agenda.

My personal agenda was the agenda from the emerging inquiry and was influenced by the literature I was reading, and the questions which were being unanswered by the inquiry.

Each group with which I was working had an agenda that was often linked to the organisational setting.

As I wrote about inquiry I had a desire to convey my naivete as an inquirer, so I adopted a writing device of dual reflection which allowed me to share with you my experiential learning, which often preceded my discovering the aspect documented in literature. With dual reflection I recorded my reflection at the time of the action as best as I could remember, then I recorded a later reflection, written at the time of writing my inquiry which reflected on the earlier action in hindsight.

I have written this way so that you may gain insight into my passion of discovery and formulation of thesis through my experiential learning.

In cycle 5, an additional type of reflection emerged as I began to question the process of my inquiry.

Critical reflection is reflection on presuppositions which we hold about ourselves and the world. It helps us to develop knowledge that leads to enlightenment and emancipation from those influences, external and internal, which dominate and oppress us. It is our knowledge of the false assumptions in our personal foundation of experience which limit out freedom and which need to be worked with creatively to achieve a new way of experiencing. The process that is
involved in critical reflection begins with reflection which leads to knowledge of tensions and constraints in our experience.’

Boud and Walker (1993:10)

In particular I was influenced by Guba and Lincoln (1982) who propose that four types of choices are being made within an inquiry, and that these choices reflect the values embedded in that inquiry.

Choice of Issue
Choice of Research Method
Choice of Substantive Theory
Choice of Context

The inquiry is never value free.
Prompted by this proposition I also reflected upon the types of choices I was making as inquirer/facilitator. In this reflection I was guided by Heron’s (1989) proposition of levels of choice making, which employs the descriptors

4. How will the decision about programming be made?
3. How will activities/program be decided?
2. What activities will be undertaken in the program?
1. How is an activity to be done?

to explore the increasing level of choice making which learners have in a learning group. I endeavoured to transfer responsibility for many of the choices in ‘Human Sculpture’ from the facilitator to the participants, by becoming less prescriptive about the ‘Human Sculpture’ process.

In cycle 6, my model of inquiry was more representative of Bawden’s (1989) model.
Figure 7:

HILL'S MODEL FOR CYCLE SIX OF THE INQUIRY

REFLECTION

FACILITATOR

PARTICIPANT
during and after
the sculpture

(How meaning is given
to the sculpture)

Long Term

Long Term

Guided by emergent questions
and new questions

PLANNING

and this model continued into cycle 7, 8 and 9 with a repetition of the planning, both for
Human Sculpture and Human Inquiry. I took a dual role of Human Sculpture facilitator
and Human Inquiry Primary Inquirer.

I have written each cycle of the inquiry in a way which expresses my changing
understanding as the inquirer. This is one of the hallmarks of action research.
For the reader, there may be times when you say to yourself, 'but I have read this phrase elsewhere in this document'. That sense is intentional, and I have written in this way in an attempt to have you experience the unfolding nature of this human inquiry.

Throughout the inquiry I have included other's articulation about their understanding of 'Human Sculpture', both written and spoken, because this contributed to my own understanding about 'Human Sculpture', as did my discussion of 'Human Sculpture' contribute to their understanding.

In this sense we are collaborators to the inquiry; however I am the writer and I am writing about my journey.
4 CHAPTER THREE

4.1 AN INQUIRER'S JOURNEY

4.1.1 Introduction

A personal journey, unlike journeys across the terrain, does not have a clearly defined starting point. Some may argue that birth and death set the parameters for the beginning and end of a personal journey; however, these parameters are also subject to debate associated with the issues of 'life's beginning' and 'life after death'.

I will not buy into either philosophical debate, and without basis of logic, set two beginnings for my personal journey.

My inquiry began when I was introduced to an activity, which I later called 'Human Sculpture'. The inquiry proceeded informally as I incorporated 'Human Sculpture' into my work as a group therapist, and later used 'Human Sculpture' as the hallmark of my management consultancy.

In the course of my working with 'Human Sculpture' I also published. These publications provide a valuable resource representing my history of reflection on 'Human Sculpture'. I have quoted these documents without alteration, even though at times the writing is poorly expressed. They are an accurate, albeit crude, statement of my thinking at the time.

The document you are reading represents a second journey which began in December 1992 when I began a formal inquiry into 'Human Sculpture'. I began this second journey by reflecting on my earlier experiences with 'Human Sculpture', and my attempts to make sense of those events. My reflection was influenced by new theory to which I had been introduced in the intervening years. The two journeys became one, as I consulted using the 'Human Sculpture', and with my co-participants to the sculpture, began constructing meaning about it.
I continued to revisit 'Human Sculpture' in subsequent cycles of learning. In each cycle my understanding was contextualised by a framework which had emerged from the previous cycle.

4.2 CYCLE 1

4.2.1 Context

I graduated in Psychology from Melbourne University in 1980. In my final undergraduate year I studied concurrently with the Victorian Department of Mental Health, training to be a telephone crisis counsellor and learnt to 'active listen' (Adler et al 1983:157) as a skill used by counsellors to enable clients to resolve problems they were experiencing.

In 1982, studying a post-graduate course with the Faculty of Agriculture at Hawkesbury Agricultural College, I was introduced to the theory of experiential learning, and the model ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To act</th>
<th>To do rather than think about doing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To reflect</td>
<td>creating meaning for the experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To learn</td>
<td>concretise what the experience meant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

after Kolb (1984)

Towards the end of my post-graduate diploma study, I was working with several fellow students at a weekend workshop we had organised. One of the activities suggested for that weekend was an activity in which we created sculptures with our bodies.

I can not remember who suggested the activity or how they had come to know about it.
4.2.2 Action (1982)

The exercise began with one person making a statue. They stood still as if they were a statue in a garden. A second person joined the sculpture by making another statue. The two juxtaposed figures created a new sculpture. The third person similarly added another statue; and so on with the fourth, fifth and sixth people joining the agglomeration, until all the people in the team had joined the sculpture.

When this final sculpture had been formed, the members of the sculpture remained stationary while the remaining participants viewed the sculpture as ‘audience’.

When all the ‘audience’ had viewed the sculpture, then the people in the sculpture relaxed, and the whole group discussed the different relationships which had formed.

Individuals talked about what they had wanted to convey through the statues they formed. The audience commented on what the statues had looked like. There were contrasts made between different statues and comments made, concerning the way in which the overall sculpture changed as each new statue was added.

We made two sculptures. One of the females and one of the males. When we discussed each sculpture individually, there was further discussion contrasting the ‘male’ and ‘female’ sculptures, which acknowledged broader issues of power, support, touching and togetherness.

4.2.3 Reflection (1982)

I was part of the male sculpture. I was not the first into the sculpture, however I can not remember where in the sequence of participants I fell. My statue was low to the ground; perhaps even prostrate on the ground.
While we were making the sculpture I made a choice about my positioning in the sculpture. I had wanted to be low to the ground and to not fall into a male stereotype of being dominant. During the discussion about the sculptures I realised that my juxtaposition to other people in the sculpture paralleled my relationships with them. I did not consciously choose this juxtaposition, and when we discussed the sculpture I became conscious of these choices which I had made. Some of this consciousness raising was prompted by my being challenged by other people in the group who knew me.

4.2.4 Reflection (13.12.1992)

I did not reflect very deeply about this activity. At that time ‘Human Sculpture’ was not the subject of an inquiry for me. It was a drama activity which I added to a repertoire of drama activities for use within workshops I was then running.

In retrospect, the process which we followed appears very much like the collaborative process proposed in Reason (1988:4 & 5). We came together and decided that one of the ways we could understand our group function was through ‘Human Sculpture’. We engaged in the ‘Human Sculpture’ then made observations about the activity.

The communication which arose for me, was more about using the activity rather than writing about it.

4.3 CYCLE 2

4.3.1 Context

Soon after graduating from Hawkesbury, I was invited to offer a theme on Drama Therapy, to the group of students enrolled in the course from which I had just graduated. This course was called the Graduate Diploma of Social Communication.
The theme was called 'Spontaneous Drama' and was run in six three hour sessions over six weeks.

By the time I included the 'Human Sculpture' exercise in the course I had worked with the students two or three times. In these sessions it became evident to me that issues were emerging for different students.

For example: One student spoke a lot about her isolation from other people. Many of the activities we did involved her being isolated.

**4.3.2 Action (1984)**

We completed two 'Human Sculptures' in a way similar to the way I had first experienced it, except that we did not do a male and female sculpture, because all the students were female.

After we had completed both sculptures I invited the students to reflect on the sculptures and some of the themes which these sculptures appeared to address. I suggested to the participants that they think about their own position in the 'Human Sculpture' and ask themselves whether this position was indicative of a 'script' or behaviour pattern. When they contemplated this proposition some of them agreed. Others disagreed.

**4.3.3 Reflection (1984)**

As I watched different participants move I interpreted their positioning in the Human Sculptures as a projection of the issues they were dealing with:
eg: One person who commented a lot on rejection had placed themself separate from the other members in the sculpture. Were they rejected or were they isolating themself?

Because this issue had been repeated throughout several activities we had done, I started to think about the issue as an unconscious behaviour ‘script’.

What I believed was that the Human Sculpture tapped some deep ways an individual had about responding to situations, and under the guise of a ‘fun’ drama exercise, an individual, dropped their usual defence mechanisms, and revealed unconscious responses they had been using.

4.3.4 Reflection (13.12.1992)

In hindsight, there is evidence in this cycle of the emergence of a hypothesis about ‘human sculpture’ and ‘script’. I was suggesting that people had unconscious behaviours and that the ‘Human Sculpture’ activity raised consciousness about the way in which people related with each other.

By this cycle I had named the activity ‘Human Sculpture’. I had also begun using the term ‘script’ for behaviour patterning. Griffin (1987) suggests that naming the names is an important step in the process of learning. Having named these names they became the building blocks in my hypothesis building.

At this time I believed that the application of the term ‘script’ to therapy was my own unique idea. It was not until I read Nelson Jones (1986) in 1987, and tracked down his reference to Berne (1964) that I became familiar with the history of the term ‘Script’ in Therapy.
In preparation of this document I wrote to that first group of participants inviting their comments about the exercise. Only one responded. She described the awareness of her behaviour as:

'This wasn't a new idea for me, but a conscious recognition of issues I have been already grappling with. It brought the issue into focus'.  
(Appendix A)

This letter made me aware that for this participant, there were two major factors influencing her response to 'Human Sculpture'.

1. Her change was complemented by a readiness to become self-aware.
2. I, as facilitator, expected participants to be reflective.

Despite this person's readiness, her letter shows that change did not take place.

4.3.5 Communication

My thesis about 'Human Sculpture' was emerging, and I was opening it to critiquing by presenting it in the arena of the Spontaneous Drama course.

I had published my understanding about 'script' and the way in which 'Human Sculpture' enabled an understanding about 'script'.

'Everybody has a way of being in life. Through most of their life they use the same way of being. I call this a 'script'. When they position themself in a sculpture they take up a statue which reflects this standard way of being, their 'script'.

Hill (1984)
4.4 CYCLE 3

4.4.1 Context

I continued to offer the theme of ‘Spontaneous Drama’ in the post graduate diploma in Social Communication at Hawkesbury College of Advanced Education. The program changed from being a six session theme, to being a weekend theme.

In each weekend workshop I used the exercise of ‘Human Sculpture’. I was concurrently working as a Crisis Counsellor with 2UE Kid’s Careline, which involved me in telephone therapy work, and as a result of this work my reflective listening had become more honed. I was involved in an ongoing group studying the Gerard Egan’s (1976) Interpersonal Living.³

Both these experiences were building on my previous experience as a crisis counsellor, and giving me new skills of challenging and gently confronting my clients. These skills were evident in my working in my Spontaneous Drama work.

4.4.2 Action (1985)

The ‘Human Sculpture’ had developed into a routine process whereby the participants to the ‘Spontaneous Drama’ workshop, formed groups of five or six people. We completed sculptures for all the groups and obtained feedback about each sculpture immediately the sculpture was complete. After all the groups had completed their sculptures and discussed them, I talked generally about some of the implications of ‘Human Sculpture’ work, and introduced the term ‘script’.

I would ask the question

‘What did you think about the statues you took in the sculpture?’

³ Egan, G. (1976) Interpersonal Living
Is that the way you always are?’

This usually prompted discussion which fluctuated between a response that there was no link between the sculpture and real life, and agreement that the ‘Human Sculpture’ did reveal real life ‘scripts’.

On several occasions, different participants experienced a cathartic self awareness, and began to explore ways to rewrite their ‘script’. One example of this was a woman, who when asked the question ‘Is this the way you always are?’, began to cry and expressed that her position in the sculpture was a recurrent ‘script’. I asked her did she want to attempt to ‘rewrite’ her ‘script’, and on agreeing to this, we reconstituted her sculpture, only this time she chose a statue which was how she would have preferred to be in the ‘Human Sculpture’. I asked her ‘What would it take in your life to change your ‘script’?’ She answered that she thought she was beginning to see ways and today was the first day that this had been clearer.

Not everyone accepted the notion of ‘script’, nor that their position in the sculpture was indicative of a ‘script’.

4.4.3 Reflection (1985)

I was using ‘Human Sculpture’ on a regular basis each time I ran the Spontaneous Drama course. I believed that the ‘Human Sculpture’ exercise was the most powerful of the exercises in the Spontaneous Drama course, because it lent itself most easily to an explanation of a ‘script’ or position. It also provided a framework from which to pursue ‘script’ rewriting or repositioning.

Egan (1976) suggested that part of a person’s change process was a point wherein they ‘begin to choose (their) own set of interpersonal values and elements of (their) own interpersonal style’  

Egan (1976:14)
and I believed that the position in the ‘Human Sculpture’ reflected an interpersonal style. When I invited people to choose a different statue in the sculpture which they felt was more comfortable for them, I believed I was opening up the possibility of making changes in their interpersonal style. When a person made changes in their position in the sculpture this was like a rehearsal for changes they would make in their real life.

When I asked a person to remodel their position, then asked them what it would take for them to change their real life ‘script’ I called this ‘stretching’ the metaphor of sculpture.

4.4.4 Reflection (13.12.1992)

Three themes of study were emerging in my reflecting about ‘Human Sculpture’:

1. There was an emerging thesis about ‘script’.
2. There was an emerging understanding about ‘Human Sculpture’ as an activity associated with ‘script’.
3. There was an evaluation of the way in which a facilitator needs to work in this activity.

‘Script’

Not everyone was accepting the notion of ‘script’. Thinking back on that time this did not concern me. Spontaneous Drama and the notion of ‘script’ was a tool to help people. The issue was not whether the notion was right or wrong, rather whether it was helpful or unhelpful. If it was something that enabled a person to begin to change out of dysfunctional interpersonal relationships, then, in my opinion, it was a helpful tool rather than being a ‘right’ tool.
I was not trying to tie myself down to a definitive definition. I was using the notion as a means to an end, which was that people began reflecting on their interpersonal behaviour.

'Human Sculpture'

I had started to see the activity of 'Human Sculpture' as a tool which facilitated a person looking at their own life.

Facilitation of 'Human Sculpture'

The concept of 'stretching the metaphor' invited a way of working in therapy which invited change, on the basis that a sculpture can be remodelled.

The most important factor for a facilitator was that they empowered people to make changes in their interpersonal relationships. It was not the role of a facilitator to say whether a given position in the sculpture was a person's 'script' or not; The facilitator's role was to raise the possibility that it could be a 'script', and the client would then determine for themself whether their actions denoted a 'script' or not. This respected their 'readiness' for this sort of confrontation and invited them to construct their own meaning about it.

4.4.5 Emergent Questions

There were several questions which I began to ask about 'Human Sculpture'.

1. What makes a person ready to become aware of their 'script'?
2. What it is about 'Human Sculpture' that enables people to become conscious about their 'script'?
4.4.6 Communication

I presented a workshop on 'Human Sculpture' in which I described 'Human Sculpture' as a cumulative statue activity. I used it as a way of reinforcing Egan's (1976) notion of rewriting one's interpersonal style and suggested that each step of the sculpture building was a rewriting, as was the last step, when the first person in the sculpture stood outside of the sculpture and decided to return to it, maybe with a different sculpture. This workshop was videoed and appears in Appendix B.

4.5 CYCLE 4

4.5.1 Context

In 1988 I was invited by a student who had attended my drama therapy classes, to present a staff development workshop for his staff in a tertiary institution. He specifically asked that I do 'Human Sculpture' with the staff.

This was not a step I had planned for 'Human Sculpture', however I responded to the opportunity.

I was then lecturing in Communication at a College of Advanced Education, and had been introduced to the subject of 'Organisational Communication' and the literature associated with this topic. I had begun thinking about the notion of 'script' as it applied to people in the organisational setting, and this invitation created an opportunity to explore that.

4.5.2 Action (18.8.1988)

There were approximately fifteen people at the workshop, and we completed three sculptures with immediate feedback to participants, before analysing any of them.
In the third sculpture, I deviated from my usual format, in that I was also included in this sculpture.

The first person in the sculpture adopted a pose of a ‘Madonna’, and the following statues reinforced this pose, forming a tableau. I was last and chose a statue which was flush with the wall of the room in which we were working. I wanted to convey a sense of attempting to walk through the wall, to escape from the ‘Madonna’ tableau.

When the first statue, ‘The Madonna’, was invited to stand back from the sculpture and if she desired, to make a change in her return to the sculpture, she moved away from here adorers and took a new position at the other end of the room.

When we discussed this sculpture, several of the participants and the audience expressed displeasure at the ‘Madonna’ not returning to her original position. They felt it was irresponsible when there was a gap left in the sculpture through her changed position.

Some also suggested that I had broken the rules of ‘Human Sculpture’ in choosing a sculpture that was flush with the wall. They did not believe that I had given permission for this sort of sculpture when I explained how ‘Human Sculpture’ was done.

The general discussion about the sculptures focussed on an individual’s right to change position when it left all the others in a sculpture where they were looking at an empty space.

The notion of ‘script’ was well received. The participants accepted that they had ‘scripts’, though they were more reticent in acknowledging that the ‘Human Sculpture’ accessed those ‘scripts’.
4.5.3 Reflection (18.8.1988)

During the ‘Madonna’ Sculpture I was irritated by the fact that everyone was focussed around one person, and it appeared to me that they were putting her on a pedestal. I really wanted to be provocative when I chose to ‘walk through the wall’. It was the only way I could think of to express my reaction to what was happening in the rest of the sculpture.

I regretted that I had become a participant in the sculpture, however this mistake taught me a little more about the role of the facilitator. My feeling now was that the facilitator should stand back from the action of the sculpture, and contribute to the reflection of the sculpture, as an equal participant observer.

The discussion which followed the sculptures, I believed to be a pertinent discussion which identified a group agenda regarding ‘responsible leadership’. In the light of the ‘readiness’ argument (cycle 2) my belief was that this group was ready to discuss the way in which their leaders were leading, and that the ‘Human Sculpture’ acted as a catalyst for that discussion. It was difficult to know whether, without ‘Human Sculpture’ prompting this discussion, it would have been possible.

This discussion raised for me, the potential of a tool such as ‘Human Sculpture’ in the organisational setting, in its ability to facilitate discussion about topics which were pertinent to the organisational group.

4.5.4 Reflection (13.12.1992)

'Script'

At this stage of my academic studies in Organisational Behaviour I had not read Mangham and Overington’s text (1987) - ‘Organisations as Theatre’. I believed the
'Script' propositions to be a relatively new way of thinking about Organisations, and one of my own creation. I was not introduced to Mangham's writing until my visit to the Centre for Organisational Change at Bath University in September 1990.

'Human Sculpture'

In preparation of this document I sent a questionnaire to my colleague and asked that it be distributed to all the participants to this workshop. Nine months had elapsed since the workshop. Seven of the 14 participants responded, and I including my own response, as I had also been a participant.

The questions and responses are in Appendix C.
My own responses are listed as participant 8.

The question which was emerging for me at this time in the inquiry was whether 'Human Sculpture' was an indicator to organisational communication problems. Two participants categorically disagreed with this suggestion, and five participants agreed with it, however one of these was prompted by my suggestions which bridged the sculpture to an organisation interpretation. It was unfortunate that so few of the participants had responded to the questionnaire.

Facilitation of 'Human Sculpture'

The role of the facilitator was unfolding through trial and error. This cycle demonstrated a clear error in hindsight of my joining the sculpture, and from that cycle onward my role as facilitator was only as participant observer. I did not join the sculpture but I was an observer, and therefore my comments about the meaning of the sculpture were pertinent when we had that discussion.
4.5.5 Emergent Questions

As I moved into the field of organisational communication I began to ask myself
Does the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ invite communication about the Organisation
through natural and/or forced bridges?

4.5.6 Communication

I had published two papers following presentations of ‘Human Sculpture’ at
conferences. I was defining ‘script’ as

‘a framework of constructed meaning about how to ‘be’ in a given situation’

Hill (1990a:2)

and suggesting that it was acquired through socialisation.

I had written about ‘Human Sculpture’ and contextualised it in organisational
communication. I suggested that it provided an insight into organisational situations,
particularly potential or real, organisational relationship dysfunctionality (Hill 1990a).
In my organisational communication studies I had heard of the use of a Communication
Audit to discern organisational relationship problems, and began proposing that a
‘Human Sculpture’ acted in a similar way to a mini Communication Audit (Hill 1990b).

I had begun to consider the way in which the facilitator facilitated ‘Human Sculpture’
expressing that is was important that the facilitator worked in such a way that the
participants were choosing their own ways to resolve problems which they saw in the
sculpture. This was evident in the language of the facilitator and the facilitators belief
that the participant could resolve problems themself.

For example: the facilitator would say ‘What do you think we could do about that to
make it better for you’ rather than ‘Why don’t you try ......’
‘Such action invites ownership and investment to the solution and empowers the participants about their ability to resolve problematic situation.’

Hill (1990a:4)

4.6 CYCLE 5

4.6.1 Context

In the twelve months following my first experience of using ‘Human Sculpture’ in an organisational context, three groups invited me to present ‘Human Sculpture’ work with them. These invitations had arisen through my giving demonstration lectures on my work. Each of the three groups at this cycle of the inquiry had employed me as a consultant under the banner of ‘Creative Approaches to the Management of Change’. The ‘Human Sculpture’ was one of the approaches, and was always the first exercise of the workshop.

Each group was a department within a larger organisation. One organisation was a hospital. One organisation was a university. One organisation was a government body.


The format on each occasion was as follows:

I would begin with a creative visualisation, and follow this immediately with the ‘Human Sculpture’ exercise. The large group would break into smaller groups, and we would complete sculptures, with immediate feedback to the participants following each sculpture.
When everyone had participated in the sculptures, and everyone had received feedback, I would then talk about the notion of 'script' and ask the participants whether aspects of the sculpture reminded them of incidents in their organisation.

The discussion would then proceed to affirmation or negation of my proposal, and discussion about particular aspects of the sculpture. The group would nominate a focus area of the sculpture, and we would resculpt, and thus explore the potential for rescripting.

In one particular sculpture, the director of the organisation was included in a sculpture, and we resculpted several times as the director explored different management relationships.

For two of the groups, participants commented after the workshop on how perceptive I had been to their organisational problems. In one of these instances I was asked whether I had been briefed. In each case I had received no briefing. The questions I had asked about the aspects of the sculpture, were based on my viewing of the sculpture, not on any preworkshop briefing.

For example: a relationship in the sculpture where one statue was removed from all the other statues, would prompt me to ask how it felt for the person, being so separated.

A relationship in the sculpture where one statue formed a base for all others to rest on, prompted me to ask how it felt for the base person, to have everyone depend on them.
4.6.3 Reflection (3.10.1989)

While the sculptures were forming I would notice specific formations and make a mental note to raise these formations as examples in the later discussion. The sculptures which I noted included

1. Where there was a focus statue, with all others attached I noted this to later raise the issue of dependence.
2. When the first person in the sculpture accepted my invitation to change position and this left a gaping hole in the sculpture. I noted this to comment later on when we talked about the implications of personal and organisational change.

While there was similarity between all three groups, different issues arose, and as the bulk of the post sculptural discussion was driven by the participants, each workshop had its own flavour. One group focussed on leadership issues. The second group focussed on attachment and separation issues. The third group focussed on provision of support for others. These were important topics for people in organisations to be talking about.

I maintained that the discussion was rich because the tool provided a less direct approach for talking about one’s fellow workers.

Egan (1976:75) suggests that the level of risk in giving feedback varies with the level of immediacy. There is low risk as participants in the group give feedback related to others not associated with the group. There is high risk with giving feedback to another person in the group about what is happening in the group at that moment. The risk is higher again if the feedback to another person in the group is negative or when there is an hierarchical imbalance between the people concerned. This was the case in the sculpture that included the director, where people had used the sculpture as way of giving the director feedback about his authoritarian style of management.
The difficulties of giving feedback are compounded if participants simply do not know the appropriate words to express some of the feelings about their organisation or people in the organisation. Using ‘Human Sculpture’ can alleviate difficulties associated with ‘immediacy’ and lack of appropriate words because in ‘Human Sculpture’ the participants are speaking indirectly to the issue. By talking about the sculpture, the level of immediacy is reduced. They speak about the sculpture, not about the people who make up the sculpture. Secondly, the sculpture is tangible, and often the issue about which people are wanting discussion, is intangible. The metaphor provides words and expressions which previously had not been applied to that particular issue.

I call overcoming these difficulties, ‘articulation about the issue’. It is more than communication, as it concretizes what a person knows intuitively but does not know how to express, enabling them to express it in a non confrontational way.

After each of these workshops I felt a growing sense of confidence in myself as facilitator of a group experience. I did little planning for each workshop and trusted in my intuitive capacity to ask appropriate questions. In addition to my questions, I was becoming more confident in using ‘active listening’ to promote discussion in the group, without my necessarily being the expert problem solver.

In my use of ‘active listening’ I was responding to the input from my involvement in the Egan Interpersonal Communication group, which was now being reinforced by my teaching ‘active listening’ to my undergraduate students. I was attempting to practice what I preached.

4.6.4 Reflection (13.12 1992)

‘Script’
My understanding of ‘script’ was being influenced by Berne (1972), and I had begun to make connections between Berne’s propositions, and both Egan (1976) and Swanson &
Delia (1976), who were proposing learned ways of interpersonal relating which could be re-learned. Neither were using the term 'script', yet their thesis implied the same notions as did Berne's (1972).

Swanson and Delia (1976) had discussed communication dysfunctionality in terms of interpreting and transmitting messages.

'Communication involves much more than acquiring the ability to use language. To communicate successfully in a particular culture, we learn to interpret messages within the system of knowledge supplied by our culture. In addition we learn how to communicate in different settings. The knowledge of how to properly play our role in differing situations is seldom explicitly recognised.'

Swanson and Delia (1976:27)

I equated Swanson's and Delia's use of the term 'play our role' to be equivalent to 'script'.

Egan (1976) had suggested

'I can admit that I am, to a great extent, a product of past forces beyond my control, but although I cannot change the past, I can take charge of my own behaviour and change the future. Even if it means involving myself in a painful process of emotional reeducation, I can begin to choose my own set of interpersonal values and the elements of my own interpersonal style. I cannot control the behaviour of others, but I can do a great deal to master my own.'

Egan (1976:14)

and his term 'the elements of my own interpersonal style', I believed to be equivalent to a 'script'.
'Human Sculpture'

As with the previous cycle I invited reflection on these workshops by sending a questionnaire to my contacts, and asking that the questionnaire be circulated to all participants of the workshop. This was early in 1990, and the workshops had been held in August, October and November of 1989.

41 people had participated across the three workshops, and 19 people responded. The responses to the questionnaire are given in Appendix C. All those who responded had remembered the sculpture, and some remembered it in sufficient detail to remember their own positions. The bulk of respondents agreed that the sculpture was indicative of relationships within the group in the organisation, however they varied on the extent of their agreement.

After each workshop, participants had spoken to me and affirmed my thesis, that the 'Human Sculpture' had been an indicator of problems in the organisation. This affirmation was not voiced during the discussion within the workshop, nor was it expressed in the written responses to the workshops. As a result, my thinking about 'Human Sculpture' began to change from believing that 'Human Sculpture' was an indicator of organisational problems to believing that it was a vehicle for things which are known intuitively about the organisation, to become articulated. I called this connection a 'bridge', suggesting that participants would bridge from the concrete of the 'Human Sculpture' to the amorphous of the organisation.

Foy (1981) and Rickards (1988) have called intuitive knowledge, 'right brained' ways of knowing, and they suggest that many employees know the problems of their organisation in this intuitive way.

Some things employees know about the organisation are too fearful to express, because of fear of hierarchical disadvantage. These can also be more easily spoken of in a 'Human Sculpture', because the immediacy of the situation about which people are
talking, is removed from the real situation to the metaphorical situation of the 'Human Sculpture'.

In either case, when the issue becomes articulated, it can be more readily discussed (Hill 1991a). I use the term articulated as distinct from communicated, since there is often the case of trying to find the right words to express an idea about one's work colleagues or the organisation. This process of articulation is empowering for the employees because it gives substance to their intuition and it promotes the intuitive knowledge of the employee as valuable.

Facilitation of 'Human Sculpture'
My style of facilitation was influenced by Egan (1976) and particularly his proposition of phases of development of trust in a group.

Phase 1. Letting yourself be known
Phase 2. Listening and Responding
Phase 3. Challenging

These phases suggest that the group process be focussed on building of trust before individuals begin to challenge and respond to each other, and precipitate personal change. Egan (1976) stresses the importance of speaking freely about your perceptions of your self and others, and listening to others perceptions of you with potential to respond.

I felt that the process of 'Human Sculpture' progresses through
1. A time of letting oneself be known as people share their impressions of the sculpture, and also speak of their desires about what they wanted to convey about the sculpture.
2. There is a time of listening and responding to the perceptions about the sculpture.
3. There is a time of challenging each others perceptions of the sculpture, and a realisation that it is possible to have different perceptions of the sculpture.

*Facilitation of a Human Inquiry into 'Human Sculpture'*

My reflection on my practice as a 'Human Sculpture' facilitator, prompted reflection on my practice as an inquirer. After devising and sending out a questionnaire, I realised that this was an unsuitable device for this type of inquiry. On rereading Reason (1988:5), I could see that I, as the inquirer, had biased the questions toward my own agenda of issues. It was not a co-operative inquiry in this sense. Later I read Guba and Lincoln (1982:238), and their proposition that no inquiry method is truly objective. They emphasised the importance of the inquirer acknowledging the values which bound the inquiry:

- Values in choosing the problem and then placing the problem in a context.
- Values in choosing the inquiry paradigm.
- Values in the choices of the substantive theory related to the inquiry issues and the inquiry methodology.
- Values of the people contributing to the inquiry.
- Values associated with congruency or dissonance of the issue, the inquiry paradigm and the inquiry context.

What was evident to me, was that, although the substantive theory related to 'Human Sculpture' was about empowerment and enabling people to make changes in their lives, the inquiry method which I was using, was not congruent with this, in that the participants had little say in the way in which the inquiry was progressing or was being formulated.

The issue of 'Human Sculpture' being an indicator to organisational problems, was my own agenda issue. I had prompted the affirming responses to the questionnaire by the way in which I worded my questionnaire. The rejection of the proposal that 'Human Sculpture' was an indicator of organisational problems, made me question whether the
inquiry method I was using was not allowing a collaborative hypothesis about 'Human Sculpture' to emerge. I had overlooked the importance of the group agenda.

My questioning of a traditional research methodology, that of questionnaire, made me feel like I was breaking rules, some of which I had acquired during my post secondary education.

For example: Research involves making a hypothesis, completing an experiment, then explaining why the results were different from the hypothesis. I usually reached the conclusion that there was 'researcher error or insufficient sample size'.

I recognised in this 'rule breaking' that I was learning a new culture. This culture is the post positivist research culture. My language had also changed. I was using the word 'inquiry' instead of 'research'.

Through this experiencing of the post positivist culture I was awakening to new concepts about inquiry, and had added a new topic to my agenda of reflection.

4.6.5 Emergent Questions

The questions which were at the forefront of my inquiry were related to the process of inquiry. The dilemma for me was how to be faithful to an empowering process of inquiry and at the same time address my own agenda.

4.6.6 Communication

I had begun to publish the outcome of my 'Human Sculpture' workshops through conference papers and journals (Hill 1991a, 1991b). I was placing my findings in the
context of organisational communication, and suggesting that ‘scripts’ between people in
the workplace could be the basis of other organisational problems.

4.7 CYCLE 6

4.7.1. Context

Soon after enrolling in the research master’s course at University of Western Sydney, I
applied to attend the Emerging Approaches to Inquiry 3 conference, at the centre of the
Study of Organisational Change and Development at Bath University. This conference
proposed an action learning environment of Collaborative Inquiry.

Many of the participants at this conference, were enrolled in post graduate studies at
Bath University. All of them were engaged in inquiry using a positivist paradigm. I
considered them my peers. Two fellow students from University of Western Sydney
attended the conference.

On the second last day of the conference, in a time programmed for conference generated
workshops, I presented a demonstration of ‘Human Sculpture’. The participants to the
workshop included the group with which I had been involved in a collaborative inquiry,
as well as my colleagues from Australia.

4.7.2 Action (23.9.1990)

I began immediately, by asking for a volunteer group to complete the sculpture. The
remainder were the audience. We completed one sculpture, and I then talked about my
hypothesis of ‘Script’.

The participant discussion focussed on the nature of facilitation of the activity, and one
person asked why I had not individually asked each member of the audience for their
perception of the sculpture. My answer had been that I believed the use of silence invited people to present their perceptions without the pressure of having to say something.

4.7.3 Reflection (23.9.1990)

I was pleased to present a demonstration with this peer group, as unlike the numerous conferences at which I had presented ‘Human Sculpture’, this group was entrenched in post positivist theory. I felt that his gave value to their comments.

I also realised that I learn about my own work, when questioned about it. The act of answering questions, and receiving critique opens me to insights which had previously not been as clear.

4.7.4 Reflection (12.12.1992)

‘Script’
This cycle did not add to my understanding about ‘Script’, however, in presenting the notion of ‘Script’ to the group of people at the Emerging Approaches to Inquiry 3 conference, the notion was subjected to critical assessment and was not rejected.

‘Human Sculpture’
I returned to Emerging Approaches to Inquiry 4 conference in September 1992, and was delighted to find that my work was remembered by the people to whom I had presented.

Facilitation of ‘Human Sculpture’ and Facilitation of a Human Inquiry into ‘Human Sculpture’
From this experience I had mainly learned about the facilitation of ‘Human Sculpture’ and the facilitation of inquiry into ‘Human Sculpture’. The two were linked, in that the
facilitation method for ‘Human Sculpture’ required an open invitation for people to speak, as did the facilitation method for a collaborative inquiry.

4.7.5 Emergent Questions

Several questions were emerging in my hypothesis forming.

1. Does the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ produce images which facilitate articulation?
2. Does the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ invite communication about the Organisation through natural or forced bridges?
3. Does the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ generate an agenda of issues which are relevant to the Organisation?
4. Does the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ assist in planning for action about addressing the issues?
5. Does the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ empower the participants?
6. How do I facilitate such a process?

4.7.6 Planning

The convergence of the questions begged a particular type of group with which to work.

1. The group must want to use the tool of ‘Human Sculpture’ as the tool to explore their organisational interrelationships.
2. Ideally the group would have about twelve people and allow two sculptures to be built during the workshop.
3. There would need to be possibilities for future meetings with them, if the group felt a follow up meeting was necessary.
The process needs to leave sufficient room for spontaneously responding to the
direction of the group. There were also some planning elements:

1. Meeting with the group.
2. Experience the 'Human Sculpture' and opening ourselves to the ramifications of the
   experience.
3. Reflecting on our experience.

Further action would emerge as a result of the group process.

4.8 CYCLE 7

4.8.1 Context

In the first year of my formal inquiry towards a higher degree, I was approached by an
organisation and invited to do 'Human Sculpture'. As with the previous organisations,
this overture came as a result of having presented 'Human Sculpture', at a conference.

The organisation matched the criteria I had sought in my planning phase:

1. They were interested in researching the nature of their organisation, and wished to
do this using a process of 'Human Sculpture'.
2. They were willing to work with me in 'Human Sculpture' and we would open
ourselves to the ramifications of the experience.
3. They planned to reflect on the experience, and to assist in this I offered to tape
our session and to provide a transcript.

The group was different from the previous organisational groups with whom I had been
working in that:
1. This workshop was not under paid consultancy.

2. There was an understanding that we were collaborators in an inquiry process into ‘Human Sculpture’.

3. The group represented the whole organisation, not a department of an organisation.

As with previous groups, there was at least one person in the group whom I knew. In this group it was a university colleague. She had been the previous director of this team of twelve people.

As with previous groups, there was at least one person who had seen me work with ‘Human Sculpture’ before, however the bulk of the group had no prior experience in ‘Human Sculpture’.

I tried to avoid obtaining a briefing about the group, however I did know that the team had been experiencing some difficulties in adjusting to a new director. The new director had invited me to attend their regular monthly meeting, and this meeting was well under way when I arrived. They had allocated one hour of the meeting, immediately prior to lunch, for staff development.

**4.8.2 Action (23.11.1990)**

I commenced the workshop with a visualisation called ‘Castle of the Pearl’. This visualisation involved participants imagining that they had gone to a room in a tower of a castle. In this room they chose a gift for themself.

We discussed some of the gifts people had chosen for themselves. The purpose of the visualisation was to create a break between the formal meeting and the workshop.
The Building of the (first) Sculpture:

This sculpture involved five participants.

The first person into the first sculpture took a standing position, legs apart and arms by her side.

The second person, stood to the left with arms and feet out.

The third person, stood at the edge of the circle which had been formed by the chairs, and leaned forward from the waist. She extended her arms like a dive.

The fourth person, took longer than the others had, to choose her position, and stood between and behind the first and second people, with her arms clasped behind her back.

The fifth person sat on the floor with her legs folded underneath her and to her left side. She supported the weight of her body on her left arm, which almost touched the second person.

The first person was invited to step out of the sculpture and return to it, as if she were the fifth person.

She returned to the sculpture at a lower level.

Reflection by Participants after the (first) Sculpture (Appendix D)

There are two ways in which the participants reflected on the sculpture. The first is that the audience (including the facilitator) talk about the meaning which the positions evoked. The second is that the individuals who took up positions talk about the meaning this act had for them.

Meaning ascribed by the audience (which included me):

The audience described their perceptions of each stage in the development of the sculpture.

When the first person took up her position, participants in the observation group described it as a wall or boundary or a framework on which the sculpture could be built.
When the second person took up her position, participants in the observation group described it as a focussing position and one which added stability to the sculpture. There was also concern about her endurance in holding that position.

When the third person took up her position, participants in the observation group described it as something she was doing (ie. diving, or about to take flight).

When the fourth person took up her position, participants in the observation group described it in terms of proximity to other people, as well as what she was doing (observing or judging others).

When the fifth person took up her position, participants in the observation group described it as being like a mermaid, as well as her proximity to others in the sculpture.

When the first person changed her position, the audience commented that it had changed the focus of the sculpture, and the balance. Where it had been three up two down, it was now three down and two standing.

*Meaning ascribed by the sculpture builders:*

The members of the sculpture each took a turn to describe their position in the sculpture.

The first person described her position as one of being unsure of the requirements of the activity. She also added

>‘I don't know where I fit in with this group’.

The second person explained her position in that she is essential to most activities so she just spread out.
The third person explained here position as arising from the guided visualisation which had been used as a warm up to the activity. She was imaging herself leaning out of a castle window. She also added

'I felt more secure. I wanted to stay close to my chair'.

The fourth person described her deliberation at choosing a place arising from the foreboding look of one of the other statues. The position she took was in the place of where she described a gap, and her arms behind her back was to stop destroying the natural circle of the sculpture.

The fifth person described her position as being for comfort, and that the gap between her toes and the next sculpture was a deliberate move because 'I am always out of the group and coming in'.

The first person described her changed position as being driven by a need for comfort. Her arms had begun to ache.

_The building of the (second) Sculpture:_

This sculpture involved the remaining five participants who had been observers to the first sculpture.

The first person in to the sculpture took a sitting position with her legs crossed and her arms supporting her weight, stretched behind her.

The second person into the sculpture stood behind, holding her hair.

The third person into the sculpture stood behind again with her right hand on her hip and her left foot touching the hand of the first person.

The fourth person stood at the back of the group.

The fifth person crawled into a space in the centre of the group and lay in fetal position in front of the first person.

The first person was invited to step out of the sculpture and return to it, as if she were the fifth person. She returned to the sculpture to exactly the same position.
Reflection by Participants after the (second) Sculpture:  (Appendix D)

Meaning ascribed by the audience (which included me):

The audience described their perceptions of each step in the development of the sculpture.

When the first person took up her position, participants in the observation group described it as a serene and calm focus position for the audience.

When the second person took up her position participants in the observation group changed their description of the first person to a person being encouraged to ‘hold on’ or to ‘hold back’. They described the position of the second person as ‘holding on’ or ‘holding back’.

When the third person took up her position, participants in the observation group described it as a position of friendship and connection. There was debate about whether the third person invited connection to herself and this bridged to that person’s nurturing role in the group.

When the fourth person took up her position, participants in the observation group described it as both in terms of enveloping and extending. This person was the director of the group.

When the fifth person took up her position, participants in the observation group described it as wanting to be enveloped in the sculpture. This person was the ex-director, and at least one person voiced their opinion that their perception was tempered by the history of the group.

When the first position was invited to change her position and she chose to retain her original position, some members of the audience expressed sorrow that she had to return to that position. They believed that she had no other choice than to return to her original position.
Meaning ascribed by the sculpture builders:

The members of the sculpture each took a turn to describe their position in the sculpture.

The first person described her position as one of being relaxed and comfortable.

The second person described her position as wanting to be near the first and not wanting to be on the ground.

The third person also said she did not want to be on the floor and that she wanted to touch the other two.

The fourth person described her position as following the flow of the sculpture, which at that time was facing in a given direction.

The fifth person expressed a preference, there was only one place for her to go, which was in the centre.

The first person commented that her choice to return to her original position was one she felt compelled to follow. She felt that her leaving the sculpture had formed a gap which needed to be filled.

The discussion which followed the both sculptures focussed on

1. Rules about the sculpture
   
   For example: did one have to be connected to the sculpture? were there spaces which were taboo for audience walking?

and through my talking about the notion of 'script'.

2. Missed opportunities of being supportive of others in the group

and finally

3. Power.
4.8.3 Reflection (23.11.1990)

Immediately following the workshop my reflection was dominated by the second sculpture.

My colleague had been part of this sculpture, and as I knew a little of her involvement with the organisation, I was drawn to the way in which the sculpture was addressing that.

She had been the last person to join the sculpture, and by her own admission had commented that she really did not want to join it. I interpreted this as paralleling her own relationship with this group, in that she had recently become the ex-director. The issue was one of a person trying to formulate their relationship with a group, and feeling that they did not fit in.

The other parts of the sculptures which were significant for me were:

1. In the first sculpture, when I had invited the first person in the sculpture to review her position, she chose to change. This contrasted to the second sculpture in which the participant chose not to change. I noted this so that I could use it as an example later in the workshop to demonstrate the impact of a person choosing to change.

2. In the first sculpture, there was one statue which some members of the audience had viewed as ‘an observer’, while other members of the audience had seen her a ‘judging’. This was a good example of how one position can have multiple meanings, reflecting different perceptions. This often arose in organisational studies, that people based their behaviour with others on unsubstantiated perceptions.

3. The two sculptures contrasted in that one was inward looking and the other was outward looking. When asked about my perception of the contrast, I explained that I saw this as mirroring the focii of the two different groups. The second group, the outward looking group, had more of the staff who were responsible for obtaining funding.
The overall workshop was satisfying, in that I felt they had begun to touch on some important issues when they began discussing power in the group. I felt that the 'Human Sculpture' had helped them broach this topic.

4.8.4 Reflection (13.12.1992)

Following the workshop, I transcribed the audio tape, and then read this transcript as a contrasting 'after the event' reflection (See Appendix E).

Circumstances prevented me from re-visiting this group until eight months later. In the interim I had spoken with two of the people from the workshop, both of whom had commented that they felt the sculptures were 'accurate'.

Prior to my return visit I circulated a transcript of the previous visit.

On the return visit we spent at least an hour discussing the transcript, and the group gave me feedback about the exercise. A summary of the return visit is given in Appendix F. Two quite significant pieces of information arose from the input from the co-researchers.

1. The activity had resonated with them and had raised important issues for the group.

2. What was lacking in the workshop for this group, was a process by which they could plan how to tackle the issues, and retain the apparent safety of the atmosphere which had been in the 'Human Sculpture'.

There were many other issues raised, and these formed another level of reflection for me.

The amount of material reflecting on this workshop was overwhelming. I had my own immediate response to the workshop (Appendix E). I had the participants response to
the workshop (Appendix F). I had my own response to the workshop, using an agenda of

1. 'Script'
2. 'Human Sculpture'
3. Facilitation of 'Human Sculpture'
4. Facilitation of a Human Inquiry into 'Human Sculpture'

The large amount of material emerging from this cycle of the inquiry prompted me to sort the material using the questions which had emerged in previous cycles of the inquiry.

1. **Does the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ produce images which facilitate articulation.**

Several examples from the transcript indicate that the activity did facilitate articulation about a number of issues.

*articulation about power*

This was one issue which came up through the sculpture, but was not one which the group were keen to talk about.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>‘Well obviously power is an issue for some of us here.’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geof</td>
<td>‘Which bit of the power would you like to talk about?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>‘I brought it up because its obvious that it .... other things’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geof (active listening)</td>
<td>‘so the wall was created in your sculpture and that's a problem for them. Would people feel comfortable to explore that through the sculpture? That we would rebuild sculpture two and talk about that wall as a way of talking about the issue of power in the caravan Project.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audience ‘Is it necessary to talk about the issue of power?’

(Appendix D)

At the following meeting, the power issue was the one which they focussed on. Several participants expressed an interest in a segment of the previous workshop which did not appear on the transcript.

‘towards the end where we talk about power we had a longer discussion about that .... where Marilyn was invited to stand on a chair and view the structure from higher up, and then got a different perspective all together’

(Appendix F)

They were right about part of the transcript being missing. This was a case of human error in that I had failed to transcribe this part of the audio tape. They were particularly interested in listening to this segment. I learned later that it was part of a conflict between two of the staff following the workshop.

Geof ‘Does it make sense now hearing it again?’

Comments from the group.

‘I’d forgotten all about that part .....’
‘a lot of laughter wasn’t there .....’

(Appendix F)

The group then discussed the ‘power’ issue, and in particular what had happened in the ensuing eight months, as the Director had attempted to discuss that issue in following meetings. A number of the group felt that following the ‘Human Sculpture’ it was no longer safe to talk about power.
articulation about rules of the activity

On two occasions people commented about unwritten rules.

They were unwritten, in that no rule for the sculpture had been stated explicitly, however people were suggesting that rules did exist.

Eg. An audience member discussed their perception of the sculpture during the time the audience walked around the sculpture.

'On the way back I considered cutting across it ... and I knew that I just couldn't do that. That was a really wrong thing to do. It was important not to do that. I thought there was a unity about it that was important not to break.'

(Appendix D)

Eg. Wendy (discussing her creating her statue)

'Well I had two thoughts in mind. One was that the group seemed to be complete and if I had a choice I would have stayed out, but given that I didn't have a choice that I had to find somewhere, I wanted to be somewhere that was not intrusive to the group focus ....'

Geof 'And you really felt that there was a rule that you had to be involved in the sculpture?'

'Yeah. I should have asked. I should have said "do we all have to be in it?" My first impulse was its complete. It doesn't need me at all. I'll stay out. But because I hadn't asked about those rules. Because I hadn't anticipated that comment I said "How can I find a place in the sculpture that doesn't intrude on the focus ... doesn't intrude on the group." And the other thing, sitting there I realised that my focus was out; out of the sculpture. If I had thought about it I would have tried to tie it up more; but it was definitely out.'

(Appendix D)

Neither of these rules:

1. Not to walk across the sculpture
2. Everyone must be part of the sculpture.

had been explicitly stated. Wendy may well have been at a disadvantage, having arrived late. She may well have thought that these rules had been stated earlier.
In this example I felt that we were tapping the unconscious knowledge of organisational rules. Borman (1984) had suggested that there are Organisational Rules which influence the inter-relationships within an Organisation. It is possible that these perceived rules for the ‘Human Sculpture’ are also rules for this organisation. It is also possible that this was an agenda item which the group was not prepared (or ready) to discuss. While both possibilities are interesting, they were not discussed in detail by the group.

**articulation about people having different perceptions**

The group responded well to talking about the sculpture and began to explore their different perceptions of the same event.

Eg. Audience commenting on (Janine’s) addition to the sculpture:

'She seem observant.
She put herself close to people. She focussed towards the centre of the group. Janine was extending the boundary. Going between the two sets of figures that were there into the centre therefore creating a circular background.
To me it became ... initially there was a gap between and she came in here and so it became a rounded.
'Though in the situation where she was looking down with her hands behind her back, I didn’t know whether she was observing or judging.’

(Appendix D)

Later, after I had asked them if the sculpture had changed as they walked around it, they again commented on the variety of meanings from Janine’s pose.

'It looked a bit enclosing from that side because it was the back of people and you couldn’t quite see anything. It looked a bit oppressive actually. It was very inviting. This was the best view for me. There was no room to see or to get in or to look through to what was on the other side.
As I walked around Janine’s hands were behind her back almost like she was pondering; but I hadn’t got that impression from the front view. It made me wonder whether she was ... ’

(Appendix D)

This aspect, of different meanings being ascribed to a situation, is a common occurrence in organisations, and is often the cause of conflict within an organisation. For example, a situation may arise that a person does not acknowledge another person in the corridor.
One of the two may describe the situation as ‘being ignored’ by the other person, the second of the two may perceive the situation as having been thinking about something else and didn’t see the other person’. The ‘Human Sculpture’ is a good vehicle for discussing this type of workplace situation. It draws out the axiom that individuals ‘see’ situations differently, based on their own history; and that this perception may change over time.

The reflection generated a new subquestion regarding whether these issues previously been un discussable. I suspect that ‘rules of the organisation’ and ‘people having different perceptions of a situation’, had never been overtly discussed. The issue of power seemed to me one which had never been broached before, and there was still some reticence in doing so. Of the three issues which had been raised in the ‘Human Sculpture’, the ‘power’ issue was the only one which had also been discussed in the follow up meeting. It was also a topic for discussion between the two meetings.

I would conclude that the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ did facilitate articulation about power and rules, and that these issues are important issues for this group. This is further developed by the next question.

2. Does the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ invite communication about the Organisation through natural and forced bridges?

There was considerable discussion about ‘power’. In addition, several other references were made to organisational life.

Marilyn (describing her choices in forming her statue)

‘Not much. I was really unsure because really I don’t know where I fit in with this group. My work’s a bit different. I am part time and being the first one it was hard to ...... So I didn’t do much. I wasn’t sure what to do.’

(Appendix D)
Narelle (describing her choices in forming her statue)

'I had in mind that I was essential to most activities and eventually everyone comes to me at some time to me, so I was just spreading out.'

(Appendix D)

Audience (describing their perceptions of Judy joining the sculpture)

'When I went behind the sculpture I noticed Judy's other hand, not the friendship hand, that was like a domineering or a disciplinary position. It was that arm, but maybe that's my perception of the role that Judy's in. I picked that up to ... She came in, in a nurturing role but with discipline.'

Geof

'And both of you are saying that that's how you see Judy in a work situation?'

No. I'm not saying that. That's what Robin is saying. I am saying that's what I saw in the sculpture. It was very much the two parts; there was this nurturing part and then there was this other part. From this perspective it was all closed off. I thought that was really interesting that everyone turned their back to the audience.'

(Appendix D)

These were natural 'bridges', as they arose without any prompting from me in my role as facilitator/inquirer.

The only comment I make is an 'active listening' comment. There were also forced 'bridges'. A 'forced bridge' is where I ask the group whether what they were seeing in the sculpture reminded them of anything about their work relationships.

Geof

'Can we use that as a bridge to now suggest, have there been any times in the history of the Caravan Project that it has suffered from missed arm opportunities, because a person has not wandered around to see where the places are, that maybe they have missed an obvious place. Does that create any resonance for the reality of the ways you are working together.'

(Appendix D)
This is essentially putting my ‘Human Inquiry’ agenda out for discussion and critiquing. The risk with a forced ‘bridge’ is that the group is not yet ready to discuss these connections, if in fact there are any.

3. Does the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ generate an agenda of issues which are relevant to the Organisation?

The activity had resonated with this group, and had raised important issues for them. A number of the co-researchers commented that the activity was ‘fascinating, ‘amazing’, ‘very revealing’, ‘a valuable exercise’, and many commented on the way it was undirected, yet seemed to tap the unconscious.

(Appendix F)

The image of a sculpture continued in the second meeting, when several of the co-researchers used sculptural terms to describe current instances. The most notable of these is the ‘missed hand’ situation, (Appendix F) which had described Judy’s helping hand which no one had seen because they had not walked around the sculpture.

The ‘missed hand’ situation, is a good example of what Griffin (1987) calls ‘naming the process’. Something which has been happening in the organisation, which no-one had been able to describe, can be given a name. Griffin (1987) suggests that this process of naming is often a preliminary step to a feeling of empowerment about the process which previously had been indescribable.

I can conclude that ‘Human Sculpture’ both raised an agenda of issues which were pertinent to this group of people, and facilitated their discussion of this agenda. This facilitation was only for the immediate, and as the next question proves, continued discussion on these issues was stifled through not having an action plan.
4. Does the process of 'Human Sculpture' assist in planning for action about addressing the issues?

In the initial workshop and in the follow up workshop, it was evident that

1. An agenda had emerged
2. The issues were real issues which this group had a desire to tackle

The workshop process failed in that it did not envisage a need for action planning about how to deal with issues which had arisen. When this was attempted, what happened was described as opening a 'Pandora's Box'. The group felt they were unable to deal with some of the issues after I had left.

'We felt safe in that session and I guess that we lost the safety. When we were just the ordinary team meeting, there wasn't the safety. Have some time to think about it, but to then come back into what was a designated safe place to deal with it ...

...We didn't have the agreement as a group, that this (the staff meeting which followed sculpture) was going to be a safe place to deal with it. It just came up on the agenda.

I was devastated by it because I was totally unprepared. I think that is something that needs to be looked at. Even if you're not available to do that, there needs to be an understanding, if they are doing follow on work, that they create that safe place ...

You as the leader of the original group would need to explore with that group how they can reestablish that.

So that that would be an effective conclusion to it to acknowledge the atmosphere which allowed the issues to come up, and to plan with the group, then, how they will approach those issues. Work out an action plan from that.

and this could include that whether it needs an outside facilitator.'

(Appendix F)

The discussion about the debilitating attempt to address the organisational issues which had been raised in the sculpture, raised two important issues for the inquiry into 'Human Sculpture'. Firstly that some sort of planning action should be included in the
'Human Sculpture' (Agenda Clarification). Secondly that the process of 'Human Sculpture' should have a means by which the group can deal with the issues raised by the activity. This could include a repeat of the 'Human Sculpture'.

With regard to the second point, participants felt that as one of the people in the sculpture has not been in the group since, there had been no opportunity to deal with those issues; they also expressed concern that so much had come out, they were too fearful to deal with it.

In response to these ideas I planned to alter the process of 'Human Sculpture', by concluding each 'Human Sculpture' workshop with a collaborative generation of an agenda of issues which arose from the sculpture, followed by action planning about how to tackle those issues, if the group wanted to tackle them at all. The group could explore the atmosphere of the activity which allowed the agenda to emerge, and examine ways in which that 'safety' could be continue in a dealing with agenda items. This may include a repeat sculpture.

5. Does the process of 'Human Sculpture' empower the participants?

In the sense that topic had been breached, and some had been given 'names', there was an element of empowering the participants.

The absence of planning for action to deal with what had emerged, however, resulted in participants feeling disempowered. They had lost the feeling of 'safety' which had given them power. I had wondered whether 'Human Sculpture' as a tool, was imposing 'scripts' on people, or helping to clarify 'scripts'. Lippitt and Lippitt (1986:61) propose a taxonomy of consultancy models. My reading of Goffman (1959) and Mangham (1988), suggested to me that they were working in what Lippitt and Lippitt (1986:61) call the advocacy model of consultancy, in which the consultant is directive in the problem solving process. I believed 'Human
Sculpture’, was working from the same notion of ‘script’, but working more in the ‘action researcher’ model of consultancy, raising questions and prompting reflection, and this was empowering for the participants.

A changed ‘Human Sculpture’ process, to include collaborative planning for action, would examine the notion of empowerment further.

6. The facilitation of ‘Human Sculpture’

and

7. The facilitation of inquiry into ‘Human Sculpture’

The two issues are linked. I had concluded in my last cycle, that there was a dual role of facilitation. I had found it difficult to separate my roles as ‘Human Sculpture’ facilitator, from that of ‘Human Sculpture’ inquiry facilitator.

I was aware that there were two agendas:

1. The organisational issues of the group.
2. Issues relating to ‘Human Sculpture’ as a tool/process.

and that the issue being discussed determined whether I was facilitating the ‘Human Sculpture’ or facilitating the inquiry into ‘Human Sculpture’.

One of the problems associated with being the facilitator was that because of my ascribed status as ‘information specialist’ [Lippitt and Lippitt (1986:61)] on ‘Human Sculpture’, there was the risk that whenever I contributed my perception of a sculpture it would be seen to hold more value than other participant’s perceptions. To resolve this dilemma I choose to withhold my perception and only add it, if no-one else has expressed a similar perception. I also used a number of ‘active listening’ responses, which allows debriefing and at the same time empowers the participants to be self debriefing.
On occasions, I have commented on the process, where elements of the process are more
evident to me than to others, by saying

‘Did you just hear what you said?’

(Appendix D)

In this particular group I had little need to add my perception, because the group was
forthcoming with all the perceptions I could have added.

This group was already advanced in their communication skills. They related well to
each other and gave willingly of positive and negative feedback. This, I suspect was due
to a history of meetings which had developed honesty and trust.

When participants expressed that a part of the sculpture was a problem for them, then I
accepted that his was their problem. By stretching the metaphor, I invite a resculpting
of the sculpture, thereby examining some options to ‘rescript’. This approach is similar
to Bower and Bower (1976) lessons for acquiring an assertive ‘script’.

We are working jointly. I am cautious not to suggest solutions. I open up space for the
participant to suggest solutions, by saying lines such as ‘What can we do now to make it
better for you?’

I also create a psychological climate in which facilitator intervention can safely be
ignored. Silence is important, as it creates space for people to comment on the action. I
try to pace the workshop, so that there is space for everyone to speak. In this
workshop I have also added a final question to the group ‘Is there anything else that
hasn’t been said about the sculpture?’

The participant empowerment is enhanced by inviting participants to comment on
things their audience has said about them. At one level this is an invitation to confirm or
deny a person's perception; at another level it is an invitation to confront people's perceptions about us; to challenge them.

In my experience of facilitating 'Human Sculpture' there are two main teaching points

1. That each individual had their own perception of a situation.
2. That when one person makes changes, this impacts on others.

This group focussed on the first of these teaching points, and my contribution to the discussion was by way of modelling the axiom by acknowledging that my own perceptions are my own perception

Eg. Geof  

I was really aware of the matching that you (as observer) had taken the same theme as Narelle higher.  
I was aware of the arms out. It was the picking up on a theme and riding with it and taking it into a new direction.

(Appendix D)

I also invited others to own their own perception.

Eg. Geof  

From your perspective it was actually getting quite non interesting.

or the phrase I often use

'How did it look to you?'

(Appendix D)

Inviting people to 'own' their own perception, relates to Egan's (1976) stage of group dynamics of 'Letting yourself be known'. It is important that group participants begin to use this type of language. Rather than 'teach' it, I model the language in appropriate situations.

When the group participants begin using such language with each other, I believe that they are beginning to communicate with each other in a way which enhances
Collaborative Inquiry. I believe that these communication skills equate to the statistical skills which one requires in order to engage in traditional (Positivist) research.

The inquiry method used with this group, contrasted to the previous inquiry methods, suggested a move towards greater collaboration. I returned to this group with an agenda of working through the transcript and making corrections and labelling it. My flexibility to meet their agendas was important in that it drew out the issues which were real for them.

It was important to be flexible in the discussion phase, to allow emergence of collaborative inquiry agenda. There are still changes which can be made in the inquiry process.

I am aware of a bias in the way in which I presented the transcript.

I had chosen not to put people's names. It had been my intent when we discussed the transcript, for people to identify their own transcripts, and also to correct my inaccurate transcription of the tape. I saw this as 'leaving space of each person to own their own script'.

A videoed transcript would remove the need to my transcribing.

There is too great a time lag between doing the 'Human Sculpture' and returning to discuss it. It had been time consuming to type the transcript. As this group only met once a month, there was also the delay in finding a mutually satisfying date.

It is important that the follow up visit comes soon after the 'Human Sculpture' activity, and this requires a recording mechanism which is faster to transcribe, or needs no transcription. While I had previously avoided using video, because I felt it was too great
an impingement on the way in which people acted, I was now open to the possibility of using it. The advantages may well outweigh the level of impingement.

In addition to the questions which had emerged from previous inquiry cycles, there were additional inquiry questions which had emerged from this cycle.

8. How significant is the guided fantasy in the overall process of ‘Human Sculpture’?

In retrospect, using guided fantasy heightened the level of self awareness and would have been a contributing factor in raising the ‘scripts’ because of its ability to tap unconscious aspects of the mind. The absence of this warm up in future workshops will allow me to assess whether this is a crucial part of the process.

9. What happens if the ‘Human Sculpture’ is repeated?

In the second meeting I was asked whether a repeat of the ‘Human Sculpture’ would invite rehearsal and destroy the spontaneity of the activity. I have been asked this on several occasions when I have presented ‘Human Sculpture’. My own belief, is that despite the possibility of rehearsal, a person would not be able to be responsible for other’s actions, and must still react to them. This issue remains a question for future research.

10. Are there differences between the way in which people give meaning to the sculpture?

As I reviewed the ways in which people explained their choice of statue in the sculpture, I discerned different types of expressions:
One type of expression involved a person talking about their position in the sculpture, as if they had no control over it, and implying that they were ruled by a force in the sculpture.

For example, Janine in the first sculpture said:

'because there was a gap, and that completes the circle, and I thought, if I do anything with my arms it is going to destroy the circle';

and Di in the second sculpture said:

'by that time the sculpture was very much facing that way, and in retrospect, if I had turned to fact the audience I would have been disconnected from the sculpture'.

These types of expression contrast with ones in which a person is aware of their own needs, and this awareness rules their choice of statue in the sculpture.

For example, Jana in the first sculpture said:

'I didn't want to go too far from my chair. I felt more secure';

and Judy in the second sculpture said:

'I wanted to be somewhere where I would be comfortable'.

The contrasting participant responses suggest differences in motivation which I would distinguish as 'out there' motivation (something beyond me is driving my decisions) and 'in here' motivation (something inside me is driving my decisions). Another two contrasting participant responses I noted, was that some people described their statue as a response to someone else's action, while others described their statue as the initiation of action.

For example, Wendy in the second sculpture said:

'Di's position was very strong. There was a unity that should not have been broken. And all I could see to do was to plug the gap.';
and Gus in the second sculpture said:

'I wanted to be close to Lindy'.

In contrast, Lindy in the second sculpture said:

'position myself in such a way so that people who built around me had a choice of where they would go.'

and Judy in the second sculpture said:

'And when I had to do something with this hand I felt I didn't want to have it down. I wanted to put it here because it made me feel strong, and also it made a lead for somebody else to have contact'.

I would suggest that these are further examples of 'out there' motivation and 'in here' motivation.

11. The context of 'Human Sculpture'

The co-researchers did not outwardly comment on 'Human Sculpture' being in the context of organisational development. Few would have had any knowledge about 'Human Sculpture' to place it in any context other than the one in which they were experiencing it. Iain Mangham and Michael Overington's "Organisations as Theatre" (1987), used the term 'script' in a way similar to my own, and Bordow and More (1991) had placed Mangham's (9179, 1987, 1988) work in the context of the Dramatistic Approach to Organisational Communication. I did likewise (Hill 1991a).

After answering the emergent questions from this and previous cycles, I was then able to address the four topics I had addressed in previous cycles.
'Script'

The experience of working with this group has strengthened my belief in a notion of 'script'.

The term 'notion' is important, as I do not believe that one can categorically prove an existence of 'scripts', however the term describes an experience that many people have. At no time did this group question the basic premise of 'script'. It was as if that metaphor, gave them a language to talk about ways that they have of relating.

This draws on the dilemma for positivist research of discovering 'truth' and replaces it with 'fit'. The theory is not necessarily 'true', but it 'fits' into people's individual reality. The theory is seen as 'credible'.

'Human Sculpture'

The procedure of 'Human Sculpture is as follows ...

The facilitator invites the formation of a sub group within the participant group, of about six people, (beyond six people there is a difficulty in remembering each individual's actions); and invites the participants of this sub group to decide on their sequence of involvement in the activity.

Having decided their sequence the first participant is asked to make (form) a statue. The facilitator may suggest that this is like the game of 'statues' played as a child.

The second participant is invited to walk around the space of the first statue and to add an additional statue. The facilitator invites the formation of an additional statue by the next participant in the chosen sequence.

The fourth, fifth and sixth repeat the process.
The remaining observers are invited to view the sculpture, and to do so by walking around it. Following the viewing, the first person into the sculpture is invited to remove themself from the sculpture.

The facilitator says ...

'You were the only person who did not have another to respond to. Look at this sculpture and decide if the position you held is the one you want to hold. If it is not go to a new place in the sculpture.'

If the first person chooses to make a change, then the sculpture can be viewed again. Everyone in the sculpture then relaxes in their position and listens while their audience discusses their perception of the sculpture and the meaning which the audience constructed. The facilitator nominates the participants to the sculpture, in sequence, inviting audience to comment about the statue formed. For each participant the facilitator says ...

'When (name) formed a statue, how did it mean to you?'

At the end of the commentary from the audience the facilitator invites the statues in the sculpture to comment on their feelings about building the sculpture, and the meaning they intended to construct. Following this cycle there are a number of additional steps which will be included in future cycles.

1. A collaborative generation of an agenda of issues which arose from the sculpture.
2. Action planning about how to tackle those issues so that the process of Human Sculpture involves
   Action
   Reflection
   Brainstorming of Issues
   Action Planning
A step which will be omitted in the next cycle is the visualisation. In addition to the process changing as a result of this cycle, the language by which ‘Human Sculpture’ is discussed is also developing. Giving of names to aspects of the process is a part of clarifying that process.

A ‘bridge’ is the term used to refer to a connection between the metaphorical activity, and the participants’ experience of reality. When such a comment is made spontaneously, it is called a ‘natural bridge’; when it is suggested by the facilitator it is called a ‘forced bridge’.

Facilitation of ‘Human Sculpture’

The facilitation skills for ‘Human Sculpture’ are ones which work in an empowering way with participants. They include

‘Active Listening’ : Reflecting to a person what it is they have said.

‘I messages’ : Speaking in a way which acknowledges that one’s perception is unique to them.

These communication skills are not unique to ‘Human Sculpture’, they are facilitation skills which are common to any collaborative inquiry group. In order that the group begin using these ways of communicating, the facilitator may need to model, or teach the skills.

The facilitator of the process needs to work in a way with the group which:

a) Encourages people to speak their perceptions of a common situation

b) Invites participants to explore the ramifications of their perceptions of the situation.

c) Leaves space for participants to make connections between their action in the ‘Human Sculpture’ and the action in the Organisational Group.

d) Encourages clarification of the issues related to the discussion.

e) Facilitates the collaborative planning of action to follow the ‘Human Sculpture’ workshop.
f) Creates a psychological climate in which facilitator intervention can be safely ignored.

**Facilitation of a Human Inquiry into ‘Human Sculpture’**

Since my return from the Emerging Approaches to Inquiry (3) conference, hosted by the Centre for the study of Organisational Change and Development, Bath University, England, I had been wondering whether Encounter Group (Egan 1976) was a precursor to Collaborative Inquiry (Reason 1988).

This particular group had a trusting environment which enabled participants to be open with each other in their feedback. They recognised the differences between their perceptions and ‘owned’ these perceptions (Egan 1976). It is important that group participants begin to have this type of group dynamic. I believe in doing this that they are beginning to communicate with each other in a way which enhances Collaborative Inquiry.

I believe that these communication skills equate to the statistical skills which one requires in order to engage in traditional (Positivist) research.

**4.8.5 Emergent Questions**

Four new inquiry questions emerged in this cycle of the inquiry.

How significant is the guided fantasy in the overall process of ‘Human Sculpture’?

What happens if the ‘Human Sculpture’ is repeated?

Are there differences between the way in which people give meaning to the sculpture?

What is the theoretical context of ‘Human Sculpture’?
4.8.6 Communication

At this stage of the inquiry, my communication about ‘Human Sculpture’ was directed to completing a literature review related to a theoretical context for ‘Human Sculpture’. This document appears in this volume as Chapter One.

4.8.7 Planning

By the end of this cycle I had decided to complete another cycle of the inquiry with a similar group, and in this cycle to make changes to the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ by eliminating the visualisation which previously preceded the workshop, and including opportunities at the end of the workshop for collaborative agenda setting and action planning.

4.9 CYCLE 8

4.9.1 Context

In August 1992 I was invited to work in an early childhood centre with nine staff. The invitation had followed a demonstration workshop on ‘Human Sculpture’ which the director of this centre had attended. The group was the same type of group as I had worked with in cycle 7, in that my working with them was an unpaid consultancy and the group represented the whole organisation.

There were two members of staff whom I knew; one as a student, the other as a colleague from the Country Children’s Services Assoc. The staff were having their regular monthly staff meeting, and the whole meeting had been given over to my working with them.
4.9.2 Action (19.8.1992)

A full video of the workshop is given in Appendix G.

We commenced the workshop with a brief discussion about the participants expectations for the workshop.

These they described as

1. Exploring how they worked together
2. Exploring how they worked individually as part of a team.
3. To explore how other people perceive them.

I briefly explained Human Sculpture in terms of the children’s game ‘statues’, and suggested that it would address the perception people have of each other.

The Building of the (first) Sculpture

This sculpture involved five participants.

The first person took a standing position, towards the back of the space which had been created by our chairs. Her arms hung by her sides and she fluctuated between both legs being straight and one leg bent slightly forward.

The second person took longer time to finalise her position, and lay on her stomach, facing in the same direction as the first person. Her arms were crossed at the elbow and her head raised. Her feet were elevated and bent at the knee.

The third person say cross legged at the feet of the first person, and directly on the right arm of the second person. Her hands were crossed loosely in her lap.

The fourth person sat cross legged alongside the second person to their left. Her hands were crossed loosely on her lap. She sat closer to the second person than the third person had. The fifth person moved immediately to her position, and stood, arm clasped in front of her at the hips. She stood immediately behind the fourth person.
The first person was invited to step out of the sculpture and to return to the sculpture as if she were the fifth person. She returned to the same position as she had held before stepping out of the sculpture.

Reflection by Participants after the (first) Sculpture:

Meaning ascribed by the audience (which included me):
The audience described their perceptions of each stage of the development of the sculpture.

The first person’s statue was described as ‘like someone not sure of what she wanted to do’ and ‘like waiting for a bus’.

Later in discussion about separateness, it was commented that she worked in a different room from others in the sculpture.

The second person’s statue was described as ‘separate’ and ‘trying to get comfortable and still be individual’.

The third person’s statue was described as ‘trying to be an intermediary level’. She was seen as still apart from the other two, and in the level between the first and second statues.

The fourth person’s statue was described as one which balanced the sculpture. It was noted that she was nearly touching the second person because she was comfortable with that person.

The fifth person’s statue was described as one which evened up the sculpture, and one in which she was standing apart. Later when separateness was discussed, it was commented that she worked in the kitchen.

The audience were asked what they had wanted the first person to do when she was invited out of the sculpture to reconsider her position. Some wanted her to return to
the same position and others wanted her to adopt a new position. As she returned to
the same position there was no changed meaning about the sculpture.

*Meaning ascribed by the sculpture builders:*

The members of the sculpture each took a turn to describe their position in the
sculpture.

The first person described her position as arising from not being sure where she
should stand or what she should do. She wanted a position which was comfortable.
In response to her audience comment about *'waiting for a bus'* she added that she
was waiting for something, notably what was going to happen next.

After the forced bridge she commented that the discussion about people fitting in to
the group had hit the nail on the head, in that she was a lot older than the others and
while she did not want to go out socially with the, she wanted to know what they
did.

The second person described her position as also arising from an uncertainty about
what to do as well as a desire to be out of the range of the camera. She wanted to be
comfortable for a while and said she liked lying down.

The third person chose her position as she said *'I didn't want to look like a fool, so I
sat down'*. She explained that she did not feel she could touch the second person, as
she thought they would both laugh.

The fourth person explained her speed at taking up a position, because the previous
person had *'stolen my statue'*, she added that she was confident to sit next to the
second person because they were good friends.

The fifth person described her position as wanting to even the statue up and to create
balance. Later in discussion about being separate, she commented that she did not
feel apart from the others.

*The Building of the (second) Sculpture*

This sculpture involved the remaining four participants who had observers to the
first sculpture.
The first person moved very quickly and sat on her bottom in the centre of the space which had been created by the audience. She had one leg extended and the other, the right leg, raised at the knee. Her body was supported by her arms which were extended behind her.

The second person also moved quickly, placing herself in a cross legged sitting position immediately behind and to the left of the first person. The second person put her right hand on the shoulder of the first person, and her left had rested on her own knee.

The third person also moved quickly, and lay across the extended leg of the first person. She raised her hips to accommodate the extended leg.

The fourth person lay in an extended position, her feet touching the second person and third person. She supported her head on her left arm, and rested her right arm along her side.

The first person was invited to step out of the sculpture and to return to the sculpture as if she were the fourth person. She returned to the same position as she had held before stepping out of the sculpture, except that she changed the extended leg.

**Reflection by Participants after the (second) Sculpture:**

*Meaning ascribed by the audience (which included me):*

The audience described their perceptions of each step in the development of the sculpture.

The first person's statue was described as 'like posing for a magazine' and she was described as confident. One person commented that the first person's character came out in their statue.

The second person's statue was described as being very together, and another member in the audience commented that Jenny and Tracy (the first and second statues) were always together in the office. Others said they looked like pals.
The third person's statue was described as looking silly, and that she wanted to get in there and be touching the other two.

The fourth person's statue was described as touching all the others, but only just.

The audience were asked what they had wanted the first person to do when she was invited out of the sculpture to reconsider her position. They acknowledged that if she changed it would affect the whole sculpture. The small change she had made was barely noticeable, and was mentioned only as an afterthought. The audience were surprised that the change she made was not more significant.

_Meaning ascribed by the sculpture builders:

Each member of the sculpture took a turn to talk about their position in the sculpture.

The first person described her position as 'being me'. Some members of the audience also commented that this statue was 'Just like Jen. Confident'. She added that she wanted to be comfortable, but that the pose was not planned, it was just the position she took at that time.

The second person described her statue as 'Wanting to be close to (the first person). I feel I can touch her'. She had adjusted her position slightly so that she could see the others better.

The third person described her statue as one chosen because she didn't want to be last. She had, she said, been uncomfortable and closed off from the group by that position.

The fourth person described her position in that she wanted to be close but not too close.

The first person, commenting on her return to the sculpture, said that she had wanted to help others in the sculpture who looked uncomfortable because of her departure. Because of her rush to rejoin the sculpture she felt that she had then adopted an uncomfortable position herself.
Action (continued)

I asked the group to explore a combined sculpture, which was investigating my own agenda. A colleague had used my approach to ‘Human Sculpture’ in this way, and I was curious how it would impact on the group. Several attempts were made to bring the two sculptures together.

The other points of discussion included.

1. Separateness and fitting together in the group.
2. The impact of a person changing position.
3. The impact of newcomers on an already formed sculpture. This was linked to one person’s experience of having been the longest serving employee, and older than the other workers, and still wanting to talk work with them, but not wanting to socialise.

4.9.3 Reflection (19.9.1992)

I asked this group to comment in writing about the workshop. These comments came about four weeks after the workshop. In the interim I viewed the video and also wrote a comment.

Geof

In the second sculpture, the first person had created a great vacuum when she stepped out of the sculpture, and this had invited discussion about dependence on people in the organisation.

Discussion also focussed on relationships between the longest serving employee, and the newer employees. I had sense that the longer serving employee was speaking things which had never been expressed before, and that her understanding about her relationship with others in the group was changing. I called this a paradigm shift.
Jenny B. I didn’t learn anything new, just what I knew was confirmed from the experience.

Rosa I thought it was fascinating and was very surprised that I didn’t think I was close to anyone yet looking back I was. I have never experienced this before and would like to do it again and see if anything changes. I would like it to be done using the entire group instead of two separate groups. I thought it was funny that we were talking about people as statues not human. I would like to do something similar again.

Jenny N. I found this a most enlightening experience. It showed where I fit into the team here at Warrawong and ‘though I hadn’t realised it showed a lot of people consciously and unconsciously lean on me. I enjoy being able to offer this support but the workshop showed me that I don’t lean on others much thus giving them the chance to feel good about supporting me. I felt the statues segment was somewhat divisive, intentionally or otherwise. I felt separated from people I usually feel close to. The ‘us’ and ‘them’ concept didn’t have us as a united team. I would have liked to have been able to form the statue again with everyone taking part as one group, not two.
Perhaps this is because I like harmony and don’t like to work in divided situations. The workshop certainly brought out some disharmonies and served to reinforce the old adage of ‘United we stand, divided we fall’.

Unsigned *What I gained:* I was able to see where I am within the team of people I work with. I probably know this already but it was interesting to see how it showed in the exercise we did. I was also able to see where the other staff see themself as part of the team, again, I
had a pretty good idea of what this was but it really showed in what we did.

How I gained the above: I gained everything from doing the statues and discussing them afterwards. Very interesting how things rang true.

Gabi

What did you learn?

- The way other staff feel and relate to the centre and each other.
- Their relationship with each other.
- How I relate and function in the centre and on a personal level.

How did you learn it?

- Through experiencing the feelings by making the statue, being able to be concretely involved.
- Openly discussing feelings whilst we were in the statue.
- Commenting on other staff without mocking or feeling mocked.

Unsigned

Excellent. He had the ability to make you feel as if you wanted to be there and not a waste of time. He had the language that you understood, and know what he was trying to tell you. Once you got into the inservice it made you think about life in general. I would like a follow up and see if I would participate in a different way.

What I got out of it was more than I thought. As time went by I kept relating back to the statues. Geof understood my meaning of wanting to look at everyone. I found this incredible. What made me sad was it pointed out that some of the staff did not want me in the group, because as I tried to move closer I was told to move back, so the statues pointed out that if I wanted to become more involved with the group some would not let me.

If I did do this inservice again I think I would change my position - to what I do not know yet. A brilliant inservice.
I feel that by the end of the inservice that I had sat back and taken a
look at myself and was able to see how other people see me. This has
made me stop and think at different times since the inservice about
what I am doing and what message others are getting from my body
language. I feel that the analysis of the statues was very effective as it
allowed everybody to think about and say how they perceived each
other, including themselves, while they were in the statue formation.
This intern gave an indication of how we saw each other and ourselves
during day to day activities.

I feel that the inservice had a lot to offer, not only on the night, but
also during the days that followed. I also feel that this inservice
should be repeated at least twice a year to really make us stop and
look at ourselves.

4.9.4 Reflection (13.12.1992)

In order to understand the participants reflections and my own reflections in the light of
this inquiry I addressed the inquiry questions which had arisen from previous cycles.

1. Did the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ produce images which facilitated
articulation?

The images which were talked about focussed on attachment/lack of attachment and
comfort/discomfort. These images prompted quite a lengthy discussion about people
fitting into a group and being comfortable in the group and with each other.
The sculpture prompted discussion about these topics. In this discussion people were
able to clarify what they meant about belonging/not belonging to a group and
distinguished between physical touching and inclusion by being in each others sight.
2. Did the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ invite communication about the Organisation?

The group felt that the issues which had been raised by the exercise included:

- Individuality
- Balance
- Perception

- Closeness
- Uncomfortableness
- and Feelings

and when asked how many of them felt were issues which related to the organisation, they said all of them.

The debate which followed related to the accuracy of the sculpture, and while they disagreed on the accuracy, the important thing was that they were discussing how close/distant they were as a group.

3. Did the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ generate an agenda of issues which were relevant to the Organisation?

The feedback sheets all suggested that the agenda which had been raised by the exercise contained issues which were relevant to the organisation or reaffirmed issues which participants had already known.

One person who had been in the first sculpture, made the comment ‘You hit the nail on the head’, and this suggested to me that the discussion, for her, had particular relevance.

Her own articulation about the problem she had of wanting to be part of the group and acknowledging she was older, I believe was an articulation of a problem she had been experiencing in this group, and that the sculpture gave her words to express this.

4. Did the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ assist in planning for action about addressing the issues?

The intention to have a specific action planning part of the process did not happen. I felt concerned about imposing the action planning on the group, when they were not clearly expressing any problems which required an action plan. It may have been more
that individuals developed action plans about individual problems, or that the paradigm shift allowed them to see situations as less problematic than they had before.

5. Did the process of 'Human Sculpture' empower the participants?
The workshop was enjoyed by all the participants, however only two participants seemed empowered by the process. The director and the longest serving employee both expressed a new way of looking at the situation, which gave them satisfaction.

My perception is that the employee who expressed her closeness/separateness in the group was particularly empowered by this. I am basing this perception on the delight she expressed when she said ‘You hit the nail on the head’.

6. & 7. How did I facilitate the process and the inquiry?
In this workshop I felt I blended in as one of the participants, and gave equal contributions to the construction of meaning. The process was very focussed on what the group wanted to do. For this reason there was no action planning, as this would have cut across their needs.

In the reflection about this cycle I have put a greater focus on the meaning which is constructed, and the different types of meaning. This acknowledges that in the inquiry process different inquirers will generate different meaning from the same situations.

I was aware in this cycle of two types of guided reflection. There is the type of guided reflection which uses ‘active listening’ and open questions, which helps the participant to reflect bases on their own agenda.

There is a second type of guided reflection which is driven by the facilitators agenda and which raises open questions to answer my agenda. 

Eg. What issues are raised?
Were any of these issues linked to the organisation?

8. What happens without the guided fantasy?

The workshop showed that the absence of the visualisation does not harm the overall process. What is important in the process is an opportunity to cognitively warm up to the activity. This can be done by asking the participants what they want to achieve from the workshop. An alternative cognitive warming up to the visualisation was my describing the activity as being like ‘statues’. The risk here is that the group are then working from their understanding of the game and the rules of that game.

9. What happens if the sculpture is repeated?

The sculpture was not repeated, and the attempt to bring the two sculptures together in a combined sculpture did not succeed.

10. Are there differences in the way meaning is given?

In this cycle I again noted the different ways people described their choice of statue in the sculpture. In the previous cycle, I had distinguished between expressions which indicated ‘out there’ motivation and ‘in here’ motivation, driving the choice of statue. I also contrasted explanations for statues which indicated a response to others actions and explanations for statues which indicated initiated action.

In this cycle there are some ‘here and now’ explanations for statues such as the first person in the first sculpture who described her position as arising from not being sure where she should stand or what she should do. Others adopt a more rational approach to their description such as the fifth person in the first sculpture who gave as a reason for her choice of statue, that this would balance the sculpture. This is an example of ‘out there’ motivation, that this person is being driven by power outside of herself. I interpreted this explanation as suggesting a disempowered person.
In contrast, the second person in the first sculpture justified her choice of statue in the sculpture as being a choice for comfort. This, to me, is an example of 'in here' motivation, and I interpreted this explanation as suggesting an empowered person.

11. The context of 'Human Sculpture'
As on previous occasions, the group had no other experience of 'Human Sculpture, to compare with, so it was contextually understood in the area of Organisational Communication.

Two new inquiry questions emerged in this cycle of the inquiry.

12. What is the significance of a combined sculpture?
When I presented 'Human Sculpture' at the Second World Congress on Action Learning conference (Brisbane 1992), two colleagues mentioned to me that when they used a 'Human Sculpture' activity modelled on the process with which I had been working, they had asked their group to complete a combined sculpture. The opportunity for this experience arose with this group and led into a discussion about how the sculpture could fit together and what that might contribute in meaning about the organisation.

13. How relevant is the term paradigm shift to explain the experience?
The term I believe has application to this exercise. For a number of participants, there was a change in belief system. Some of the examples of an insight into the belief system were:

Comment by Jenny N. after the workshop

'...the workshop showed me that I don't lean on others much thus giving them the chance to feel good about supporting me.'

Unsigned comment after the workshop
'What I got out of it was more than I thought. As time went by I kept relating back to the statues. Geof understood my meaning of wanting to look at everyone. I found this incredible. What made me sad was it pointed out that some of the staff did not want me in the group, because as I tried to move closer I was told to move back, so the statues pointed out that if I wanted to become more involved with the group some would not let me.'

Unsigned comment after the workshop

'This has made me stop and think at different times since the inservice about what I am doing and what message others are getting from my body language.'

After addressing the emergent questions from this and previous cycles, I then addressed the four topics which I had been addressing in previous cycles.

'Script'

When a person explains why they have chosen a particular statue in the sculpture, this may be providing an insight into their motivation, and this in turn can give an insight into the belief system they hold.

For example: someone describing their actions as 'I wanted to be relaxed' is offering an insight into their beliefs about themself.

someone describing the sculpture as 'not balanced' is providing an insight into a belief about that particular sculpture and perhaps the group forming that sculpture.

This belief system is important when considering whether a person is likely to rewrite a given 'script'. If a person has a high belief system in their own power, they are likely to be able to rewrite a 'script'.
"Human Sculpture"

The process of 'Human Sculpture' is extremely flexible; however, the facilitation of the process is important. The 'Human Sculpture' is just a catalyst for discussion, hence the facilitation must be aimed at achieving open and honest discussion.

The procedure which has been followed in this cycle, could be supplemented with an opportunity to identify things which have been said by participants, which were beliefs about themselves.

My hypothesis is that some of the 'scripts' which were articulated as the participants gave meaning to their sculptural positions were expressions of their beliefs about themselves, other people or the organisation.

Bawden (1989) refers to the understanding of a situation as a 'weltanschauung' or a 'window on the world'. Because my 'weltanschauung' is belief-laden, when it changes, I undergo a 'paradigm' shift. I believe the 'Human Sculpture' works in the same way. The way people are understanding their organisational life changes as a result of understanding their organisational life through a metaphorical window of sculpture. This window gives them a new vocabulary, which includes words such as 'script' and 'bridge', and it also takes an old vocabulary (i.e. The vocabulary which we use of sculpture) and applies it to a new situation.

I believe that the 'scripts' which are accessed through 'Human Sculpture', or any 'script' accessing activity for that matter, give an insight into the belief system we hold about ourselves, others and the organisation for which we work. This final step is an intuitive one. It begs to be investigated in the next cycle of the inquiry.
Facilitation of 'Human Sculpture'

The facilitation skills are all related to being group centred, and responding to the direction the group desires to go, even if this may be different direction than previous experience of 'Human Sculpture' has led me.

Facilitation of a Human Inquiry into 'Human Sculpture'

The process of asking the group for feedback is dependent on the agenda which is set. From a number of the feedback sheets I suspected that the agenda was more about could the workshop be done again, rather than how effective it was for them.

The more I pursue this inquiry the more I start to question my belief system about research.

4.9.5 Emergent Questions

Two new inquiry questions have emerged:
What is the significance of a combined sculpture?
How relevant is the term paradigm shift to explain the experience?

4.9.6 Communication

Concurrent with this cycle of the inquiry I was presenting work related to the Dramatistic Approach at several national and international conferences. Two of these conference presentations were published [Hill (1992) & Hill (1993)]. These publications and presentations gave me an opportunity to have my work exposed to critical reflection, in the national and international arena.
4.9.7 Planning

Soon after this cycle of the inquiry, I was invited to repeat the workshop to a group of people closely associated with the group in this cycle. I decided to comply with that request. The context of the cycle would be very similar and would allow opportunities to respond to a different agenda, thus exploring the flexibility of 'Human Sculpture'.

4.10 CYCLE 9

4.10.1 Context

I was invited to work in an early childhood centre with ten staff (seven of whom attended the workshop) by the secretary who had been a participant in a previous Wollongong workshop. The secretary did not attend the workshop.

The staff were having their regular monthly staff meeting, and the whole meeting had been given over to my working with them. Some of the staff had heard about my ‘Human Sculpture’ work from a previous director who had attended a demonstration workshop. She had not like the workshop and had given a negative report to her work colleagues.

4.10.2 Action (30.11.1992)

The workshop was videoed. A full video of the workshop is given in Appendix H.

We commenced the workshop with a brief discussion about the participants expectations for the workshop.

These they described as

1. Communication
2. Friendship
3. Shared work
4. Appreciating that everyone has something to offer.
5. Commitment
6. Loyalty

and they commented that they had been unaware that this meeting was to be a staff development. They had only learned that day that I was the guest.

I briefly explained Human Sculpture in terms of the children’s game ‘statues’.

The Building of the (first) Sculpture:

This sculpture involved three participants.

The first person took a standing position, on the edge of the space which had been created by our chairs. Her arms were held out from her sides, like a scarecrow. She stood on the left leg, and lifted here right foot behind her, bending the leg at the knee.

The second person also stood, on the left of the first person, supporting her around the shoulders with her right arm, and extending her left arm in the same way as the previous person.

The third person stood on the right of the first person, with her left arm around the back of the first person and her left hand on her hip. She crossed her right foot across to touch the first person on the foot.

The first person was invited to step out of the sculpture and to return to the sculpture as if she were the third person. She returned to the same position as she had held before stepping out of the sculpture.

Reflection by Participants after the (first) Sculpture:

Meaning ascribed by the audience (which included me):

The audience described their perceptions of each stage of the development of the sculpture.
The first person’s position was described as looking uncomfortable or ‘silly’. This was clarified that only the top half looked uncomfortable.

The second person’s position was described as happy and supportive. One member of the audience commented ‘That’s Christa’, suggesting that this pose was one they would have expected from this person.

The third person’s position was described as ‘wanting to do something different’.

The audience were asked what they had wanted the first person to do when she was invited out of the sculpture to reconsider her position. One of the audience commented that she expected this person to return to their original position. Another commented that she expected this person to embrace both the other two sculpture, rather than try and fit between them.

**Meaning ascribed by the sculpture builders:**

The members of the sculpture each took a turn to describe their position in the sculpture.

The first person described her position as being the first position that had come into her mind. She commented that she had felt silly doing this, as she had been the first.

The second person described her position as one which would make the first person feel OK.

The third person chose her position as she said, to even out the sculpture and provide support.

When asked about her return to the sculpture after reconsidering her position, the first person commented that she had to return to the original position as this was better than leaving the other two with an obvious vacancy between them.

**Action (continued)**

This sculpture involved the remaining four participants who had been observers to the first sculpture.

The first person moved very quickly and knelt on hands and knees on the floor, with her head up.
The second person also moved quickly, and sat to the left of the first person, holding her head. She then stood up and after walking around the space sat down stating that she could not go at this time.

The alternate second person sat cross legged on the floor, alongside the left shoulder of the first person, and placed her hands in her lap.

The third person knelt at the rear right hand side and touched the first person, by resting her left elbow on the right buttock of the first person.

The fourth person, who had previously had an abortive attempt as second person, stood this time firstly hunched, then squatting at the back of all three, touching the second and third people on the shoulders.

The first person was invited to step out of the sculpture and to return to the sculpture as if she were the fourth person. She returned to the back of the sculpture, hunching down to touch the shoulders of the third and fourth person.

Reflection by participants after the (second) Sculpture:

**Meaning ascribed by the audience (which included me):**

The audience described their perceptions of each stage of the development of the sculpture.

The first person's position was described as being very structured and hard to join on to. It was described as someone being by herself.

The second person's position was described as watching and a bit distant.

The third person's position was described as 'being unsure of herself and like she wanted to stay away'.

The fourth person's position was described as bringing it all together but looking uncomfortable.

The audience were asked what they had wanted the first person to do when she was invited out of the sculpture to reconsider her position. One of the audience commented that she wanted this person to return to the same position but sitting rather than on all fours. The all fours position had looked uncomfortable. The other
two members of the audience nodded an agreement and affirmed that they had wanted something similar. They felt the embracing position looked uncomfortable.

*Meaning ascribed by the sculpture builders:*

The members of the sculpture each took a turn to describe their position in the sculpture.

The first person described her position as one which was stable.

The second person described her position as one in which she felt comfortable.

The third person described her position as that she may as well sit on the other side.

The fourth person described her first attempt at joining the sculpture, as not being suitable for her, because she likes to join everything together and be in the middle.

She expressed a desire to be first. This same reasoning explained the position which she later took. She described her choice making as *'That's the way I am'*'. When asked about her return to the sculpture after reconsidering her position, the first person commented that she was aware of the hole she had created, and that she had a desire to bring the sculpture together.

*Action (continued)*

We compared the issues discussed in the sculpture with the original agenda, and agreed that the things which had been mentioned in the agenda had been addressed in the sculpture. The sculpture had enabled these people to discuss the topics on their agenda.

We talked about the problems of the sculptures and addressed the difficulties of bringing these two sculptures together. It was suggested that if we started out to make one sculpture that this would be different. On this suggestion the group formed a seven person sculpture.
The building of the (third) Sculpture:

The first person (who had been the first person in sculpture 2) sat cross legged on the floor with her hands in her lap. In the previous sculpture she had been on hands and knees on the floor.

The second person (who had been the third person in sculpture 1) knelt to the right of the first person, with her left arm on the first person. In the previous sculpture she had stood to the right of the first person with her left arm around their shoulder and right foot touching their foot.

The third person (who had been the second person in sculpture 1) lay on the floor with her head in the lap of the first person. In the previous sculpture she had stood to the left of the first person, supporting them with her right arm.

The fourth person (who had been the fourth person in sculpture 2) knelt behind the first person with her hands on the first person's shoulders. She was indecisive about her position and at one point left the sculpture. In the previous sculpture she had squatted behind the sculpture with her hands on the others shoulders, after being indecisive about the appropriate position for her.

The fifth person (who had been the first person in sculpture 1) stood behind the first person, with her left hand on the first person's shoulder. In the previous sculpture she had stood like a scarecrow.

The sixth person (who had been the third person in sculpture 2) sat with her feet tucked under her and supported herself on her right arm. She sat to the left of the first person. In the previous sculpture she had knelt to the right of the first person slightly behind her.

The seventh person (who had been the second person in sculpture 2) knelt alongside the fifth person. In the previous sculpture she had knelt alongside the first person.

We did not discuss these positions, however I put to them my perception which was that several people in the sculpture, even though they may have changed positions, still followed a particular theme:
For example: The person who in their first sculpture took a hands and knees position on the floor, was in the second sculpture still providing a base when she sat cross legged. The person who in their first sculpture had had difficulty finding the right place, again in this one had difficulty.

The director of the group had made a major change from a supportive sculpture to one which was reliant upon others and vulnerable. We were able to liken this to a change in directorship style, and examine the implications of such a dramatic change. When we discussed the implications of ‘Human Sculpture’ work, the director expressed satisfaction that the activity had allowed her to discuss things with the group which she had felt for some time. In particular she was pleased to address the issue of dominant members of the team.

4.10.3 Reflection (13.12.1992)

I asked the group to comment in writing about the workshop on what they had learned and why we may have learned. This agenda for reflection was on my suggestion. These comments came about a week after the workshop.

Geof

(Facilitator) I was reinforced through working with this group, that beyond doing the sculpture, little needs to be planned. The greatest benefit from this work, is being guided by the needs of the group.

In this workshop, their needs were to do a repeat sculpture using all seven, and this proved to be of benefit for all the group.

Christa

(Director) A good way to start staff talking in a non-threatening way. Barbara and I have been talking about different approaches to working with others. Giving others a chance to participate. I
feel I need to give much more support to Sonia (our second teacher). Lynda and I have talked about feeling unsettled in her work environment. Thank you for doing the body sculpture with us.

Judith

It was very interesting how something so unstructured as a statue sculpture can give such insight into people’s personalities and traits.

Unsigned

Very good way of handling staff development issues. Positive reinforcement for everyone! Everyone could be involved and were able to contribute to the statues!!

Unsigned

I found the inservice very interesting. It has made me conscious of the different personalities that I work with and will make me more aware of their feelings.

Unsigned

A very positive way to help staff members see their personalities and why they do things the way they do.

Unsigned

The body sculpture idea was very interesting. It made me realise some of the problems I was having at work and at home and gave me an incentive to try and sort them out.

Unsigned

I found it very interesting. Gave me something to think about. Be aware of other people’s personalities their thought and ideas. It was helpful and informative.

In order to understand the participants reflections and my own reflections in the light of the inquiry I addressed the inquiry questions which had arisen from previous cycles.
1. Did the process of 'Human Sculpture' produce images which facilitated articulation?

2. Did the process of 'Human Sculpture' invite communication about the Organisation?

3. Did the process of 'Human Sculpture' generate an agenda of issues which were relevant to the Organisation?

The process of 'Human Sculpture' with this particular group generated images which invited discussion about inclusion/exclusion and support/absence of support. At least one participant had said that this facilitated her expressing ideas which she previously had not expressed, and others describing the process as interesting or positive. This is particularly important in the light of some participants having a negative perception about this form of staff development prior to the meeting. The topics raised were relevant to the group agenda.

4. Did the process of 'Human sculpture' assist in planning for action about addressing the issues?

While there was no formal action planning, several comments were made throughout the workshop about action planning. In particular the director encouraged staff to be aware of those who step in and act, and for them to be mindful that the workload was evenly spread. Two of the participants expressed action plans in their comment about the workshop suggesting that they would now use this information to resolve other issues.

5. Did the process of 'Human Sculpture' empower the participants?

Most expressed value about the workshop and satisfaction of having talked about these issues. One was 'confused' at the end of the workshop and was wanting to think more about her actions in the workshop.

One participant was very disempowered at the beginning of the workshop because she had not known that it was about staff development. Later in the workshop she was able
to talk about that and seemed to me, by the end of the workshop to be much more comfortable in it. I felt it was empowering for her to be able to comment on the lack of information about the workshop and how that was uncomfortable for her to the extent she almost walked out.

6. & 7. How did I facilitate the process and the inquiry?
In this group I was more responsive to the group than to the documented process of ‘Human Sculpture’. This led us to discover new aspects about ‘Human Sculpture’ and identified the flexibility of the process.
As usual there was reflective listening, however I was also conscious of a ‘framing’ response wherein I reframed a comment made from the group into the action of the sculpture, or reframed the sculpture into actions in their day to day life.
The language I used encouraged individuals to ‘own’ their perception and their solutions to problems.
For example: When one participant said that another participant was not ‘connected’ I asked ‘How might she have been to make it more connected for you?’

8. What happens without a guided fantasy?
The absence of this warm up, and the rapid leading into the ‘Human Sculpture’ demonstrated that the guided fantasy is not necessary.

9. What happens if the sculpture is repeated?
In this group the opportunity arose to repeat the sculpture. This demonstrated that even the repeated (or rehearsed) sculpture can still reveal repetitive ‘scripts’.
One participant actively changed her ‘script’ and invited comment from the others about that change. A number of the other participants, despite taking a different position from their position in the previous sculpture, retained the salient elements of the statue they had held previously.
10. Are there differences in the way meaning is given?

In the previous two cycles, I had been noting the way in which a person described their choice of statue in the sculpture, and linking this to an insight of their sense of personal power.

I had suggested in the previous cycle, that this intuitive link could be explored more formally in this cycle. In this cycle I was more responsive to the group agenda, than to the documented process of ‘Human Sculpture’, or my own inquiry agenda needs. The opportunity to examine the connection between ‘script’ and personal paradigm did not arise, and remains an issue of inquiry for future inquirers.

There are examples in this cycle which I have interpreted as connections between ‘script’ and personal paradigm. A person explaining their position in the sculpture in terms of ‘I wanted to balance the sculpture out’, is recognising the needs of the sculpture over her own stated needs. This choice is driven by ‘out there’ motivation, but is still recognising her choice to initiate changes in the sculpture.

A person explaining their position in the sculpture in terms of ‘I have to get in the middle, but that’s the way I am’, is beginning to recognise her own needs, an ‘in here’ motivation, and also recognising a helplessness to change that ‘script’. The person explaining her position in the sculpture in terms of ‘I felt comfortable sitting on the floor next to her’, is being driven by ‘in here’ motivation, and also recognising her power to initiate action.

11. The context of ‘Human Sculpture’.

For this group the context was presented as management consultancy and this was not challenged.
12. What is the significance of a combined sculpture?
In this cycle the request to have a combined sculpture arose from the participants, rather than arising from my own agenda, as had happened in the previous cycle. This provided an opportunity to explore the workings of the total team, and was perhaps easier to achieve because the overall team was small.

13. How relevant is the term paradigm shift to explain the experience?
Only one person in the group commented about a potential to change. Her wording 'It made me realise some of the problems I was having at work', could suggest that the 'Human Sculpture' gave her a new way of understanding her problems and that this was the 'incentive to try and sort them out'. In this regard it could be said that she has had a paradigm shift, however this is supposition. A differently structured experience may be able to tap her paradigm about her self and her workplace, and thus more accurately assess whether there has in fact been a paradigm shift.

It was becoming evident to me that, the structure of the 'Human Sculpture' workshop, while appropriate to explore the emergent questions relevant to 'Human Sculpture', was inappropriate for exploring emergent questions related to 'script'. As nine cycles of inquiry had been completed, it seemed appropriate to conclude the inquiry at this cycle. My reflection about this cycle and the previous cycles is given in Chapter Four.
5  CHAPTER FOUR

5.1  INQUIRY CONCLUSIONS

5.1.1 Inquiry Context

This inquiry has been contextualised in the Dramatistic Approach, which has been
defined (Bordow & More 1991:60) as an organisational inquiry method using dramatic
or theatrical metaphors to draw out aspects of interpersonal communication. One of the
propositions made within this inquiry (This volume: 8) is that the notion of ‘script’ is
the primary dramatic metaphor used in the Dramatistic Approach.

‘Script’ has been defined as

a) a routine for social interpersonal behaviour;
b) a socialised acquisition;
c) a predominantly unconscious way of relating

(Ibid:11)

It has further been proposed, that the main purpose for using the notion of ‘script’, is
so that people in organisations may become conscious of the ‘scripts’ they use, and that
that will commence a process of empowerment through which they can ‘rewrite’
dysfunctional ‘scripts’.

The apparent absence of strategies for consciousness raising and ‘script’ rewriting in the
organisational setting (Ibid:14) has prompted this inquirer to pursue a line of inquiry
which examines the technique of ‘Human Sculpture’ (Hill:1991b) with regard to its
appropriateness as a technique for the Dramatistic Approach.

5.1.2 Inquiry Methodology

The methodology proposed for the inquiry was multiple cycles of collaborative inquiry
(action research). The nine cycles of inquiry have involved seven organisational groups
and six non organisational groups. The six non organisational groups were exposed to
‘Human Sculpture’ in the context of a ‘Spontaneous Drama’ workshop. The seven
organisational groups along with an additional seventeen organisational groups, which
were not included in the inquiry cycles, were also exposed to the technique of ‘Human Sculpture’ in the context of a workshop entitled ‘Working with Change’ (See Appendix I). The inquiry formally involved one hundred and fifty people and informally involved over five hundred people.

5.1.3 Inquiry Data
The inquiry has generated several different collections of data, each of which has contributed to the inquiry conclusion.

The primary data is an inquirer log (This volume: 36-120) which documents the inquirer’s changing construction of meaning about the inquiry topic. This data is presented in a series of action accounts, each of which is accompanied by a reflection on the action.

The secondary data consists of workshop survey response sheets for the inquiry group in cycle four, and for the three inquiry groups in cycle five (Appendix C); a workshop transcript for the inquiry group in cycle seven (Appendix D); a transcript of the workshop discussion of the workshop in cycle seven (Appendix F); a video of the inquiry groups in cycles eight and nine (Appendices G & H); participant response sheets from the inquiry groups in cycles eight and nine (This volume: 97-99, 115-116).

5.1.4 Inquiry Data Analysis
One of the signifying features of collaborative inquiry is that the co-researchers are encouraged to contribute to the inquiry through their analysis of the data. The co-researchers in the context of this inquiry, were the participants in the workshops detailed in cycles four, five, six, seven, eight and nine.

Co-researcher analysis in cycles four and five was encouraged by using a post workshop survey response sheet. It was recognised in cycle five (Ibid:57) that this method was incongruent with the inquiry methodology and replaced with workshop discussions in cycles six and seven, and workshop participant response sheets in cycles eight and nine.
A substantial amount of co-researcher analysis contributed to the co-researcher group gaining a greater understanding of their workgroup interpersonal communication practices. In addition, co-researcher analysis also contributed to an analysis of the process of 'Human Sculpture' (Ibid: 48, 55, 61, 73, 77, 78, 97, 98, 99, 115) and in these instances their analysis has been reported without metacomment by the thesis writer's opinion, further metacomment would suggest some level of inadequacy in the co-researcher's analysis. The co-researcher analysis has contributed significantly to the thesis writer's understanding of the inquiry topic.

The other data analysis incorporated in this inquiry has involved:

a) guided reflection on the action of each cycle of this inquiry, driven by an agenda of questions which emerged from the previous cycles of the inquiry, prompted either by the inquirer, the co-researchers, or the inquiry supervisor. In several instances this reflection was critical reflection (Ibid: 41, 47, 57, 61, 77, 78, 79, 89, 102, 104, 108) and prompted changes in either the construction of meaning about the inquiry topic or about the inquiry methodology.

b) statistical analysis of the workshop survey response sheets. While this analysis contributed to the early formation of an inquiry hypothesis, it was also recognised as being an analysis method which was incongruent with the inquiry methodology (Ibid: 51).

c) discourse analysis of the transcripts of the workshop, the videos of the workshops, the workshop discussion transcript for cycle seven and the participant response sheets for cycles eight and nine.

The discourse analysis has been incorporated into the action reflection in each of the inquiry cycles.

The discourse analysis of the workshop discussion transcript for the workshop in cycle seven of this inquiry, identified with workshop agenda and this led to a conclusion that
‘Human Sculpture’ assisted the discussion about the agenda (Ibid: 100). The discourse analysis of the workshop in cycle seven led to a conclusion that the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ was not effective in identifying beliefs which people have about themselves (Ibid: 105).

The discourse analysis of the video of the workshop activity in cycle eight, together with the co-researcher analysis form this inquiry cycle and the participant response sheets (Ibid: 97-99) identified the discussion about the involvement of the longest serving team member (Ibid: 101), and the occasional absence of one team member from the team and the grief that that caused (Appendix G), and this analysis reinforced the already established conclusion that ‘Human Sculpture’ helps to address here and now issues for the team (Ibid: 100).

The discourse analysis of the video identified the unwillingness of the participants to action plan (Ibid: 101) leading to a conclusion that although there was not a group action plan, individuals had made individual plans.

The discourse analysis of the video for cycle eight analysed the way in which participants constructed meaning about the ‘sculptures’, and this lead to a hypothesis about the different types of motivation (Ibid: 103). Discourse analysis also identified and named two facilitator skills (Ibid: 102).

The discourse analysis of the video of the workshop activity in cycle nine identified the agenda for this group and affirmed and already held conclusion that the ‘Human Sculpture’ assisted the discussion about the agenda (Ibid: 116).

The discourse analysis of the video of the workshop activity in cycle nine also focussed on the fact that the workshop started off with a negative attitude about the workshop by one of the participants, because she had not been fully advised of the nature of the workshop. The anxiety in this instance was not related to the ‘Human Sculpture’ per se, but had more to do with the failure to notify this staff member about the nature of the workshop. Despite those feelings of anxiety, nervousness and reluctance, none of the participants commented on this aspect in their feedback sheets. On the contrary
they commented on how much they enjoyed the workshop. In the light of the additional discourse analysis of the feedback sheets it was concluded that the feelings of nervousness anxiety and reluctance were short lived and that during the course of the 'Human Sculpture' process, participants moved beyond the nervousness of a new and unfamiliar activity and focussed on what the activity had to offer them.

The discourse analysis of the video of the workshop activity in cycle nine also focussed on two specific events

The incidence of one staff member feeling she had nothing to contribute to the team (Ibid: 116).

The incidence of the staff member shifting her understanding about her relationship with the team (Ibid: 119).

and this analysis contributed to the hypothesis that the technique of ‘Human Sculpture’ helps to articulate ‘scripts’.

The discourse analysis of the video of the workshop activity in cycle nine focussed on the facilitation of ‘Human Sculpture’ and identified that repetition of the ‘Human Sculpture’ activity with the same group may produce difference sculpture, however the theme of those sculpture is likely to remain the same (Ibid: 114). The discourse analysis of the video highlighted the inadequacy of the ‘Human Sculpture’ process to identify people’s beliefs about themselves, which influenced their ability to ‘rewrite’ a ‘script’, and this identified that the methodology was no longer adequate to address the issues which were emerging in cycles eight and nine of the inquiry (Ibid: 119).

5.1.5 Inquiry Conclusion
The inquiry resulted in considerable meta comment about the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ including

• Naming of Human Sculpture (Ibid: 38)
• The concept of ‘stretching the metaphor’ (Ibid: 44)
• Whether the Facilitator joins the Human Sculpture (Ibid: 49)

• Phases of the Human Sculpture process (Ibid: 56)

• Similarity between facilitating Human Sculpture and facilitating Human Inquiry (Ibid: 61, 80)

• Facilitator creating a psychological climate in which intervention can safely be ignored (Ibid: 81)

• The main teaching points in Human Sculpture (Ibid: 82)

• Repeating the Human Sculpture (Ibid: 84)

• The skills relevant for facilitating a Human Sculpture (Ibid: 88 & 89, 102, 106, 117)

• The significance of a repeated sculpture (Ibid: 104, 118) and a drawing together of many of these themes (Ibid: 138-147) to reach a final conclusion that ‘Human Sculpture’ (Ibid) is a technique appropriate for use within the Dramatistic Approach.

5.1.6 Inquiry Validity Indicators

The indicators which measure the validity of this conclusion are:

1. That the technique enables groups of people in organisational settings to talk about their interpersonal behaviour.

2. That the technique enables people who identify dysfunctional ‘scripts’, to rewrite these, following an acceptance of the primary metaphor of ‘script’.

The technique enabled discussion about organisational interpersonal behaviour. The inquiry conclusion, that ‘Human Sculpture’ is an appropriate technique for the Dramatistic Approach, is validated firstly by the fact that in the seven organisational groups of the inquiry, the technique enabled people to discuss issues about their organisational interpersonal relationships.
With the first organisational group to be exposed to 'Human Sculpture' in cycle four, the discussion about the sculpture (This volume: 47) involved considerable discussion about responsibility to the organisation and appropriate leadership action. Both issues were pertinent issues to that organisational group.

Eight of the fifteen participants in this workshop responded to a post workshop survey and only two commented that the sculpture was not an indicator of that particular organisations organisational issues. Of the six remaining respondents, one indicated that they felt the positions taken in the sculpture were relevant to personalities and roles within the group. A second respondent commented that whenever the sculpture had been used, that it had had surprising accuracy and that it helped explain questionable behaviour previously observed.

The three groups exposed to 'Human Sculpture' in cycle five involved forty-one participants, of which nineteen responded to a post workshop survey. Their responses varied, with sixteen of the respondents agreeing that the 'Human Sculpture' mirrored relationships which existed in the organisation group. In two of the groups, participants commented after the workshop, about how perceptive I had been in addressing organisational issues (Ibid: 52). The three groups discussed issues which were pertinent to their organisational situations such as trying to include others in the team, leadership and organisational conflict (Appendix C).

The survey form used with all four organisational groups did not specifically ask the question whether 'Human Sculpture' helped the group to discuss their organisational issues. This flaw in the inquiry method, identified too late in the cycles of inquiry to warrant a return questionnaire for the groups in cycles four and five, has been overcome by reverting to the inference of the responses in workshop surveys.

Question 4 of the survey asked whether the respondent believed that the sculpture acted as an indicator for problems in the organisation. Four participants within the four
groups did not believe that this was the case, and it can be inferred that for these people, the 'Human Sculpture' did not enable them to talk about organisational problems, however, the remaining twenty three respondents in varying qualifications of agreement, believed that the 'Human Sculpture' was an indicator of organisational issues, and it can be inferred that for these people the 'Human Sculpture' assisted them in the discussion of their problems.

Cycle six was not an organisational group.

In cycle seven a number of the participants commented on how successfully 'Human Sculpture' addressed their organisational issues, despite it opening a Pandora's Box. Di, the Director said

'I have dwelt on it a lot since and I just think it was remarkable. In the end when Wendy (the previous Director) came in, she was actually in the other group, and that was the reason that she came into our group, she came late and that was why but how it was so right that it turned up with us.'

(Appendix F)

and Judy one of the staff members said

'I found it very revealing too. I thought it certainly revealed a lot and with missed opportunities, as it was said, that was an amazing analysis of the way people move within the team. They very often don't look for the opportunity that is there; that people are looking from only one angle, they don't see the opportunities that are there.' (Appendix F)

Another staff member said

'I enjoyed doing the sculpture and I thought it was a very valuable exercise.'

(Appendix F)

In cycle eight the participants were not specifically asked whether the activity had assisted them in discussing their organisational issues, however it is evident from their discussion at the end of the workshop, where they identified the issues which the
'Human Sculpture' had addressed, that all the issues discussed were ones which were pertinent to this group's organisational relationships (Appendix G), and that 'Human Sculpture' did enable them to talk about organisational issues. The participants in this workshop differed in their belief about the accuracy of the sculpture as an indicator of current organisational issues, however both the Director (Tracey) and one the staff (Rose) make comments that the sculpture was very accurate. Rose's comment, that the 'Human Sculpture' activity 'hit the nail right on the head' (Appendix G) suggests to me that not only was the activity successful for Rose in helping her to understand her relationships with other staff members, but that this insight was a freeing and empowering experience.

The workshop feedback responses from this group suggest that all the members of that group liked the activity and that five of the nine participants (Jenny N, Gabi and three unsigned responses: This volume: 97-99) linked these positive responses to specific organisational issues.

In cycle nine the participants were again not asked specifically to comment on whether the activity had enabled them to discuss their organisational issues. In this particular instance, because the director had not informed them about the nature of the workshop, some participants started with a negative attitude to the workshop, some participants started with a negative attitude to the workshop. By the end of the workshop all were in favour of the workshop process, and in particular the participant who had been most distressed that she had not been informed of the workshop content, suggested 'at the beginning of the workshop I felt angry. I could have walked out. I feel a lot calmer now. I can see benefit in it' (Appendix H). She added 'when I am not informed about what I am going to be involved in I feel threatened and angry', which clarified that her anxiety, nervousness and reluctance were more linked to the lack of information given to her about the workshop rather than the 'Human Sculpture' process. The feedback sheets at the end of the workshop from this group of people were all positive suggesting the workshop was a valuable experience.
Christa the Director said it was
‘a good way to start staff talking in a non-threatening way’;
Judith, one of the staff members said it
‘gave such insight into people’s personalities and traits’;
Another staff member (unsigned) said
‘it made me conscious of the different personalities that I work with’;
and yet another staff member (unsigned) said it was
‘a very positive way to help staff members see their personalities and why they do things the way they do’;
Another staff member (unsigned) said the activity
‘made me realise some of the problems I was having at work’; (This volume: Pp115-116).

In the seven organisational groups involved in five of the cycles of the inquiry, the technique enabled people to discuss issues about their organisational interpersonal relationships.
The question still remains as to whether, without the technique of ‘Human Sculpture’, these staff would have been able to address some of the issues. In the particular inquiry model chosen it is not possible to categorically answer this question, however comments such as the one made by the participant in cycle eight, when she expressed in delight that the activity ‘hit the nail right on the head’ (Appendix G) suggest that not only was the theatre metaphor (‘script’) helpful, but that the vocabulary provided by the sculpture metaphor enabled people to express things about the organisational team which they may never have expressed before. These examples suggest that the technique thus enable discussion about organisational interpersonal behaviour. That the technique enables people who identify dysfunctional ‘scripts’, to rewrite these.

The inquiry conclusion, that ‘Human Sculpture’ is an appropriate technique for the Dramatistic Approach, is also validated by the way in which it creates opportunities for workshop participants to identify dysfunctional ‘scripts’ and to begin to ‘rewrite’
them. Before the 'scripts' could be identified and rewritten, it was necessary for workshop participants to accept the notion of 'script'. The acceptance or otherwise of this notion is, in each of the cycles, a peripheral agenda for all the co-researchers. Their focus agenda is their interpersonal relationships, and after cycle four, their interpersonal relationships in the particular organisation.

In each of the cycles delivered in organisational settings, the workshop participants progressed from talking about the sculpture to talking about interpersonal relationships. In the early cycles, the notion of 'script' was introduced at the beginning of the workshop process and in the later cycles the notion of 'script' was introduced after the 'Human Sculpture' had been completed. In each case, the participants response to this notion provides a basis for exploring the 'fit' or acceptance of the notion of 'script'.

In cycle one, I introduced the notion of 'script' for my own purposes of constructing personal meaning about 'Human Sculpture'. The notion was acceptable to me in that I continued to use the notion on subsequent occasions when I introduced the technique of 'Human Sculpture'.

In cycle two and three, I introduced the notion of 'script' during the workshops on Spontaneous Drama, and it was, on almost all occasions unchallenged. I have inferred that this lack of comment indicated non rejection of the notion of 'script'. I recall no students who suggested that the notion was unhelpful. For many students the notion was helpful and enabled them to begin to rewrite dysfunctional 'scripts' which were blocking them.

Despite her inability to rewrite her 'script', the sole respondent from the second cycle said of her position taking in the sculpture, 'This wasn’t a new idea for me, but a conscious recognition of issues I have already been grappling with. It brought the issues into focus' (Appendix A). Other students in these cycles made similar comments about the notion of 'script', including one who later invited me to present 'Human Sculpture' in his organisation. He says in his workshop feedback sheet for the organisational workshop that 'whenever the sculpture had been used, that it had had surprising
accuracy and that it help explain questionable behaviour previously observed’ (Appendix C, Cycle four, respondent 6).

In cycle four and five, the questionnaire did not specifically ask about the validity of the notion of ‘script’. I have inferred, by the absence of comments to the contrary, that the notion of ‘script’ was well received, and that participants accepted that they had ‘scripts’.

In cycle six, I presented the notion of ‘script’ to a group of Postgraduate students at Bath University. It can be argued that the participant groups (the co-researchers) in previous cycles, may not have had sufficient academic grounding to challenge this notion, nor expose it to adequate critical reflection. If this was the case, then with this participant group the notion was exposed to a considerable amount of rigour. The notion was not rejected nor challenged. In fact, by this group, the ‘Human Sculpture’ activity was seen as one in harmony with the philosophy of post positivist inquiry (Pp 60 & 61).

In cycle seven, eight and nine, I introduced the notion of ‘script’ following the ‘Human Sculpture’, and there was a notable absence of challenge to this notion. I have inferred from the absence of challenge that the notion posed no problems for people. I believe this to be a valid inference, as several workshop participants acknowledged that the ‘Human Sculpture’, and therefore the foundation notion of ‘script’, were helpful to them in their understanding of organisational issues.

Di, the Director in cycle seven said ‘I just think it was remarkable’ (Appendix F).

Judy in cycle seven said ‘I found it very revealing too. I thought it certainly revealed a lot’ (Appendix F).

Another staff member in cycle seven said ‘I enjoyed doing the sculpture and I thought it was a very valuable exercise’ (Appendix F).

Rose in cycle eight said ‘It hit the nail right on the head’ (Appendix G).
Christa the Director in cycle nine said the 'Human Sculpture' as 'A good way to start staff talking in a non-threatening way' (Appendix H).

Other staff in cycle nine said the 'Human Sculpture' was 'was a very positive way to help staff members see their personalities and why they do things the way they do' (Appendix H).

In addition to the supportive comments from many of the people who engaged in 'Human Sculpture', a second measure of the 'fit' of the notion of 'script' is that this notion has been accepted in the context of communications about the inquiry, both through conferences at which I presented (Appendix I), and the publication of those journals (Hill (1990a, 1990b, 1991a, 1992, 1993)). In none of these instances has the notion of 'script' been challenged. This indicator of the 'fit' of the notion is in keeping with Reason (1988:6) who emphasises the importance of communication as part of the inquiry cycle. Communicating findings from an inquiry provides opportunities for these findings to be exposed to critical challenge, leading to their being refined, validated or repudiated.

It is a conclusion reached by this inquiry, that the notion of 'script' is one which is acceptable and 'fits' peoples construction of understanding about their interpersonal behaviour.

In the course of this inquiry there were numerous opportunities in which 'scripts' could be 'rewritten'.

In every sculpture completed, the first person into the sculpture is invited out the sculpture to consider their position and invited to return to the sculpture. This was an opportunity to 'rewrite' a 'script' which a number of participants in the workshops took up. There were other examples of opportunities to 'rewrite' when with particular groups of people I varied the usual process of 'Human Sculpture', thus enabling opportunities for rehearsal of alternate 'scripts'.
In the sculpture detailed from cycle four, the first person into the sculpture took a position of a Madonna and chose to change this position when the opportunity arose (This volume: 47).

In one of the sculpture detailed in cycle five, the sculpture involving the director of the organisation was resculpted several times and this enabled the director of the organisation to rehearse alternate management relationships (Ibid: 51).

In the first sculpture of cycle seven the first person into the sculpture returned to it at a lower level, which prompted the audience to comment on the changed focus (Ibid: 64-5).

In the second sculpture of cycle seven the first person into the sculpture returned to exactly the same position, which prompted some members of the audience to express sorrow about her not changing position (Ibid: 67-8).

In cycle seven, several people explored different positions in the sculpture, enabling them to rehearse alternate ‘scripts’ for that organisation (Appendix D).

In the first sculpture of cycle eight the first person into sculpture returned to exactly the same position, which prompted a mixed response from the audience with some wanting her to change and others happy that she returned to the original position (This volume: 92-3).

In the second sculpture of cycle eight the first person into the sculpture returned to an almost identical position and made only a change to her extended leg. This prompted discussion by the audience that the change had not been more significant, and they they recognised that any change she chose to make would have had an impact on the whole sculpture. This particular choice prompted discussion about the real changes this person had made recently with regard to her relationship with the rest of the team (Ibid: 94-5).

In cycle eight the whole group had an opportunity to ‘rewrite’ ‘scripts’ as they explored the ways in which the two sculptures could combine (Ibid: 96).
In the first sculpture of cycle nine the first person into the sculpture returned to the same position that she had held before, prompting discussion about some of the possibilities which the audience had considered for alternate positions (Ibid: 109-110).

In the second sculpture of cycle nine the first person, when invited to step out of the sculpture, changed her position, and this prompted discussion by the audience about the opportunities and possibilities of making change (Ibid: 111).

In cycle nine the whole group constructed a third sculpture, thus giving all the participants to the workshop an opportunity to rehearse an alternate ‘script’. In this particular resculpting the interpretation was made that despite adopting different statues, some of the participants had retained the same theme as their previous statue (Ibid: 114).

These examples demonstrate that the process of ‘Human Sculpture’ enabled people to rehearse alternate ‘scripts’.

On the basis of these indicators of validity it has been concluded that the ‘Human Sculpture’ process promotes discussion about organisational interpersonal issues and provides opportunities for participants to the process to rehearse alternate ‘scripts’. It is therefore a technique which can be appropriately labelled as a Dramatistic Approach technique.

This inquiry has also contributed to the epistemology of the Dramatistic Approach by:

1. Elaborating on the notional nature of ‘script’.
2. Discussing the problems associated with articulation of ‘script’.
3. Exploring the factors for rewriting ‘script’.
4. Documenting the procedure of the technique.
5. Discussing the facilitation of ‘Human Sculpture’.

1. The notional nature of ‘Script’

Throughout this inquiry, the way in which ‘script’ has been defined has changed. Sometimes these changes are in response to the evolving nature of the inquiry into
'Human Sculpture'. At other times the definitional changes reflect the impact of certain parts of the epistemology of the Dramatistic Approach.

In the course of this inquiry I have published several articles about 'Human Sculpture' and the Dramatistic Approach (Hill (1984, 1990a, 1990b, 1991a, 1991b, 1992, 1993)). These present a range of definitions which chart my evolving understanding about 'script', the central notion of the Dramatistic Approach. My earliest reference to 'script' (Hill 1984), albeit not specifically labelling it as such, discusses the nature of Spontaneous Drama, and explains that it provides people with opportunities to recognise 'how they communicate in different situations'. This is in essence my early definition of 'script' drawn from my experiential work with 'Human Sculpture' (This volume: 36).

Later (Hill 1990a, 1990b) I was defining 'script' as

\[ a \text{ framework of constructed meaning about how to relate to others in a given situation. } \]

Hill (1990a),

which reflected my being influenced by Eric Berne (1964, 1972). I believed my applying Berne's (1962, 1972) concept of 'script' to an organisational setting to be an innovation (This volume: 46-59).

Later still (Hill 1991a, 1991b) with the hindsight of the comparative body of literature related to Iain Mangham (1979, 1988 and with Overington 1987), I recognised incongruence between Berne's definition of 'script' and the examples of 'script' given by Bower and Bower (1976) and Nelson-Jones (1986) which were presumably based on a Bernesian definition. I also noted the lack of cross referencing between Iain Mangham (1979, 1988 and with Overington 1987) and Eric Berne (1964, 1972) (This volume : 8).

By examining the similarities between Iain Mangham (1979, 1988 and with Overington 1987) and Eric Berne (1964, 1972) I came to define 'script' as:
• a routine for social interpersonal behaviour
• a socialised acquisition
• a predominantly unconscious way of relating (This volume: 11).

Understood from an organisational context, this definition would suggest that people involved in their work life, relate with each other in socialised unconscious ways. In the bulk of daily meetings these relationships could be assessed as functional, in that the ‘script’ being used functions for all parties.

At the conclusion of this inquiry, I retain the definition noted earlier (Ibid) and maintain that ‘script’ is notional. That the word ‘script’ acts as a construct which assists thinking about human behaviour, so that the unconscious behaviour may become conscious, as a step to it being reflected upon, evaluated and if desired changed.

In addition to a generic description of interpersonal behaviour, ‘script’ has application to specific interpersonal situations such as ‘gender scripts’ (Nelson Jones (1986: 27)), and ‘non assertive scripts’ (Bower and Bower (1976: 87)). I have proposed that this range of specific applications can be expanded to include, ‘Reflective Listening’ (Nelson Jones (1986: 168) and ‘I’ statements (Nelson Jones (1986: 263)) which can be referred to as ‘listening scripts’ and ‘conflict scripts’, particularly where people are being encouraged to change their listening response to a ‘reflective listening’ response; or change their conflict response to an ‘I’ statement.

2. Problems associated with articulation of a ‘Script’

One of the assumptions which appears to have been made by Mangham (1979, 1988) is that ‘script’ identification is straightforward. He appears to have worked in a management consultancy framework wherein the consultant (as distinct from the workers or employees) identifies the ‘scripts’. With a trained consultant, this recognition of ‘scripts’ may be straightforward, however, in this inquiry it has been advocated that rewriting of dysfunctional ‘scripts’ is more likely to occur, if the
participant themself identifies the dysfunctional ‘scripts’. The management consultancy framework adopted by this inquiry has been one in which the consultant acts as process facilitator, facilitating a process wherein the participants themselves identify ‘scripts’, identify those which are dysfunctional, and identify those for which they seek opportunities to rehearse alternate ‘scripts’ (This volume: Pg 80). By adopting such a framework it has been possible to highlight several difficulties of ‘script’ identification, which are not evident if one maintains a management consultancy framework in which the consultant identifies the ‘scripts’.

The main difficulty encountered has been the area of articulating a ‘script’. Despite ‘script’ being a notion which ‘fits’ peoples understanding of their behaviour, and which has enabled groups to move with ease into discussion about ‘script’, and subsequently into discussing the notion of ‘script’ in the particular organisational setting, there have been examples in these cycles of inquiry where a particular collection of ‘scripts’ has not been discussed with ease.

In cycle five (Ibid: 55), people expressed to me privately, their perception about the ‘accuracy’ of the ‘Human Sculpture’ and yet would not talk about this in the discussion groups.

In cycle seven (Ibid: 71) the issue of power was one which was delicate to discuss. There have been examples in these cycles of inquiry, where it was acknowledged that the topic was a difficult one of discuss, but that the ‘Human Sculpture’ activity had aided the discussion.

In cycle eight (Ibid: 98) one participant commented on the ability to talk about other staff without mocking or feeling mocked.

In cycle nine (Ibid: 115) the Director commented that the ‘Human Sculpture’ activity enabled her to talk in a non threatening way to staff about different approaches to working with others.
I have concluded from these examples in the inquiry, that some interpersonal communication issues are often not raised publicly in the organisational setting, despite many people privately knowing about these problems, because of the level of immediacy (Ibid: 14), which in the organisational setting is magnified because of hierarchical power.

It has also been proposed in this inquiry that discussion of certain issues is stifled because of the fear of reprisals from commenting about organisational relationships (Ibid: 14). I have labelled the reluctance to talk about certain issues, 'a problem of articulation' (Ibid: 75), and suggested that simply having the word 'script' provides a point to initiate discussion.

In this inquiry, it has also been evident that the additional vocabulary associated with 'Human Sculpture' has assisted people to articulate their feelings about other organisational issues.

In Group A of Cycle five respondent 3 describes her position as 'separate from the group' and adds that that was how she felt at that time (Appendix C).

In Group B of Cycle five respondent 2 describes the sculpture 'in which the Administrator found it difficult to find a position for himself and he later talked about feeling excluded sometimes' (Appendix C).

In cycle seven, Judy picks up on the terminology of the 'missed arm opportunities', which describe her position in the sculpture, and used this term to describe situations in the day to day life of this organisational group which she described as 'missed arm opportunities' (This volume: 77).

In cycle eight the words used to describe the 'Human Sculpture' were 'connected', 'apart', 'mediator', 'balanced', 'comfortable' and 'even', and all of these words are words which can be and were applied to real relationships in the organisation (Appendix G).
In cycle eight Jenny's removal and return to the second sculpture was used to address the real situation of her not being in the group as regularly as she had been, and that this had generated some feelings of loss (Appendix G).

In cycle nine Linda's choice to be a strong foundation for the group sculpture, was interpreted that she may often feel that other's were not doing any work. Her responses to this analysis was to say 'What you are saying is so true. I don't stop to think' (Appendix H).

3. Factors which contribute to rewriting the 'Script'

The nature of 'rewriting' a 'script' is not overtly addressed in Mangham (1979, 1988). It is addressed by other writers (Bower and Bower (1976: 87) and Egan (1976: 14)) and acknowledged as involving a potentially 'painful process of emotional reeducation' (Ibid).

This inquiry has identified that despite readiness to rewrite a 'script', and opportunities for rehearsal, 'script' 'rewriting' does not always happen. This inquiry had identified several people who have suggested that following the 'Human Sculpture', they made changes which they had rehearsed within the 'Human Sculpture'.

In cycle four, respondent 5 comments in the workshop survey

'I chose to not return to the sculpture and change. This I did later in the year - I chose to leave the organisation' (Appendix C).

In Group A of cycle five respondent 3

'I was an associate of the college, and therefore not a 'full' member. My position echoed this I believe! The person who bridged the gap was frustrated with me for not joining the group - I no longer work for (organisation named)' (Appendix C).

The inquiry has also identified several people who have rehearsed alternate 'scripts' in the context of the 'Human Sculpture', and whose comments following the 'Human
Sculpture’ suggest that they are likely to carry through with these rehearsed alternatives.

The respondent in cycle eight (This volume: 99) saying ‘If I did do this inservice again I think I would change my position’.

The respondent in cycle nine (Ibid: 115) saying ‘The body sculpture was very interesting. It made me realise some of the problems I was having at work and gave me an incentive to try to sort them out’.

The inquiry has also identified one person who in their opportunities to rehearse alternate ‘scripts’ expressed an expectation that others will make changes in their behaviour (Participant in Appendix G). The inquiry has also identified one person who despite her desire to make changes to her ‘script’, was unable to because of ‘layers of denial, suppression, conditioning all in the name of survival’ (Appendix A).

In this inquiry it has been recognised that articulation of a ‘script’ is the starting point to ‘rewriting’, as it is often the first opportunity a person has to express behaviour which they desire to change. It has also been recognised that articulation alone does not ensure that a ‘script’ will be rewritten.

The respondent (Ibid: 41) who expressed her inability to ‘rewrite’ a ‘script’ reinforces the significance of self-esteem for a person moving from readiness to ‘rewrite’, to actually ‘rewriting’.

In the final cycles of this inquiry, I have attempted to add to this unexplored area of the notion of ‘script’, by examining the ways in which people describe their choice of statue in the ‘Human Sculpture’. In cycle seven (Ibid: 84) I noted differences in the way people described their choices concerning their movement into the sculpture. Sometimes they suggested that their choice was a response to the sculpture. I called this an ‘out there’ motivation. Others acknowledged that their choice was governed by personal needs and I called this an ‘in here’ motivation. In cycle eight (Ibid: 103) I
suggested that these different types of motivation were an indication of a person’s sense of personal power.

My view of humanity is that we all began in life powerful, despite physical socialisation, this power has been eroded and hence they have arrived at adulthood without a sense of personal power. For people with a low sense of personal power, there is a submission to the belief that others have control over their lives. This can be indicated by the presence of ‘out there’ motivation evident in their ‘script’. I suspect that the presence of ‘out there’ motivation in the language of someone describing their choice of statue in the sculpture, is an indicator of insufficient personal power to warrant their ability to ‘rewrite’ an identified dysfunctional ‘script’. This belief, however, can not be substantiated by this inquiry because many of the post workshop comments are anonymous, and therefore can not be connected to specific examples of language used in explaining choices of statue in the ‘Human Sculpture’. Other inquirers may pursue the connections between the language used to describe choices of statue in the ‘Human Sculpture’ and a person’s language indicators which predict likelihood of ‘rewriting’ a ‘script’.

It has been suggested on the basis of the single respondent in cycle one (Ibid: 41) that there is a positive link between a person’s self-esteem and their ability to ‘rewrite’ their ‘script’.

4. The procedure of ‘Human Sculpture’

The purpose of this inquiry was to introduce the technique of ‘Human Sculpture’ as a process which enabled discussion about ‘scripts’ in the organisational setting, and in achieving that purpose, to provide a basis for proposing ‘Human Sculpture’ as a technique within the Dramatistic Approach.

This inquiry has resulted in seven documented instances of ‘Human Sculpture’ being used with different groups in different organisations.
The inquiry has been an exercise in technique building, and in that regard it is important to note the changes in the technique over the course of the several cycles of inquiry. These changes are most evident by contrasting the process in Appendix B with the process evident in Appendix G. In summary the changes are as follows:

In early presentations of 'Human Sculpture' participants determined their order of sequence by actually numbering off. This step in the process was relinquished by cycle eight.

The warm up of a Visualisation was retained up to cycle seven and removed in cycle eight without any apparent consequences. A simplified warm up of the participants identifying their expectations about the workshop replaced the original warm up.

In the earlier versions of 'Human Sculpture', the first person into the sculpture was the only one given the opportunity to resculpt or rehearse a new 'script'. In later versions there is much more flexibility following the construction of the sculptures, and this responds to the specific agendas created by the particular workshop group.

In the earlier versions of 'Human Sculpture' the notion of 'script' was introduced in the explanations of the activity. In later versions the notion of 'script' is introduced following the completion of all the sculptures, as a way of constructing meaning about the activity.

The technique changes have been a response both to problems which arose in the facilitating of 'Human Sculpture' and to several questions asked about the procedure of 'Human Sculpture':

a) To participate or not to participate?
In cycle four (This volume: 49) as facilitator I participated in the sculpture. This had an impact on the sculpture which was interpreted as the facilitator breaking the established rules. It reinforced for me the power which the facilitator holds and from that cycle onward I chose not to participate in the building of the sculpture, and to only participate in discussion about the sculpture.

b) To resculpt or not to resculpt?

The question of repeating a ‘Human Sculpture’ was raised in cycle seven (This volume: 84). My answer then was that I did not believe that a repeated sculpture would be false and that a new sculpture would give people an opportunity to respond to new situations. In both cycle eight and nine the opportunities to resculpt (cycle 9). On both occasions this provided additional opportunities for alternate ‘script’ rehearsal, and in cycle nine the possibility of a third combined sculpture (This volume: 113) also raised the issue of new statues which appeared to be consistent with themes of previous statues.

My response to the question whether to resculpt is that it should be the choice of the participant group, and that if they feel that this would benefit their addressing the organisation issues then that should be the deciding factor, rather than resculpting as a structured part of the process.

c) To warm up or not to warm up?

Following cycle seven (Ibid: 102) I ceased using the visualisation and replaced it with a workshop introduction which solicited from the participants their expectations about the workshop. The absence of the visualisation did not appear to harm the overall process, and the statement of expectations helped the workshop participants to focus on some of the organisational issues. In these instances, when the group reviewed their list of topics on which they would like the workshop to focus, they concluded that the topics had all been addressed in the context of the ‘Human Sculpture’.
d) To action plan or not to action plan?

In cycle seven (Ibid: 88) an absence of a planning mechanism to assist the group to plan how they would address some of the issues which had emerged from the ‘Human Sculpture’, had been identified as one of the reasons that the activity opened a Pandora’s Box. In following cycles there were opportunities to plan action, however these opportunities were not always taken up by the workshop participants. This could be an indicator of non readiness to begin changing ‘scripts’, however a group choosing not to plan action should not be seen as indicating that no change will result from the workshop. Individuals in the group are likely to plan personal change with personal action plans.

The procedure for ‘Human Sculpture’ has been modified as a result of this inquiry. These changes can generally be described as having become less prescriptive. In subsequent cycles of the inquiry, I was less rigorous about a specific procedure to follow, and this in turn has enabled the identification of what is essential for the procedure of ‘Human Sculpture’. That procedure can be summarised in six steps.

i. There is time at the beginning of the activity to discuss what the group wishes to address through the workshop. This is the group agenda setting.

ii. The participants choose to be either sculpture builders or observers. These roles may reverse if more than one sculpture is completed.

iii. The sculpture builders build a human sculpture by a first person making or forming a statue, and all other members of the sculpture builders subsequently forming statues so that the overall sculpture is progressively built. This minimalist instruction invites spontaneity in the response, and through its unstructured nature provides an open-ended gestalt onto which the participants and the audience will project their interpresentations of the statues. Some of these interpretations can be the articulation of a ‘script’ which one person has
with others in the sculpture, and may have with others in their everyday organisational life.

iv. When all the statue builders have contributed to the sculpture, the person who started the sculpture is invited to step back from their position and review the sculpture, and change their original position, if they so wish.

v. There is discussion about the building of the sculpture involving the audience discussing their perceptions of the steps in the development of the sculpture; the sculpture builders discussing their perceptions of what they and each other were doing; and the group saying anything about the sculpture which they believe has not been paid.

vi. The activity is debriefed addressing issues raised by the group’s discussion. In this debriefing the notion of ‘script’ is introduced. In addition there can be discussion about relationships. ‘The bridge’ can be used to speculate on whether things said about the sculpture were also things which apply to the organisation. The group can develop an action plan to tackle issues which have arisen as a result of the ‘Human Sculpture’.

This process, I believe features distinct differences from another process also labelled ‘Human Sculpture’ (Satir 1972) with which I became aware during this inquiry. The Satir ‘Human Sculpture’, in my experience of seeing it in operation, always involved a topic or theme about which the participants would construct a sculpture. Sometimes one person carves the remainder of the group. The lack of a topic or theme, as is the feature of Hill ‘Human Sculpture’ provides a medium by which participants project their issues into the activity, thus enabling the activity to address the issues of the group rather than an topic or theme set by a facilitator.
1. The facilitation, the technique.

The procedures listed here are minimal. This, together with a need to empower people in rewriting ‘scripts’, places more responsibility on the facilitator to have specific skills of facilitation. These skills, as will be later discussed, are a much skills of facilitating a collaborative inquiry as they are skills for facilitating ‘Human Sculpture’.

It has been evident by my reflecting on the facilitation of the ‘Human Sculpture’ that a facilitator needs to work in a way with the group which:

1. Encourages people to communicate their perceptions of a common situation.
2. Invites participants to explore the ramifications of their perceptions of the situation.
3. Leaves space for participants to make connections between their action in the ‘Human Sculpture’ and the action in the Organisational Group.
4. Creates a psychological climate in which facilitator intervention can be safely ignored.
5. Encourages clarification of the issues related to the discussion.
6. Facilitates the collaborative planning of action to follow the ‘Human Sculpture’ workshop.

In the process of this inquiry those facilitator skills, as mentioned earlier, have been identified as:

1) Reflective Listening (Nelson-Jones 1986: 168)
The bulk of the facilitators language is reflective. They use reflective listening to draw from each participant the meaning they ascribed to their own and others actions. They use reflective listening to ensure that each participant hears their own words and perhaps their own ‘script’. Reflective Listening is used in the sense that the facilitator mirrors part or all of what the participant has said to affirm for the speaker that they have been heard.
2) Facilitated Silence

The use of silence has been demonstrated in this inquiry to be an important facilitation tool. In particular during cycle six (This volume: 60), when I was asked why I did not ask each person for their perception of the sculpture, I answered that I believed it to be more empowering to leave the choice to speak to the participants. In my later reflection on this answer I coined the term ‘facilitated silence’.

Silence creates space into which people can speak. Often in a group, insufficient silent time is left to allow the less forthcoming members of the group to gather their thought so that they may speak.

Facilitated Silence is the skill of the facilitator to say nothing; to resist the temptation to fill the void of silence with their own voice, and this leaves space for the participants to speak, if they so wish.

The choice to remain silent is grounded in a belief about the group participants that what they have to say about the ‘Human Sculpture’ is as valid as what the facilitator has to say. The role of the facilitator moves away from being an expert or an analyst to one who is maintaining the flow of the process.

The silence of the facilitator also leaves ample space for members of the group to articulate their thought about the sculpture, to make their own connections between these observations and the real organisational work they experience, and begin to articulate their perception of the organisational ‘scripts’. As the facilitator is not regularly a member of this group then the more communication that can be encouraged by the members of the group the more effective the ‘Human Sculpture’ process will be.

3) Open Questions (Egan (1976: 125))

Despite there being spontaneous reflection about the activity, there will still be a need for guided reflection, and this can be generated with questions which invite
comment. The spontaneous reflection follows the agenda of the participants, while the guided reflection is driven by the agenda of the facilitator. Questions such as ‘What did it look like to you?’ and ‘Were there any bits of what has been said, which you want to respond to?’, invite comment from speakers. The one question which emerged in this inquiry which if found to be of particular benefit was the question ‘Is there anything about the sculpture, which hasn’t been said?’ I asked this question at the end of the activity and always found that it invited further comment about the sculpture.

4) Reframing (Goffman 1971)

Some of the reflective listening is presented in a way which reframes what has been said into a new perspective. When a person comments that ‘The sculpture was unbalanced’, the facilitator can reframe this with what appears to be reflective listening, by saying ‘The sculpture appeared unbalanced to you’. This reframes their generalisation in a way which invites them to own their specific perception. Similarly, a comment such as ‘She did what she always does’, can be reframed by saying ‘This is how this person appears to you at work’, which reframes the sculptural ‘script’ into an organisational ‘script’.

5) Speaking for self (Nelson-Jones (1986: 263))

It is understandable that the facilitator, as spectator and participant to the ‘Human Sculpture’ will also have perceptions about the action. When the facilitator makes a comment, if they stress that this is only their perception, this reinforces that the facilitator is also a co-participant in the exercise. They might say ‘This is how it looked to me’.

The status which is ascribed to the facilitator by the other participants may cause any of the facilitator’s statements to be interpreted as ‘fact’ rather than perception. Hence it is important for the facilitator to be aware of this and made a greater effort to establish their own perceptions as perceptions. In doing this the facilitator also models ways of speaking for self.
The naming of the facilitator skills is an important outcome of this inquiry. In addition to naming the skills, it has also been pertinent to identify the appropriate facilitator attitude for using these skills. It is my belief that in order to effectively facilitate a 'tool of articulation', the facilitator needs to believe in their own and others' empowerment and to use above five mentioned facilitator skills in a way which promotes collaborative discussion.

The purpose of the 'Human Sculpture' activity is firstly to engender comment from the participants about the 'here and now' of their 'Human Sculpture'; secondly to raise consciousness about 'scripts' and the possibility of 'scripts' evident in the sculpture being ones at work in the organisation; and thirdly, through this consciousness-raising as a bridge, to generate discussion about the organisation and the relationships between people in that organisation.

Therefore the agenda which the facilitator is driven by is:

1. Reflectiveness about the sculpture
2. Ownership of one's own perceptions and reflection on others perceptions.
3. Reflectiveness about the organisation.
4. Ownership of personal 'scripts'.
5. Empowerment to rewrite personal 'scripts'.

and this will be a consistent agenda, even if the organisational group has their own agenda about organisational issues. As the agenda of the organisational group is likely to vary organisation to organisation, the sixth item which drives the facilitator's agenda is the need to respond to the organisational group's agenda.

5.1.7 Response to an inquirer's journey

In proposing an inquiry methodology for this inquiry, I presented a case for writing parts of the inquiry in the first person, in order to demonstrate personal development, personal change and personal learning (Ibid: 27). In essence, this choice about writing style has allowed me to document my personal journey, and to the extent of my being a
traveller on a road of 'Human Sculpture' technique building and a theorist in the Dramatistic Approach, this has been addressed in the earlier sections of this chapter. What remains is to elaborate on my personal presence as an inquirer.

At the outset of this inquiry I set forth as a research, bound unwittingly by the mores and routines of positivist inquiry. By cycle five (Ibid: 57) my reflection on my practice as an inquirer made me aware that many of my practices were entrenched in a positivist belief system about research. My realisation of these beliefs prompted changes in my presence as an inquirer.

I firstly differentiated between the agenda of my co-researchers and my own inquiry agenda, which prompted a change in the devise for soliciting co-researcher feedback. By changing to an open ended response sheet I opened the inquiry to the co-researcher agendas, however at times this meant a reliance upon inference in order to address the questions of my own agenda.

Secondly, I began to recognise the parallel between facilitation techniques appropriate for 'Human Sculpture' and facilitation of Human Inquiry. My participating in the ‘Emerging Approaches to Inquiry’ at the centre for the Study of Organisational Change at Bath University and exposing my inquiry topic in that context, raised my awareness of the inquiry skills which paralleled the research skills related to positivist research.

At the outset of this inquiry, the term 'human inquiry' was new to me, as I suspect it was to many researchers working in post positivist research paradigms. The topic of inquiry skills was left, at least in my inquiry training, to be learned by serendipitously through emersing oneself in the inquiry methodology. This inquiry has created for me, an opportunity in technique building for an action researcher, focussing on practices and issues for an inquirer working in a post positivist paradigm. The technique building is essentially focussed on (1) inquiry skills and (2) writing skills, as they pertain to the methodological debate surrounding post positivist inquiry. My ongoing experience as
an action researcher submitting a thesis for examination, also part of my presence as an inquirer, has raised other methodological considerations in the field of post positivist inquiry. In particular it has raised issues for me related to (3) validity of inquiry findings and (4) supervision and examination of a thesis developed using action research methodology.

1. Inquiry Skills

In cycle three (This volume: 57), I became aware of an incongruence between the theory of 'Human Sculpture' and my practice of using a questionnaire to seek my co-researchers input. In hindsight I recognised that I had worked from my traditional understandings about research in using a questionnaire method, and that this device did not invite my co-researchers to input their agendas into the inquiry. I recognised that this inquiry method was flawed by a bias of my own agenda. In later cycles when I adopted open-ended statements to collect participant input, I found that the inquiry became more co-researcher centred.

In cycle six (Ibid: 60) I was encouraged by the evaluation by my human inquiry peers at the Emerging Approaches to Inquiry 3 Conference, that the technique of 'Human Sculpture' was congruent with techniques of human inquiry. This assessment, together with an increasing awareness of multiple agendas in an inquiry (Ibid: 57 & 106), prompted me to begin to identify appropriate group communication and facilitator skills which would enhance a collaborative inquiry.

I noted in cycle seven (Ibid: 80) that the more experienced a co-researcher group was in engaging in self-reflective practice, the less an inquiry facilitator needed to intervene. This lead me to conclude that there were group communication skills which enhanced a collaborative inquiry, and that the development of these skills was necessary for a post positivist inquirer, in the same way as development of statistical skills was necessary for the positivist researcher. By cycle nine (Ibid: 88) I was proposing that these skills included:
• Reflective Listening
• Facilitated Silence
• Open Questioning
• Reframing
• Speaking for self

and that the skills were identical to the facilitator skills necessary for facilitating a 'Human Sculpture'.

It was evident to me, through my reflection on my practice, that I had acquired many of these skills through the nature of the work with which I was engaged prior to my embarking on an inquiry. This may not always be the case for a post positivist inquirer, and as researchers presenting themselves for higher degree are encouraged to improve their statistical skills in the preparation for positivist research, so, post-positivist inquirers might be encouraged to improve their interpersonal and small group communication skills in their lead up to post positivist inquiry.

2. Writing Skills

A considerable volume of literature has been devoted to the topic of thesis writing. As the bulk of theses have documented research undertaken using a positivist research paradigm, it is understandable that literature about thesis writing is more likely to have been written from a positivist perspective, and because the positivist research paradigm was at one time considered synonymous with research, the writers of this literature may not even recognise a need to explicitly state their contextual bias.

Similarly, many thesis writing requirements prompted by universities, may inadvertently be endorsing a positivist paradigm and may be inappropriate for a thesis written using a post positivist inquiry paradigm. These requirements, like the research paradigm itself, must be subjected to critical reflection in order to ensure that
there is congruence between an inquiry and the documentation of that inquiry where the inquiry has been pursued for the purpose of awarding a higher degree.

In establishing the research methodology for this inquiry (Ibid: 26) I questioned the need for documenting the report in the third person, suggesting that this writing style, although advised for thesis writing, was one entrenched in the positivist paradigm, and not congruent with an inquiry adopting a post-positivist inquiry paradigm. By writing in the first person I have become conscious of my personal presence as an inquirer and have attempted to convey this in my writing style.

The most notable feature of my journey as an inquiry is that the inquiry began long before I started to formally document. From the moment I had been exposed to the activity, which I later called ‘Human Sculpture’, I had begun reflecting and adapting the process according to my own agenda. The problem which was posed when I later began to write a thesis, was to devise a writing style which could document such experience. I chose to adopt a writing device of dual reflection which was intended to convey my naivete as a novice inquirer, and to convey the impact of hindsight reflection on my practice.

It is my conclusion, that much action research often commences well before a student has formulated their inquiry methodology, and the use of dual reflection enables them to include in the inquiry, cycles which address the first emergence of their inquiry topic, despite this emergence not being governed by a formally stated inquiry methodology. An inquirer should be encouraged, through their supervision, to document their earliest questions about the inquiry topic and to note the way in which the literature review impacts on their understanding about their topic. This practice is one which I have adapted in my supervision of students engaged in thesis writing using action research methodology.
On three occasions in this inquiry I have incorrectly believed that my naming of a construct or process was an innovation. My labelling an activity of 'Human Sculpture' (Ibid: 40) which I later discovered was a term also used by Satir (1972) (Ibid: 142); my coining the term 'script', which I later discovered was a term used by Berne (1964) (Ibid: 40); and my applying the notion of 'script' to an organisational setting, which I later discovered was an application used by Mangham and Overington (1987) (Ibid: 48). This has highlighted for me my preference for experiential learning over literature learning, and has reinforced the dilemma I faced as an inquirer regarding how to appropriately document and annotate learning which has arisen through experience rather than from literature. This experience again reinforces the importance of the inquirer being encouraged in the early stages of their supervision to document their constructs about the topic under inquiry, in order that they may retain this naive understanding before it becomes influenced by other literature. Throughout this inquiry the nature of the methodology, multiple cycles of action research, required the revisiting of several topics in progressive cycles. The documentation of this revisiting can be interpreted as repetitious.

It has also been necessary, because of the emergent nature of the construction of meaning about the topic, to regularly add subject headings to address newly emerging aspects of the inquiry. This feature may be judged by some as a writing inconsistency. I maintain that both these features are inevitable outcomes of an inquiry that advocates progressive emergence of outcome findings, and proposes that the inquirer constructs their understanding about the inquiry through continual reflection on practice. This has bearing on readers of a thesis developed using this methodology, as it may require them to put aside their values regarding what is appropriate thesis writing in order to emerse themselves as much as is possible in the process of the inquiry.

The style of writing adopted in this inquiry, while not offered as a perfect example of thesis writing for an inquiry based on a post positivist research paradigm, is being
put forward as an attempt by this inquirer to address the intrinsic differences between positivist research and post positivist inquiry.

The writing style adopted in this inquiry, and its frequent dissonance with the traditions of thesis writing, has made me consider whether the literature related to thesis writing is more governed by the needs to examine the document rather than needs to document a process of inquiry. In 1994, as I was grappling with this question, I attended a speech presented by Dale Spender at the International Experiential Conference in Washington. In addressing some of the dilemmas of modern technology she commented.

'With computers anyone can become a maker rather than a receiver of information. They can produce rather than store. They are empowered in the same way that previous generations were empowered by reading. For print meant the creation of mass audience. The new technologies mean the creations of mass authorship.

And the huge challenge for educators at this time is to develop a theory and practice which explains and fosters new skills and strengths. A new philosophy which gives us a part to play in the future rather than making unanachronistic.
This means we have to accept, as I have done, that we are being deskillled and that we have better become reskilled pretty darn quickly. We even have to learn from the young.

We have to critique our own dearly held assumptions; assess our values; make decisions about what is useful and go through the painful process of putting aside some of our deepest convictions about learning, scholarship, civilisation, values and standards.

It is no small task that we face.

And one of the most obvious assumptions that has to be revised is that of our dependence on content; because its not content but process which now becomes the salient issue.'
The challenge for educators devising rules and regulations about thesis writing, is to develop a theory and practice which acknowledges the intrinsic differences between the nature and function of positivist research and of post-positivist inquiry, and enables the production of a document which presents both the content and the process for examination. This may require the putting aside of some of our deepest convictions about learning, scholarship, research and examination of research. The issue of thesis writing for a thesis using post positivist inquiry methodology, remains an area for inquiry for which I have considerable passion. I believe there is merit in discourse analysis of higher degree handbooks, and in particular those sections of the handbooks which address thesis writing, so that the congruence between the inquiry methodology and the thesis writing can be assessed.

3. Validity of Post Positivist Inquiry

Part of my personal presence as an inquirer has been to attempt to step aside from the role of inquirer and ask myself about the acceptability of the theory which I have proposed. One aspect of this has been to return to the definition of the inquiry topic, (i.e. The Dramatistic Approach) and determine whether the salient features of that definition have been met. This approach has been detailed in an earlier section of this chapter.

Another aspect of recognising acceptability of the content, is to recognise that the content has emerged from multiple cycles of inquiry and that this represents considerable reflection on practice. A third approach to determine acceptability of the proposed theory is to ascertain its exposition. I am fortunate in that there has been considerable exposure of the concepts of this document to a varied audience, both through its sectional publication (Hill (1984, 1990a, 1990b, 1991a, 1991b, 1992, 1993) and through its exposition in the public arena (Appendix I), and this has given me insight into a large portion of the readership. An often overlooked measure of validity is the acceptability of a set of concepts by the public. The term I have used
to convey this, is the conceptual ‘fit’ by its public, and that type of reader find this
document lacking, then this reality can be interpreted either as the inadequacy of the
document or as a failure of the document to address that particular reader’s agenda.
A fourth approach to determining acceptability of a theory can derive from the
groundedness of the theory, and this can invoke assessment concerning the breadth of
the groundedness. There is, I believe, inbuilt into the paradigm of thesis writing, a
belief that extensive reading, not only on the topic of the thesis but on other related
topics, extends the theoretical groundedness of the work. Without disputing this
belief, it must also be acknowledged that literature is but one source of knowledge,
and that discussion with people also extends the theoretical groundedness of a work.
The groundedness of this work has been achieved by addressing and discussing it
with a large number of co-researchers with a varied collection of backgrounds.

There are other relevant indicators of ‘fit’, which unfortunately have not been
available in this inquiry and these include the acceptance of the procedural
information for ‘Human Sculpture’, as procedures which work for other
practitioners.

4. Emerging Methodological Considerations in the field of Post Positivist Inquiry
In this inquiry I have proposed that post-positivist inquiry needs a different set of
inquiry skills to the researcher skills required for positivist research. I have also
proposed that the style of writing for a thesis using post-positivist inquiry
methodology should be different from the style of writing for a thesis based on a
positivist research paradigm. These two aspects of reflection on post-positivist
inquiry have led me to consider, that other aspects of inquiry for a higher degree must
be subjected to critical reflection in order to ensure that there is congruence between
the inquiry and the practices related to that inquiry where the inquiry has been
pursued for the purpose of awarding a higher degree.
I believe that there is potential to consider supervision of the post positivist inquiry as itself a collaborative inquiry between the supervisor and the primary inquirer. This would invite a different form of relationship between supervisor and inquirer from that required for positivist research. It would enable the supervision to include a variety of people with different skills, and hence take pressure off a single supervisor to have skills relevant to both the content and the format of a thesis. Under this model, an inquirer would be encouraged to have their work regularly reviewed by a collaboration of people, all of whom are focussed on ensuring high quality of the work, and each of whom would bring their own agenda of what constitutes high quality. The collaboration may even include examiners.

Similarly, in an inquiry where process is as important as content, it would seem inappropriate to maintain the tradition of appointing examiners at the end of the inquiry process, as this prevents them from examining the unfolding inquiry which has led to the final examinable document.

It would seem to me that there are many challenges for practices associated with inquiry leading to a higher degree, and that this field is ripe for further inquiry.

**Emergent Questions**

Each of the major dimensions of investigation of the inquiry have generated new questions to be asked.

‘Script’:

If we accept that empowerment is an important factor in determining readiness for ‘script’ rewriting, what connection is there between the language used to describe choices of statue in the ‘Human Sculpture’ and a person’s perception of their personal power or self-esteem?

‘Human Sculpture’:

If we accept that ‘Human Sculpture’ is an example of an activity in the context of the Dramatistic Approach what additional activities can be presented under this
banner? My current work in this area has generated 'Into the Woods' (Hill 1993), a fairystory/pantomime activity, as one which raises consciousness about organisational 'scripts'.

The procedure of facilitating 'Human Sculpture' has been set down in this inquiry. Other inquirers may examine variation in that procedure. In particular, the practice of having the audience to the 'Human Sculpture', communicate their perceptions of the 'Human Sculpture', before the members of the 'Human Sculpture' have spoken, may be one which other inquirers may seek to reverse. Other steps may also be added to the process of 'Human Sculpture' to elicit participants belief systems and thereby examine whether the 'scripts' revealed in the 'Human Sculpture' are driven by beliefs which the participants hold about themself or about others?

Facilitation of Human Inquiry:

The field of post positivist inquiry, and the writing and examining of thesis written in a post positivist paradigm, is relatively new. The traditions of supervision and examination which are accepted as part of the process of post graduate study, may themselves require the rigour of inquiry according to the post-positivist paradigm.

5.1.8 Conclusion

This inquiry, carried out in an explicitly post-positivist mode, has been an exercise in technique building.

From the initial concept, derived from my work in drama therapy, the notion of 'script' and the instrument of 'Human Sculpture' have been refined and extended to their application in the understanding of human behaviour in organisations and thus demonstrated the potential of 'Human Sculpture' as an agent for change.

The notional nature of 'script' has been articulated (Ibid: 8) and it has been demonstrated in successive cycles that this notion has been accepted as a reasonable
stepping stone to acquiring a greater understanding about one's interpersonal relationships (Ibid: 132-133).

It is a conclusion of this inquiry that the word 'script' acts as a construct which assists thinking about human behaviour, and in particular unconscious repetitious interpersonal behaviour, so that the unconscious behaviour may become conscious, as a step to it being reflected upon, evaluated and if desired changed.

It is further conclusion of this inquiry, that despite 'script' being an acceptable notion, certain organisational 'scripts' are not raised publicly because of a fear of reprisals or because of the level of immediacy (Ibid: 1340) and that this create a problem of 'script' articulation. It has been demonstrated in successive cycles that 'Human Sculpture' assists in the articulation of 'scripts' and particularly assists in situations where there are articulation problems because of immediacy or fear of reprisals.

In this inquiry it has been recognised that articulation of a 'script' is a starting point for 'rewriting' a 'script', as it is often the first opportunity a person has to express behaviour which they may desire to change. It has also been recognised that articulation alone does not ensure 'script' 'rewriting' (Ibid: 137). It has been suggested that there is a positive link between a person's self esteem and their ability to 'rewrite' a 'script'.

A series of trials and modifications of 'Human Sculpture' have resulted in the present form of 'Human Sculpture', which whilst no claim is being made that this form is perfect, the conclusion has been reached that this form is useful for facilitating organisational inquiry, and that this type of inquiry may lead to people in an organisation making 'script' changes.

Given that the Dramatistic Approach is void of any documented techniques, and that this is a notable absence in texts which include the Dramatistic Approach, the conclusion reached by this inquiry, that 'Human Sculpture' is a technique appropriate for use in the Dramatistic Approach, is considered a significant one. It is further conclusion of this inquiry that this instrument has considerable potential for future
development. Other inquirers may be included to explore variations in the process of 'Human Sculpture' as documented in this document.

In particular the practice of having the audience to the 'Human Sculpture' discuss their perceptions of the sculpture prior to the constructors of the sculpture discussing their perceptions may be one which other inquirers may seek to reverse. Other steps may also be added to the process of 'Human Sculpture' to elicit participants belief systems and thereby examine whether the 'scripts' revealed in the 'Human Sculpture' are driven by beliefs which the participants hold about themself or about others.
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APPENDIX A

A letter from a participant of ‘Human Sculpture’

At the beginning of the formal inquiry into ‘Human Sculpture’, I wrote to the participants of the group to whom I had originally presented in a context of Spontaneous Drama.

One participant responded. This is her letter.

17.7.90

Dear Geof,

Thank you for your letter. It is nice to be remembered and even nicer being asked for my recollections of our ‘Human Sculpture’ sessions. It was a great experience and it is rather stimulating for me now, to recall the learnings I benefited from so many years ago. Congratulations for doing your Masters. It looks like you are having fun with it.

I took out my old exercise book and I noticed a sense of loss welling up in me as I looked back at my notes of our Spontaneous Drama Class.

Everything seemed new and exciting then. I was like a little kid who finds a clock and upon cracking it open, taking it apart, is amazed to see all those cogs and wheels that make the clock tick. After examining with great curiosity each part, one after the other, she realises that she can’t or wouldn’t put the clock together again. I think that is the sudden grief I have touched upon.

I was on a mission or expedition then to discover WHO I AM?, WHERE AM I GOING? (or maybe just simply in school). What I found after years of learning was; that I am NO-body, going NO-where, doing NO-thing and making NO-sense. The something big I hoped to find inside the clock turned out to be a heap of disconnected fragments.

The ‘Sculpture’ was one of the ‘cogs’. What have I learned from it? The ‘Sculpture’ (Sc), used as a metaphor, contains the whole Truth about what it represents in
a symbolic form. Just like a single cell or atom contains the whole Universe. When I used the Sc. as a symbolic mirror, it reflected back as much Truth about myself as I projected onto it and was ready to perceive and acknowledge about myself. As I was searching for My Self, the goal determined my perception. Had I come to your classes with a different goal (would you call this the script?) I probably would have projected different ideas onto the Sc. and therefore perceived the exercises differently.

At the Living Sc. exercises I found myself taking second positions behind the ‘leaders’ and energising the set up from that position. This wasn’t a new idea for me, but a conscious recognition of issues I have been already grappling with. It brought the issue into focus.

For me the important learning was the practical experience of being an observer, asking relevant questions and receiving useful answers. In fact, I was awed about the generous response of all things I turned to with questions, how readily they supplied me with helpful answers! Your encouragement to expect answers in the stillness of the after-class mood was also very beneficial and much appreciated by me.

In a more general sense it taught me to pay attention to details, to treat everything as a potential source of information and to become aware of the difference between useless and useful questions. ‘WHY’ is useless, ‘WHAT’ and ‘HOW’ are useful. (Like: what is it for? How does it connect with me? What is it mirroring? How to see it differently? etc.) More important still, I learned to listen. Sometimes not even asking question just welcoming in stillness whatever guidance comes to me.

Mind you, at the time I was immersed in many other courses and books. But somehow all the different topics dovetailed and crystallised into learnings relevant for my needs. Geared to my level of understanding at that time.

This brings me to the SCRIPT.

The idea of ‘rewriting’ my ‘script’ was for me a great source of disappointment and feelings of failure. What one ‘discovers’ within the framework of a class might theoretically be very exciting. My experiences though did not support the theory. I found that I can not ‘choose my own set of values, my own interpersonal style’ (as you quoted from Egan) because this is hidden under innumerable layers of denial, suppression, conditions all in the name of ‘survival’. Conscious or unconscious ‘rewriting’ occurs when my environment, education, social contact changes. But this is more of a reaction
to meet the demands of the new setting, to reassure acceptance in that changed milieu, ensure 'survival'! I personally had my share of wildly changing and differing social, cultural, political, educational, philosophical values to adjust to. For me the question is unavoidable; out of the many 'roles', 'scripts', 'disguises' what is my Real value? Who am I?

The Buddhists have a metaphor; the peeling of the onion. It is something like that when I discard, layer after layer of styles and values realising that none of it is mine. I am at the end of my onion.

When I recognised some characteristics in the Sculpture as mine, that particular style had been resorted to (for purposes of safety) so often that I stiffened into it. It became a solidified addiction. There is a tendency to re-write, re-do the same thing over and again. What is the purpose of that? Better the know Devil than the untired Unknown. There is great fear involved in altering a solidified sculpture, the fear of disintegration. This is a strong emotion, extravagant feeling, addiction, crucifying oneself on the cross of physicality. Is this what our passion is all about? (According to your exerts from the dictionary.)

So then, who writes the script? What is it for?

The script must have a purpose, which the sculpture, from it's limited vantage-point is unable to perceive. It might not like it's form or style, but that doesn't enable it to 'rewrite' the original Idea that materialised it to existence. The only choice available at sculpture level (the conscious) is either to learn to love and appreciate it's manifestations or hate and fight itself in vicious battles. At least this is the understanding that helped me in growing out of my depressing feelings of failure after many unsuccessful attempts in 'rewriting'.

My next question relating to sculpture and script became:

Am I what I identify with?

It seemed easy to associate myself with 'sculpture-hood', but often painfully stiff and limiting. If I am the sculpture and the observer, the player in the script and the audience, then who is the Sculptor and the play-Director, who is the Author of the Ideas behind them?

It is too glib to simply say; I am that too, because I don't know.
The Sc. exercise provided answers from the sculpture's vantage-point of materiality; hard, solidified, fractured ideas experienced in separation. I might be all of the things or none of them. Still, it was a necessary stepping stone for me in my 'primary education', to lead me to the next questions and next opportunities of learnings.

As I am writing this and review my past curriculum, I am becoming aware that I have come to the end of my 'primary school', yet I am still somewhat fearful about leaving it all behind and entering my next phase of learning.

What is it like to identify with the Artist? With infinite variety of characteristics all accepted, appreciated and lovingly embraced into delightful creations?

My sculpture has been whittled away, the clock is dismantled and what I have to work with now is a heap of Ideas. I see myself as a gestalt of immaterial Ideas, reflected back from everything and everyone around me. Belonging to the same great Idea of Loving Oneness, I am ready to dance to the music. It seems that my next phase of learning will involve working with softer, more flexible ideas, in a musical sense rather than sculptural. Claiming all the instruments with their different sounds, tones and vibration. Incorporating them into a harmonious melody.

I am happy to tell you, that as I am ending this letter, my gloom is gone and I am filled with a peaceful, delightful anticipation for whatever comes next. In America, when Students graduate, they attend a 'Commencement' ceremony, this is how I feel now.

Thank you for providing me with the stimulus and opportunity to go through this overview. It helped me to say goodbye and let go of past learnings. I don't need to chew them over again and again. They've been digested and are now part of me. I am free to explore new pastures, open to new ideas and experiences.

Wishing you every success and delight in your Master-ful experiential learning.
APPENDIX B

A video of a demonstration of ‘Human Sculpture’ presented at Hawkesbury College of Advanced Education in 1984

While I was presenting Spontaneous Drama at Hawkesbury College of Advanced Education, I was invited to give a demonstration workshop in it.

The workshop was one of my early communications about the notion of ‘script’, and also included a ‘Human Sculpture’.

This is a video of that workshop.
APPENDIX C

Responses to a questionnaire sent to four organisations
with whom I had used 'Human Sculpture'
in Organisational Inquiry

At the beginning of the formal inquiry I wrote to participants who had participated in
organisational workshops which had contained 'Human Sculpture'.

The responses follow.
Pilot survey responses:  Cycle 4  Participants: 15  Responses: 8

1. Do you remember doing the Human Sculpture during the Management Workshop which Geof ran in your Organisation?

1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Yes
4. Yes
5. Yes - vividly
6. Yes
7. Yes
8. Yes

2. Do you remember the positions you and others adopted within the sculpture?

1. Yes - the one I was actually involved had an almost religious imagery.
2. Yes - some of them.
3. I remember one or two positions of others in opposite sculptures, but can not clearly visualise my position.
4. Yes
5. Yes - for my position. I am less clear about who else was where.
6. I can't remember the stance I adopted but I do remember stances taken by a few others that were significant for me and the group.
7. Yes I remember it quite well.
8. Yes I remember taking a statue position which was like it was walking through the wall. This was in response to the other statues which were all worshipping the first statue, 'A Madonna'.

3. Do the relationships suggested in the sculpture in any way mirror those relationships you know to exist in your Organisation between the same people?

1. No.
2. Yes. One sculpture consisted of people in symmetrical pattern all fitting together neatly. Another had one person in a flamboyant position with others subservient.
3. No.
4. When Geof explained the significance of the sculpture - yes.
5. I believe so - although it was only from my perspective. I chose to not return to the sculpture and change. This I did later in the year - I chose to leave the organisation.
6. Yes. I remember seeing similar actions and behaviours of the staff coming through.
7. At the time soon after the workshop I remember the positions taken by some of the participants were quite relevant to their personalities and roles within the group.
8. I am not regularly part of this organisation, and as the outsider consultant there is probably an element of my relationship evident in the statue.

4. **Do you believe the sculpture acts as an indicator of the sort of situations (problematic and non-problematic) which exist in your organisation?**

1. For me, from my perspective - no.
2. Yes. The latter one represented a problem where the person in question tried to exert her authority over people to their resentment (although she has since left). The former seemed to mirror a team building approach in individuals.
3. I don't feel the sculpture assisted in my actual working in (organisation named), but it did reflect personalities and problems of some of the participants.
4. Again with the assistance of Geof many of the concepts became clear - but were not obvious at first.
5. To a certain extent but I believe it is not clear cut as certainty is affected by emotions moods thoughts at the time.
6. Indeed. Whenever the sculpture has been used I have been surprised as to its accuracy in indicating problem situations. I find that it can help explain some questionable behaviour previously observed.
7. I don't know if just doing one sculpture is enough of an indicator. It could just indicate the mood one is in at the time. Therefore timing of the sculptures is an important factor - trust and the relaxed or unrelaxed or uptight state of the group would affect the sculpture.
8. I don't know if the sculpture is an indicator, but this configuration prompted a lot of discussion about responsibility to the organisation and acting appropriately as a leader.
Pilot survey responses: Cycle 5 Group A Participants: 12 Responses: 7

1. Do you remember doing the Human Sculpture during the Management Workshop which Geof ran in your Organisation?

1. Yes
2. I remember some aspects better than others.
3. Yes
4. Yes - vividly. It was great.
5. Very clearly. A workable group size (10-12 persons); a reasonable degree of unfamiliarity between persons.
6. Yes
7. Yes

2. Do you remember the positions you and others adopted within the sculpture?

1. Fairly well.
2. I recall the difficulty I experienced in finding a position and the frustration created by the positions of two of my peers.
3. I remember my own and two others, but not all.
4. Precisely for some - vaguely for others - but I remember the general shape of the sculpture.
5. To some extent, not being familiar with other persons in group and indeed the organisation being infiltrated by 'association' organisations.
6. I remember my own very clearly. The others I am not so clear.
7. Yes.

3. Do the relationships suggested in the sculpture in any way mirror those relationships you know to exist in your Organisation between the same people?

1. Some did and some seemed to relate to me and my family.
2. Only in one instance. Otherwise relationships are collaborative and harmonious. Sometimes stances in a group do not reflect those in a one-to-one basis.
3. To a certain extent yes - one person 'bridging the gap' between people - trying to be a facilitator; the other being a solid foundation on the floor, and my position as separate from the group (actually what I felt like at the time).
4. To some extent - difficult to assess because we had outsiders join in the group which affected relationships.
5. To a large extent yes. The sculpture offers a perspective on the interactions of elements within the organisation I had not previously considered.
6. I work part time as (organisation named) and I am unaware of what the other people in my group do within the organisation.
7. Not really as I am not part of that organisation, but I was aware of my self and the tension I had.
4. Do you believe the sculpture acts as an indicator of the sort of situations (problematic and non-problematic) which exist in your organisation?

1. Yes.
2. Only marginally - for two reasons: 1. The whole group was not present and 2. There were peripheral members present.
3. Yes I do - I was an associate of the college, and therefore not a 'full' member. My position echoed this I believe! The person who 'bridged the gap' was frustrated with me for not joining the group - I no longer work for (organisation named).
4. Uncertain in this case due to outsiders being included. I imagine that the sculpture could be very informative.
5. To a large extent yes. The sculpture offers a perspective on interactions of elements within the organisation I had not previously considered.
6. No, because of my (part time) situation. I do believe the sculpture showed much more clearly personal attributes and feelings we had about ourselves in personal relationships and in group situations. I thought it was an excellent exercise.
7. Yes. I do.
Pilot survey responses: Cycle 5 Group B Participants: 15 Responses: 4

1. Do you remember doing the Human Sculpture during the Management Workshop which Geof ran in your Organisation?
   1. Yes.
   2. Yes. It was an educative and enjoyable experience.
   4. At (Organisation named) with fifteen staff members who were working in group therapy.

2. Do you remember the positions you and others adopted within the sculpture?
   1. Yes.
   2. Sort of - it was 6 months ago and I was only a visitor at the time. Now I work here.
   3. Yes - remember some others more than my own.

3. Do the relationships suggested in the sculpture in any way mirror those relationships you know to exist in your Organisation between the same people?
   1. Yes.
   2. We discussed this in the debriefing after the sculpture and decided that it did mirror our working relationships.
   3. Most certainly: in some cases very clear. As people bring their personal styles to the sculpture so too do they in their interactions at work in their work style.
   4. It very much reflects that even though we work in different (Organisation subset named) we are all a team over all.

4. Do you believe the sculpture acts as an indicator of the sort of situations (problematic and non-problematic) which exist in your organisation?
   1. Yes.
   2. Yes. This was particularly telling in a sculpture in which the Administrator found it difficult to find a position for himself and he later talked about feeling excluded sometimes.
   3. Yes. In our workshop the sculptures were less aired at organisational understanding but nevertheless the situations were often clear and sometimes provided insight into why people choose to work as they do.
   4. Yes, but as one appreciates that is the reality working in and with people that are hurting to a large degree.
Pilot survey responses: Cycle 5 Group C Participants: 14 Responses: 8

1. Do you remember doing the Human Sculpture during the Management Workshop which Geof ran in your Organisation?

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. Yes.
7. Yes.
8. Yes - very clearly.

2. Do you remember the positions you and others adopted within the sculpture?

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Not all - but a reasonable number.
5. Yes.
6. Yes.
7. Yes.
8. Yes. Very well.

3. Do the relationships suggested in the sculpture in any way mirror those relationships you know to exist in your Organisation between the same people?

1. Only relationships which I suspect exist from my limited experience within the organisation.
2. No.
3. Yes.
4. I think there was some resemblance of some relationships.
5. To some extent - some people in my sculpture are not people that I am in close enough contact to make an assessment.
6. Yes.
7. Definitely - especially highlighting 'problem' areas for individuals and the group - as perceived by them but also perceived by others.
8. Yes.
4. Do you believe the sculpture acts as an indicator of the sort of situations (problematic and non-problematic) which exist in your organisation?

1. Perhaps, although I think it is dangerous to buy too much store by these things if they are not going to be properly and fully explored.

2. No.

3. Yes.

4. Yes. In small groups mainly.

5. Yes - an indicator of the effect of individual personality on the organisation.

6. Yes.

7. Yes. I feel that it is a very creative indicator that can appear quite non-threatening, although as the situations developed there were participants that I felt were threatened by facing what the sculpture meant to them.

8. Yes, but with the following caution: I believe that there are strong aspects which allow themselves to be interpreted as reflecting one's own perception of how/what relationships exist between those people in the Organisation.
APPENDIX D

Transcript from the audio tape of the workshop
detailed in Cycle 7

For the purposes of obtaining a clear record of speech, the facilitator often repeated a phrase in Active Listening Mode to ensure that it had been recorded. These have not been recorded in the transcript.

Children Services Committee with 12 staff. Two sculptures formed.

Sculpture 1:

Geof When Marilyn formed the first sculpture what did it look like to the audience.

Audience It wasn’t making a statement. (I think I am making a comment after the rest of the sculpture). It was like she was forming a wall or an outside boundary. She was giving a frame to work with.

Geof Second into the sculpture was Narelle. When Narelle joined the sculpture how did it look to the audience?

Audience It took the attention off Marilyn, but she set the tone for the rest of the sculpture. Focussed the attention onto her. It became a more stable sculpture when Narelle got there and painfully put her arms out. She knew that she would have to hold it for ten minutes but was prepared to do it. It made the sculpture more stable. And gave it balance. Just the fact that Narelle moved to be near Marilyn.

Geof The third into the sculpture was Jana. When Jana joined the sculpture how did it look to you.

Audience To me it looked like a free form about to take flight over the rest of the sculpture. Like also a preparedness for fun. It looked to me like a big dive.

Geof (as observer) I was really aware of the matching that you had taken the same theme as Narelle higher. I was aware of the arms out. It was the picking up on a theme and riding with it and taking it into a new direction.
The fourth person in the sculpture was Janine. How did it look when Janine joined the sculpture.

She seemed observant. She put herself close to people. She focussed towards the centre of the group. Janine was extending the boundary. Going between the two sets of figures that were there into the centre therefore creating a circular background. To me it became ..... initially there was a gap between and she came in here and so it became a rounded. ‘Though in the situation where she was looking down with her hands behind her back, I didn’t know whether she was observing or judging.

(as observer) I was very aware that where the others had moved very quickly into their positions, there seemed to be a thought process of thinking about where am I going to be in here. It was really noticeable in that the others had gone very quickly into it, where yours seemed to taking time to think, and choosing this is how I am going to be in the sculpture.

When Robyn joined the sculpture how did it look to you?

I thought it was visually complete. I thought it was visually delightful; and it was a question of colour and balance and form and everything. And Robyn went there into that position and I just felt delighted. From back on Robyn’s pose looked very relaxed and a beautiful shape and it reminded me of that mermaid that sits on that rock in Denmark. One of her toes pointed towards Narelle, so there was the flow there between the bodies and that’s how I saw it and I thought it looked beautiful.

I noticed that there was a slight gap between Narelle and Robyn was really careful to make sure that there was just a slight gap there.

When you looked at the sculpture from different perspectives did that change anything for you, because we had seen it grow from this side. Did it seem any different when you wandered around and looked at the sculpture from different angles.

It looked a bit enclosing from that side because it was the back of people and you couldn’t quite see anything. It looked a bit oppressive actually. It was very inviting. This was the best view for me. There was no room to see or to get in or to look through to what was on the other side.
As I walked around Janine's hands were behind her back almost like she was pondering; but I hadn't got that impression from the front view. It made me wonder whether she was ..... 

Geof

I will highlight a bit because I think what you are describing is an important thing about the sculpture. When we look at a situation if we change our perception of that situation maybe it changes. We may look at a person and say you are being very judgmental, but when we wander around and look at them from another point of view, maybe they aren't being judgemental. We have a very concrete example there, that Janine from one direction may appear to be judgmental, and we need (the audience) needs to change; not Janine, to realise that maybe she is not being that way.

Audience

On the way back I considered cutting across it ..... and I knew that I just couldn't do that. That that was a really wrong thing to do. It was important not to do that. I thought there was a unity about it that was important not to break.

Geof

When Marilyn came out what did you want her to do?

Audience

I wanted her to go back into the same sport. I think she joined in. I mean she may have destroyed the visual impact, but I think she actually added to it. I could see that she was going to be more comfortable where she was going. By being the first person she didn't have the opportunity that other people had and so I felt for her that it was the best thing.

..... and she was beside her, that was like a lot of support and when Marilyn moved away I was worried that the sculpture was going to fall over. But when Marilyn moved out she was very well supported by her back, by herself anyway. From this angle that is what I thought, she's going to collapse.

I thought there was a danger of collapse, but when I walked around there wasn't.

Geof

When Marilyn was in the new position did that add anything, change anything about the way you saw the sculpture.

Audience

It made, slightly made Janine and Jane, because they were standing up, look a little out of context. There were just two standing up and everyone else was coming down to the ground and being on the same level as each other.

I think it changed the focus. Before it was three and two and then it became two and three, and so it changed the focus of the sculpture, by
just changing the shape. It had a normal easygoing feeling about it without that strong line beside it. A bit more flexibility.

The Sculpture talks for itself:

Geof  When you formed the first sculpture Marilyn what did you have in mind?

Marilyn Not much. I was really unsure because really I don’t know where I fit in with this group. My works a bit different. I am part time and being the first one it was hard to ..... So I didn’t do much. I wasn’t sure what to do.

Geof  When you joined the sculpture Narelle, what were you thinking?

Narelle I had in mind that I was essential to most activities and eventually everyone comes to at some time to me, so I was just spreading out.

Geof  So what the audience said, as soon as you joined it was like the focus, you had thought about yourself being the focus point.

Narelle Yes.

Geof  Jana?

Jana I was still carrying in my mind when we had that imaginary walk ..... I felt terribly excited about it and I leaned out of the castle window saying ‘look, look what I’ve got ....’ I was leaning down and out to attract peoples attention down there. At the same time I didn’t want to go too far away from my chair. I felt more secure. I wanted to stay close to my chair.

Geof  That’s interesting that what the audience saw as you diving was actually leaning out. How easily our action can be misinterpreted and yet both of them were positive things. What you thought you were doing was slightly different to what they thought you were doing.

Janine?

Janine From this angle Jana looked just a little bit foreboding so that is why I made the point of actually walking around to get the different perspectives. Narelle was standing there with her arms out, and Jana with her; it just sort of seemed to be a circle and that just seemed a really safe space for me to be. In between, because there was the gap
and that completes the circle. And I thought if I do anything with my arms it is going to destroy the circle. That's why I put my arms behind my back. I really didn't want to put them in front. The arms were very expressive.

Geof

So there was no judgement or anything like that about it. That's just where your arms happened to be.

Janine

I didn't want to destroy the expression that I saw because Jana took on quite a different form; an expressive form. Narelle and Marilyn were both very expressive and I thought to add another pair of arms would just destroy that expression.

Geof

Robyn?

Robyn

I decided that I would be more comfortable on the floor and as soon as Narelle sat down I could just see where I would go when I got into that position the gap between the toes was very deliberate, because I'm always 'out' of the group and coming in, but usually out .... and when I got into that position I thought I'm under the protection of the group, the three of them standing; which was really interesting.

Geof

Marilyn, when you came out what passed through your mind?

Marilyn

I wanted to be comfortable and Narelle, usually when I'm in the office, she's always there, and the arms out like this was right. If you want something. It's safe being there as well.

Geof

Something I had forgotten about, it was commented that they were concerned that your arms would get tired. Did that happen?

Marilyn

Oh yes (this was said in a tone of .... but that's to be expected), but it wasn't difficult. It was like a pain and I thought 'oh well you've had worse pain'.

Geof

It was a bearable pain.

General

Your's was a different kind of pain. Your's was more a need to be more in the group.

Geof

Is there anything that needs to be said about the sculpture that hasn't been said; from the audience or the statues themselves?

Audience

I felt that when Marilyn moved she physically removed herself a bit from the group. From where I was standing, once she moved away
from the group it was like she had gone outside the group. And I was looking at it from a different angle. I felt concerned for Marilyn, that given the choice to move toward the group that she was a little bit separate from the group.

Geof: You saw it a moving away from the group rather than moving toward.

Audience: Yes. I was feeling a bit concerned that she would have to pull herself more into the group.

Sculpture 2:

Geof: When Lindy formed the first part of the sculpture. How did it look to you?

Audience: I thought Lindy looked very serene calm and relaxed. I thought she was very composed. Very confident. She knew how she wanted to be. I saw her as saying 'look at me'.

Geof: Very inviting for people to ..... Taking a focus position?

Audience: A need to be looked at.

Geof: Then Gus.

Audience: I saw her connecting herself with Lindy; saying its all right I've got you. It was more like 'hold on'.

Geof: So Gus was holding on or asking Lindy to hold on?

Audience: Holding Lindy back. She was almost childlike.

Geof: (As observer) It looked like the younger sister playing with the older sister's long hair.

Geof: How did it look when Judy joined the sculpture?

Audience: Friendship ..... moving past..... and then there was one step forward.

Geof: Friendship and progression. Moving forward.

Audience: Yes.
Audience: Everyone was connected because Judy put her foot on Lindy's .... They were all in touch; all in tune.

Geof: (As observer) I must admit I worried about that foot because in some ways it was like inflicting pain. It reminded me of a little child I had at the centre who would consciously tread on my toe to hurt it. And it worried me that it might hurt Lindy's toe.

Audience: When I went behind the sculpture I noticed Judy's other hand, not the friendship hand, that was like a domineering or a disciplinary position. It was that arm, but maybe that's my perception of the role that Judy's in. I picked that up to ..... She came in in a nurturing role but with discipline.

Geof: And both of you are saying that that's how you see Judy in a work situation.

Audience: No. I'm not saying that. That's what Robin is saying. I am saying that's what I saw in the sculpture. It was very much the two parts; there was this nurturing part and then there was this other part. From this perspective it was all closed off. I thought that was really interesting that everyone turned their back to the audience.

Geof: From your perspective it was actually getting quite non interesting.

Audience: Yes.

Audience: It was different when Di joined it. Then from the back view all you could see was Di.

Geof: Well let's move on to Di.

Audience: It extended attention out. It was very ..... (something about having back to audience). Wasn't it a feeling of enveloping everyone. From here I thought it was very strong. God! But from here where I could see into the sculpture it was more caring.

Geof: So your first perception was as if it was enveloping, and it was only when you changed position that you realised that it wasn't as enveloping as you thought it was at the start.

Audience: No ....

Geof: You could still see it there ....
Audience: I looked at Di and laughed because I thought that’s it. That’s reasonably .... for a start .... Gregarious and loud.

Geof: When Wendy joined the sculpture.

Audience: I felt sad. It was like Wendy was made to be kept in there. Maybe that’s me. Thinking about next year .... I was just like wanting to be enveloped. It was very much like a child crawling into the centre. Like sitting on someone’s lap. .... history .... taking everything out ....

Geof: So what you were seeing was tempered by your understanding of the history of the whole group.

Audience: Hmmm

Geof: When I said to Lindy to come out .... what did you want Lindy to do?

Audience: I thought she would go back.

Geof: You thought she would do .... What did you want her to do?

Audience: Not move.

Audience: I wanted her to open up more on that side. Without taking Lindy’s support but I just wanted her to open up a bit more, come back sort of on the floor.... a bit more open I did not see Lindy’s pose as comfortable for Wendy.

Geof: When Lindy went to that position and it was the same position did the sculpture in any way change?

Audience: No. I felt sad that she went out and then had to go back in. I don’t think it achieved the same. It wasn’t the look of it. It was the feeling. It just wasn’t how it was. It didn’t feel the same. She thought about it and said that’s where I am going to be. Its my place.

Geof: Something in the tone of your voice is suggesting to me that she had to go back. She had no choice. It that how it was for you?

Audience: Yes, I think so.

Geof: Because the sculpture made it impossible for her to choose otherwise. That is my words but I just want to clarify.
Yes. She just couldn’t find another place. I thought it would be good if she could fill up the middle space. The top level down.

The sculpture speaks:

Lindy

I originally sat in the position I did; not as posing but just to be somewhere where I would be comfortable and feel relaxed. And position myself in such a way so that the people who built around me had a choice of where they could go. Like I faced that way. I was half faced towards this group. Just thinking about the other people coming to join me, because I was looking straight ahead I could see the figures of Judy and Di. I couldn’t really see Gus. I could see up to about Judy and Di’s waist and I didn’t feel intimidated by that; but when I thought I have to look up at them, so I did that and that was OK. I didn’t feel that they were crowding in on top me. That was OK for them to be there. When Judy put her foot on my foot I thought that was really nice. I liked that …. I thought that was wonderful. it was like her little seal on my foot. And I enjoyed the connectedness of the people around. I must admit I felt a touch uncomfortable when Wendy came crawling through. I kept thinking where is she going. I kept wondering where she was going to end up. That was different actually, that end bit.

Gus what did you think of when you joined the sculpture?

I wanted to be close to Lindy, but I didn’t feel as though I wanted to be on the ground. And I think someone said about the sister thing and I think that that fits in very well. I wanted to be connected to her in a way which wasn’t really an intellectual way but more a feeling way. The best way to do that would be to pick up her hair and I made a point of not dragging it but just holding it. There was just that connecting thing ... cause otherwise I would have had to bend down, so that was just a nice way of doing it. I wanted to change later. I wanted to put my arm around her and when Dianne joined the sculpture I wanted to look up and give her a grin. I felt a bit constrained that I had to keep stay just looking down. It was childlike .... it was an emotional contact.
Judy

Well I knew I didn’t want to be on the floor because I wouldn’t be comfortable. And I just felt that I would stand beside .... and touch her and I wanted to touch Lindy and I had to do it with my foot because it was very hard to connect with because I felt .... and I felt that that was a good contact because she didn’t have her shoes on and I didn’t either. It was skin to skin. And when I had to do something with this hand I felt I didn’t want to have it down. I wanted to put it here because it made me feel strong and also it made a lead form somebody else to have contact.

Geof

When you heard the audience say that it was a combination of discipline and nurturing, have you got any comment about that?

Judy

I think that that is probably true. Discipline, well in my own home but even so I feel that I feel that even in my work even though I nurture I am still quite strong with what I believe when I have to be.

Geof

What about you Di?

Di

I tried to just go and not think it through and I found that that was just the right place to go and I was curious that the audience mentioned that we were facing away but by that time the sculpture was very much facing that way, and in retrospect if I had turned to face the audience I would have been disconnected with the sculpture.

Another member of the sculpture

Also when you stood there I couldn’t see or feel you. I had to turn to look up to you to see what you had actually done.

Geof

Wendy

Wendy

Well I had two thoughts in mind. One was that the group seemed to be complete and if I had a choice I would have stayed out, but given that I didn’t have a choice that I had to find somewhere, I wanted to be somewhere that was not intrusive to the group focus, and the other kind of immediate feeling was that there was a gap there from where I was sitting. Had I walked around and looked at it differently I probably would have chosen somewhere. Given that I had to overcome the impulse not to go in at all. I then did the quickest thing rather than taking a lot of time to look at the focus. There was no question about coming in. Di’s position was very strong. There was a unity there that should not have been broken. And so all I could see to do was to plug the gap but without intruding on the total.
Geof  And you really felt that there was a rule that you had to be involved in the sculpture?

Wendy  Yeah. I should have asked. I should have said ‘do we all have to be in it?’ My first impulse was its complete. It doesn’t need me at all. I’ll stay out but because I hadn’t asked about those rules, because I hadn’t anticipated that comment, I said ‘How can I find a place in the sculpture that doesn’t intrude on the focus ... doesn’t intrude on the group’. And the other thing, sitting there I realised that my focus was out, out of the sculpture. If I had thought about it I would have tried to tie it up more, but it was definitely out.

Geof  So once you were within the sculpture your focus was looking out, not looking at the sculpture.

Wendy  Yes, that’s right.

Another member of the sculpture  I thought it seemed like a real struggle for her to get in but when she was in position it just seemed like a tight family. Like it filled it in. There really wasn’t meant to be a space there for her to do that, but when she managed to fit there, it just sort of interlocked.

Geof  Almost like she created the space for herself.

Audience  She fitted into the space that was there.

Wendy  I didn’t feel uncomfortable.

Geof  Lindy

Lindy  It was funny to remove myself because I had to disconnect myself from three people and that felt strange. Because my foot went all cold again, and I wandered around and the only other thing that I thought I could have done was to do something really dramatic, something really open, like hands and legs and a star. Somewhere but I didn’t know where. Then I thought ‘No that won’t be right’; but I was actually conscious of the fact that people had their backs to the audience at that stage when I went out of the group and afterwards I thought I can’t do anything else.

Geof  A real sense of I can’t do anything else.

Lindy  No! It wouldn’t have been right because I couldn’t think where I could stand in any other position, that would compliment what was
already there and I just saw that the gap where I had left there was a space there and that's where I should be.

Geof

Is there anything that hasn't been said about that sculpture that people really feel needs to be said?

Audience

I think the only thing that I can hit on is the fact that they all had their backs to us. That maybe the three standing up felt that they were the power and that we were just on the outside.

Sculpture

But I wasn't regarding them as an audience. I was doing it as part of the sculpture. Subconsciously you may do that anyway. What was really interesting was that Wendy got up and walked around here, and came in from that point. I got the impression that she didn't actually feel comfortable about walking around.

Wendy

Yes, I didn't feel comfortable. It's interesting that you say that, given that my first impulse was to stay out.

Audience

When we had to divide into groups I just checked how we fell, where was the power. Wendy came late and she wasn't with this group she was with that group. I was trying to work out where it was. What the connections were between us, as opposed to the connections between them. We're the workers.

Off tape

(Geof asks the question: What is interesting about either of the sculptures?)

Wendy

OK that's interesting because you were sitting on the side, and I was sitting on the side, and yet we still saw that as a line not to be broken.

Audience

Definitely a line not to be broken, but I didn't see it as the back; that we were the audience and that was the back.

Geof

I'll just note parts not to be broken (writing up) so we have a couple of themes.

Audience

It was a strong line.

Geof

Are there other bits that resonated out of either sculpture. Or of both the sculptures?

Audience

I think with sculpture one, the focus on Narelle was important.
Was that something in sculpture two. The nature of the focus?

There was a focus, wasn’t there! Didn’t it sort of go down towards ....
I found it interesting that there was a gap between ourselves and ....

That idea of gap was picked up twice. Wendy also spoke of the only gap through which she was to come in there.

Another interesting thing about sculpture two was that everyone, a couple of them said that they didn’t want to be on the ground. And nobody was.

Sculpture two the levels (writing on whiteboard)

I was very aware that a number of people talked about there was only one place for them to go, and I wondered whether that’s something other people picked up. Sort of ‘I don’t have any choice. This is where I must go.’ Is that an issue that other people were concerned about in the sculpture? For me it seemed to be mentioned a number of times in terms of what is available in a sculpture in terms of the options available.

I didn’t see it so much as much lack of choice as ‘rightness’. I had to go on that side because Gus was there and that was the right place for me to go, and so my choice was limited because of it being that particular side. I also saw that it wasn’t that you had to be in a particular place, but that was where you felt most comfortable and that was a consideration.

In sculpture I was that a similar theme?
That there was a right place to go?

I thought from my position it was. I don’t know about the other positions.

I think that Marilyn actually mentioned that her choice was about comfort.

I don’t understand why under sculpture 1 you put ‘closedness’ there, because it wasn’t a closed sculpture? (This question was related to what was written on the whiteboard)

I repeated the theme where it was commented on that it may not be closed it could be unity. That seems to be an issue.
Is something closed or is it a unit that a number of people were talking about, about both sculptures.

Audience
Because in the first one there was a lot more room for other people. If you decided to put two more people onto it, you could have had some additions.

Audience
Well you could have on your one. (The other sculpture) On the other side it was completely free. You (Judy) had that arm out .... expecting somebody to go there.

Geof
Can I ask if anyone ever thought of standing over here and being part of the sculpture. To me that is an interesting aspect, that there are no rules, but we limited ourselves to the physical boundary, but then a new boundary that the sculpture created. Then when Wendy said there was nowhere else I could go, there was nothing to stop Wendy coming over to take her part in the sculpture here. It would still be a sculpture. Like the sculptures in Queensland during the Expo that were often mistaken for people and that sometimes they would be far apart; but they were part of the one sculpture. We are often guided by 'It must be there' and it comes back to the rights of choice.

Wendy
I thought that that sense of completeness was there. I could have made that statement by staying where I was, but I thought the rest of the group would think that I didn’t want to be a part of the group. So there is an implication there as well.

Geof
Did you just hear what you said? The rest of the group will think!

Wendy
It was quite a conscious decision. Seeing I didn’t have this choice (I agree I probably took that on myself. You didn’t say that) that having thought that through then I looked for the gaps.

Geof
And that was the only gap that you could see.

Wendy
From my perspective.

Sculpture
Because you couldn’t see my arm there.

Wendy
If I had seen your arm I would have done something.

Sculpture
It’s absolutely spot on.
It can be interpreted two ways too. It can be a friendly thing or it can be quite a.....

Can we use that as a bridge to now suggest, have there been any times in the history of the Caravan project that it has suffered from missed arm opportunities, because a person has not wandered around to see where the places are, that maybe they have missed an obvious place. Does that create any resonance for the reality of the ways you are working together.

Not currently but it certainly has in the past.

There have been instance of missed arm opportunities? Here we have a really good example that the arm may have been seen had Wendy walked around. If the sculpture could talk. If Wendy could talk with the sculpture say ‘I’m not too sure where I should go’ and then the sculpture says I have an arm over here that is waiting to be linked to. That sometimes the sculpture in reality can not talk because it has not contemplated that it needs to make that communication. It’s a two-way thing.

What about other bits in there? Are there parts that you can see as a metaphor for the way that the group is working as a group. That we move away from the sculpture. The sculpture is just the means to look at it. I am talking about the way in which this group as an organisational group functions.

Can I just go back to the missed out opportunities before you go away from it completely. I sort of feel that there does come occasions, even now, that because of our roles we see things from different viewpoints and therefore, we are not aware of the arms that are there, and the options available.

There are always surely occasions......

I agree with you. I think we have a very good lesson here that that particular arm may have been picked up if Wendy had made the walk around the sculpture. To me that is management by walking around. Sometimes you see the opportunities when you wander around and look at the situation, from the different sides before you respond to how you are going to respond to the different situations.

Let's say that there is a staff conflict and I am standing back here and I say that 'the only gap is there' but if I move over here I may see a missed arm so that there is a management lesson by walking around the situation we may see other ways in which we can respond to the
situation. As happened with the sculpture. What I really noticed to
day was how quickly we move into position. It was only Janine who
I was really aware of who took time to move into that position and to
me there is value in that. That contemplating. And yes, it takes time
and while its taking time anything could happen. Pieces of the
sculpture could fall away.

Wendy

The other management thing is that my first situation is to stay out. I
mean that was my gut reaction that there is a completeness that it
doesn’t need anything else. And then the kind of pressure. I have to
do this so I will and that again is a management choice.

Audience

I think that you are doing that, the way you feel rather than the feeling
of the total sculptures. You went in because you felt that people
would want you to move in so you must move in. From where you
were sitting that was the only place that was available to you.

Wendy

The management lesson was that intuitively my feeling was to stay
out. The sculpture didn’t need anything else. It was complete, it had
focus. It had presence. It had power. It didn’t need any more
participation. Maybe I or maybe we go in when we don’t have to go
in at all.

Audience

But haven’t you set that up for the sculpture to be like that to work?

Wendy

Yes.

Audience

Had you decided to stay out you still would have had the opportunity
to explain.

Wendy

That’s true.

Audience

I think that its really interesting, having decided to come in ... the body
language wasn’t management language. It was very much a very
personal sort of language, that I saw you expressing .... I think its
really understandable that it indicates the duality about it.
.... and that’s where the true power is. You are actually giving away
the power ....

Geof

An option where we could follow on, using that as an example of
where you can go with the sculpture, is that we can allow Wendy to
use the sculpture, to explore some alternatives. Now one rule that we
had was that it was a static sculpture.
We could talk that rule away and say lets make it a dynamic sculpture
and what happens to the sculpture if Wendy dances around it. Then
we have a totally new sculpture; and then what does that mean in a management sense when we take it away from the metaphor. How do we achieve that. And we can explore different ways in the sculpture and say ‘how can we achieve that in real life? What does it mean to do that?’ Or we could still keep the rule that the sculpture has to be static, and that Wendy explore ‘What’s it like to be part of the sculpture sitting over there? How does Wendy feel about that? How does the sculpture feel about that? For any of the cases we can explore that alternatives, and at least before we are finished today we will take one alternative and we will explore it. I will show you how the sculpture can be used to explore alternatives in a metaphorical way where we have to take them into reality.

Geof

What are the other things which really started to resonate.

Wendy

I found the ambivalence of Lindy’s statement interesting. Some people saw it as posing; other people saw it as comfortable. A lot of discord about the position and it being definite; Whether it was definite, whether it was posed, whether it was convenient; whether it was a focus ...

I saw that as being the most ambivalent in terms of the audience.

Geof

If we take that to stretching the metaphor we can say that does that happen in your work. That some people interpret the way that you are working one way. That you are asking for focus on yourself. Have you received that sort of feedback?

Lindy

I don’t know how to put, what to say to that. Certain things have happened this year that I have thought the reaction from other people was not the reaction that I expected; and not the reaction I sought. I have become aware of that more this year, and its been a process for me over the last few months, but I have become more aware of it this year and I have tried to enable other people not to misunderstand me. Not to misinterpret things that I do and say, so that there’s less discord amongst other people towards me.

Geof

So there is actually a similarity between what happened today and what you have experienced.

Audience

Well yes. But everybody’s different.

Geof

That doesn’t surprise me at all because that is what I see happen in the sculpture a lot. The way that we are in the sculpture often mirrors what happens in life because life is based on exactly the same things that affect the sculpture.
When you are given no rules and you just go and do it we sort of get a microcosm and what we see happen in the sculpture can be exactly mirroring what we are experiencing in life. Through the sculpture we can see ways of resolving that. We can play with the metaphor. In your case maybe there isn’t anything other than acknowledging that people will perceive you in different ways and that’s their problem. You know what you are doing and if they want to take the effort to say ‘well it looks to me like you are doing this’, then that at least allows you to explain what you are doing otherwise you are going to be misinterpreted. It doesn’t mean its right or wrong.

Geof

Other bits.

Audience

Well obviously power is an issue for some of us here.

Geof

Which bit of the power would you like to talk about.

Audience

I brought it up because it’s obvious that it other things.

Geof

(Active Listening) so the wall was created in your sculpture and that’s a problem for them. Would people feel comfortable to explore that through the sculpture? That we would rebuild sculpture two and talk about that wall as a way of talking about the issue of power in the caravan Project.

Audience

Is it necessary to talk about the issue of power?

Geof

No, its not necessary. Where I find the sculpture is handy is that we can talk about what’s happening in the sculpture and that may give us some insights into the issue. When we talk about the issue there are many things which get in the way. I think that’s where I see the value in using the sculpture. We are talking about something over here, and then we bring it across and say ‘how can we apply that?’

Geof

And I am wondering if that’s what Di picked up in ‘it seemed the only place to go’ and ‘that’s where you felt you had to be’ .... to do with the parts not to be broken, and of the rightness of choice rather than a personal preference. Are people feeling that they have a certain part in this team, a certain role that they can’t break out of that role. What happens to the rest if I change?

Audience

I think that that’s probably me because I was prepared to carry the weight.

Audience

You chose that didn’t you.
It's pretty rigid where I am.

Do you want to change that?

It's your own choice to stay there.

Yes, but there is different ways you could look at it in your position that may ease the burden on your arms. Get two people to support your arms for you. You've got two volunteers holding up your arms. Hire employees to be your support people if that's the position you want to hold. We've only looked at Marilyn and Lindy changing, but technically anyone in the sculpture can step out of the sculpture and say 'Is that where I want to be? What's difficult for me in that position. Is the same thing difficult in my work, but I've chosen to be this way in my work and its tiring. How might I change myself in the sculpture? It allows you to look at options. Anyone could stand outside and that's a management concept, standing outside the situation and say what is happening here? What is my feeling about my role in there and its hard to do that at a head level; its easier to do it when you have a physical sculpture there to remove yourself. Look at everything that is resting on you and say yeah, that is resting on me. That's probably where the annoyance is. There is an elbow sticking in my knee or something, and that's uncomfortable.

What other bits need to be explored about the sculpture or about work.

Levels?

Uncomfortable but comfortable about Marilyn, when Jana joined the sculpture I said 'that's right'. The same when Robyn came and I felt uncomfortable about you wandering around. Hovering abroad trying to make just waiting for you to stand still.

and were you comfortable with the position I took?

It was like as though there was power.

Is that how it is in work?

But is it an uncomfortable feeling.

Janine does walk around and think about things. Deciding what she will do.
Because I think sometimes Janine takes on more than her own problems.

A couple of questions came up through the session I remember Di asked, and I think now is the later on time. You've seen how it works. We've only touched the surface, but you have a tool there is you want to use that. It allows you to explore situations in a different way, and I really advocate to a lot of my management groups when you ever need a new way of looking at a situation physically say well lets build a sculpture and you don't need me because the process is really straight forward. Some act as audience and reflect. Is that in any way similar to the situation. When I came in this morning, the debate over whether we use the word perfect, or quality, is what was happening in the sculpture, and that may give us insights as to how to sort out the other situation. So you have got enough of that, but there may be questions about the overall process that people want to ask. It's appropriate to deal with some of those ones now. As to why it works certain ways and why I did certain things people may be curious about that.
APPENDIX E

Flow of consciousness on reading the transcript from the audio tape of the workshop detailed in Cycle 7

1. I used the phrase ‘How did it look to you’ a lot;

2. I was aware of my teaching example; (I had developed while teaching at the Institute of Counselling.) I did this by making my observations as an observer and within the statement stated that it was my observation.

On the one side I am wanting each person to ‘own’ their perception of the sculpture, on the other hand conscious of using a language which other may begin to adopt.
Similarly I acknowledge that I am one of the observers, and occasionally introduced my perceptions of the sculpture. I wait until others have given my perceptions, as I am conscious that as the facilitator that I have an amount of ascribed status. I actively work to disempower myself.

   What did you want her to do?

was an attempt to distinguish between what one wants to happen and what one saw happen, and what one expected to happen based on their knowledge about that person (knowledge of their ‘scripts’). I think this happens a lot in management. The desire for something to happen takes over the perception of the situation. I liked the way I drew this out to show how we perceive situations differently.

4. My style throughout seems to me like what had been commented on in England. Very non intrusive. I spend a lot of time inviting comment and making only minimal comment my self.

Michael in England had questioned why I did not ask each person what they saw in the sculpture, as a way of making sure that everyone had a chance to speak. My answer to that had been that I felt that that was intrusive and I preferred to use Silence as a way of letting the whole group know that there was space for anyone to comment on the sculpture. I noticed in this workshop that I also used the phrase:

‘Is there anything that hasn’t been said about that sculpture people really feel needs to be said?’

as a way of also creating space for more people to speak.
5. When I used the phrase
   ‘And you really thought there was a rule that you had to be involved in the sculpture’
There is a bit of the showman going on here. I am trying to draw out a point that there may be unspoken peer group pressure - but I am hamming it up.
When I am speaking about written rules I was very much influenced by what I had read in the article by Cathcart and Samovar, that in organisations there are rules of behaviour.

6. The ‘Are you saying’ phrases are influenced by my understandings about active listening and clarification. These lead to ownership of ones perceptions which I believe is an important part of this work. These are often confused.
   Where I say to a member of the audience
   ‘Are you saying that if you had been in Lindy’s position you would have gone into the middle level?’
   is a clarification of whether this is something they want for the protagonist or whether they, in their imagination, have become the protagonist, and this is an expression of their own playing out this situation. The clarification particularly has come up at conference where I have presented the Human Sculpture and we deal with the dilemma, ‘what if you do not get a chance to be in the sculpture’.
I have always argued that the act of suggesting what a person should do, or what you wanted them to do, is equivalent to being in the sculpture yourself and working out the situation in your own way.

7. Where I have used the phrase
   ‘Some of your audience suggested ....’
I like that I have remembered these things without having notes about them. It invited the speaker to challenge the perceptions of the audience. This links to the notion that each person’s perception is their own, and I believe is empowering in that it opens space for a person to reject another’s perception of their actions.

8. The final comment at the end of discussing the sculpture
   ‘Is there any other comment ....’
opens space for things unsaid. I had not used this before and my time at Bath University has prompted me to how hard the facilitator had to work to ensure that there are spaces for each person to speak.

9. I come into this exercise both with knowledge about the exercise but more importantly with confidence to speak. My co-researcher do not necessarily have these skills, and I as facilitator need to act in a way which is empowering for them to speak their mind.

10. In the second sculpture is a moment where I add my perception to the sculpture. I am mindful of the status I hold as Facilitator and so I rarely add my perceptions for fear that it will create too strong an agenda. As a co-researcher I am entitled to
make perceptions with this caveat. I wait and if I have a perception that no-one else has made then I will offer my own perceptions. I am very cautious in my language to be explicit that it is my perception by using a lot of I statements. When we are debriefing the second sculpture, I use another variation of this in saying 'These are my words but I just want to check them out'. I should say 'These are my words and I just want to check them out'. I am also noting that it is my perception. In this instance my clarifying obtained confirmation. Like I had summarised what the person from the sculpture was saying correctly.

11. When we summarise both sculptures and begin the move into agenda setting I need to be so careful about the way in which I create the agenda. A good example of this is when I draw attention to a specific part of the 'Human Sculpture', by saying 'I'd like to highlight that for discussion later on'; this may well influence their appearance on the agenda. This issue again is revealed in the statement 'I want to suggest a bridge'.
APPENDIX F

Transcript of the return visit to the client group
with whom I had worked in Cycle 7

The discussion about the transcript opened with some questions about the ending of the transcript. A number of the participants were unable to find a specific reference:

‘towards the end where we talk about power we had a longer discussion about that ....'
‘....where Marilyn was invited to stand on a chair and view the structure from higher up, and then got a different perspective all together.’

I explained that it was possible that parts of the transcript were not there.

A number of the participants seemed particularly interested to read that part of the transcript. (I was to learn later that it was part of a conflict between two of the staff)

Di ‘Whether it’s because most of that is missing on the transcript; the big thing for me after that session was the issue of power, that I needed to look at; and like when I reread the transcript, it was, like, barely an issue and when it was brought up again it was actually me that brought it up because I perceived it was an issue for everybody and I wondered whether I’d blown that up in my mind ...

?? Well are we going to talk about it later or something. Maybe the session finished; the time had run out.’

I tracked the segment down on the tape. We listened to the tape.

Geof ‘Does it make sense now hearing it again?’

Comments from the group

‘I’d forgotten all about that part ....’
‘a lot of laughter wasn’t there ....’

I commented how difficult it had been to recognise the voices and what they were saying, as a way of explaining why this section may have been omitted from the transcript.

Comment from the group
‘Yes, I noticed that you have put audience and I wondered at first whether that was a tactic or whether it was because ... eventually I worked out it was because you couldn’t have named everyone. It was interesting when you are analysing something like that; when you reflect on it, in a report such as this, a transcript; are you wanting to put comments to people or not worry about ownership and just allow it to come out. If you knew everybody’s name would you put peoples names?’

I discussed with the group how I had recognised some of the voices, and why I had chosen not to put people’s names. It had been my intent when we discussed the transcript, for people to say to me that it was their words, and also to correct my inaccurate listening of the tape. I called this

‘leaving space for people to own (their scripts).’

Someone in the group raised a new issue.

‘I suppose that if those of us in that sculpture are fair dinkum about the power, we should after this time frame, in the eight months, ask the audience of that sculpture how they now still feel about it ....’

someone who had been audience responded (the person who stood on the chair in the sculpture restructure)

‘I just noticed that what I felt was power was people standing up and the one’s down the bottom a difference in levels. To me it seemed like power but when I got up and looked at it, it did look different, when I was higher. But I don’t have a power issue at the moment.’

Judi commented on the way the large group had divided into two small groups to do the sculptures

‘I didn’t have an issue with power but I was fascinated by the way that the group actually broke up, the people who are in the (not a more powerful position but in) leadership role were together ...’

‘Yeah they were weren’t they.’

‘... and the rest of the people were in the other group. I don’t think it was the actual power I think it was the positions we were in.’

‘... and that was a completely unconscious and undirected’

‘... that is what I am saying’
'It was unconscious and it wasn’t contrived.'

'I thought the whole thing was absolutely amazing. If you tried to write down an narrative about the people, the way they interact and the whole project way in which you could not have done anything accurate as revealing as those two sculptures.'

'yes, it was incredible.'

Di  'I have dwelled on it a lot since and I just think it was remarkable. In the end when Wendy came in, she was actually in the other group, and that was the reason that she came into our group, she came late and that was why but how it was so right that it turned up with us.'

(This was a comment about Wendy Schiller, the ex-director, arriving late and having therefore to join the sculpture of the second group of people, which was the appropriate leadership group to be in.)

Judi Gegi  ‘I found it very revealing too. I thought it certainly revealed a lot and with missed opportunities, as it was said, that was an amazing analysis of the way people move within the team they very often don’t look for the opportunity that is there; that people are looking from only one angle, they don’t see the opportunities that are there.’

(Judi was commenting on her own part in the sculpture where she had an arm out available but others in the sculpture did not see it.)

Di  ‘Does anyone think that the metaphor that that gave us has improved that situation of lost opportunities. Do people think that we are more aware now as a result of the sculpture?’

1.  ‘.... well I feel that I am aware of it. I don’t know whether it has changed my behaviour, but its given a metaphor to heighten awareness.’

2.  ‘I haven’t consciously thought of making changes.’

3.  ‘When I think about the things that have gone on in the team in the last six months, all the conflicts that have been there, that possibly it hasn’t necessarily stopped conflicts from arising, maybe its a tool that people can then see that they should be looking at it from another angle; so that it can be a remedial thing rather than a preventative. Understanding that if you just walk around the sculpture a little bit ....’

Di  ‘Well I suppose I had a perfect example of it last week. We’ve had a tremendous lot of stress getting the final report and it was a question of two people looking at
it from our own perspectives. We've got this deadline. We have got to get this report done in a particular way. It has to be a good report. And Narelle who wasn't able to visualise it (what I wanted anyhow), maybe didn't have the skills but I didn't know that we were both just looking at this thing from our own point of view and then eventually we both had to take a walk around the sculpture and look at it from the other point of view; which was a very revealing experience. It was good for me to realise what is involved. The time involved to get the result you wanted. It was a really big revelation for me ....but I think it is unrealistic to think that conflict won't ever arise. But it is a useful mechanism, to work with.'

Di 'I think one of the frustrations for me, after that session was, yes, it was very revealing; yes they're really good issues; so righto lets sort them out; and so I think I made a really big tactical mistake thinking we could continue the dialogue. That after the session, right, we have got the metaphors; we have got the dialogue; don't let it die; leave it at that session, let's use it as a tool. And I believe that can happen and does happen; but to force it was big mistake. And then I saw clearly that there was conflict situation and that it ought to be resolved and OK let's do it. I realise now that was my agenda and that it shouldn't have been forced.'

The discussion which followed distinguished between the agenda being set and the action which needed to take place in order for the agenda to be met. This raised the issue of the amount of time between the workshop and the discussion of the workshop with me.

1. 'I am feeling it was a bit too long (between sessions). I am feeling a bit detached from it. I was really excited about it. I just felt that if we had the opportunity to have another go at it, while it was fresh. Not necessarily having to deal with everything that came up. It just seems to be so long ago. ... I feel its a very useful way of learning about people.'

2. 'It was a wonderful activity having the transcript. Say in two or three months we could do a similar thing or follow on.'

We explored the implications of repeating the sculpture.

1. 'You can only rehearse to a certain degree and after that its the instincts that come out.'

Contemplating a repeat sculpture returned us to the issue about the way in which outcomes from the sculpture were dealt with.

4. 'If it were to happen again when Di said she raised her agenda I finished up on the end of some very painful things out of that. ...and it was interesting hearing the tape again, because certain team members thought that I was the one that had raised the power issue and obviously (from listening to the tape) it was Narelle.
That whole thing worked out a very negative and painful process for me .... It’s still been ongoing with Narelle. So I think some follow up to actually look at that, as a facilitator to help deal with that, would have been a really good part of the process.

The conversation about this raised the issue that the “Human Sculpture” had opened a ‘Pandora’s Box’.

‘Once the situation was removed from the safety of the sculpture it wasn’t safe anymore, and it turned out to be very hurtful and that was not the intention. The intention was let’s resolve the conflicts.’

‘I felt very sad about that.’

‘we were using gestures and positions and non-verbal stuff, and once you take it out of that context and try to resolve it with words, it’s a different method, you resolve it within that safety of the sculpture ....’

‘I don’t think that issue has ever been resolved.’

‘I enjoyed doing the sculpture and I thought it was very valuable exercise. I think without that follow up it can also be a fairly destructive .... you either need someone (some preparation for the people involved in it) so that someone then comes out of it with some sort of skill to deal with that.’

‘You need a follow up. If stuff’s going to come out, it has to be resolved; it can’t be left hanging there. With everybody’s awareness heightened about it, it’s like a time bomb situation, and certainly the way I dealt with it was very inappropriate.’

We discussed the implications of this:

1. That we had explored a way to deal with it in the sculpture.  
参与者表示，他们非常害怕去处理这个问题。

2. One of the people in the sculpture has not been in the group since, and so there was no opportunity to deal with those issues.

‘It reminded me about opening doors, which you can’t keep open and to me that was opening doors and we had no way of dealing with what was coming through the door. I think it was really revealing but for me because there was no mechanism to deal with it, I guess the result has been treading on egg shells around certain issues and this is definitely a negative. I think that it’s something that you need to look at; that you are for a whole group of people opening up a whole lot
of doors, but you are not setting any mechanism that could successfully help deal with it.’

This was an important challenge both to the process and to my facilitation. I was concerned that if I resolved the problems, that that was a disempowering action. However, I took the criticism that somewhere in the process it needed to be explored, what the mechanism was to be, that would tackle the agenda items which had arise.

The session was likened to therapy.

‘But it is a therapy tool and you very seldom in therapy session would only have one session. And then not having a sort of follow on. Maybe it only happened for us as a team because we are a very special team. If we look at what has happened for certain members of the team, since then, in terms of identifying a whole range of personal issues and needs and things, that was really what it came down to.’

We talked about what additions we could make to the process of the sculpture (understanding that it is both the action and the reflection on that action) which would avoid some of the problems that this group had faced.

One person was very forthcoming with constructive criticism, from which was emerging additions to the process.

‘We felt safe in that session and I guess that we lost the safety. When we were just the ordinary team meeting, there wasn’t the safety. Have some time to think about it, but to then come back into what was a designated safe place to deal with it …’

‘…We didn’t have the agreement as a group, that this (the staff meeting which followed the sculpture) was going to be a safe place to deal with it. It just came up on the agenda. I was devastated by it because I was totally unprepared. I think that is something that needs to be looked at. Even if you’re not available to do that, there needs to be an understanding, if they are doing follow on work, that they create that safe place …’

You as the leader of the original group would need to explore with that group how they can re-establish that.

So that that would be an effective conclusion to it to acknowledge the atmosphere which allowed the issues to come up, and to plan with the group, then, how they will approach those issues. Work out an action plan from that and this could include that whether is needs an outside facilitator.’
Beyond these suggestions the group also started to explore the implications that they had left the responsibility of this action planning to Di, the official leader, and that that probably was not owning their responsibility to the issues.

Di responded to this that in her own reflection she realised that she was taking responsibility for the group and members of the group.

'It is still my agenda that everyone get one well and be happy. It was still my grieving for Janine and Narelle for not getting on that made me bring the issue up. It didn’t work and I have felt really sad about it every since.'

The discussion from this point moved more to the conflict between those staff, and away from discussion about the sculpture.
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1. INTRODUCTION

People in organisations often have difficulty communicating with each other about their understanding of the problems of the organisation. The Dramatistic Approach (Bordow & More 1991:60) is an organisational inquiry method, based on a notion of ‘script’, which assists people in organisations to discuss interpersonal communication problems. A ‘script’ is defined in this document as being an unconscious socialised social routine.

Even though people may have the ability to discuss communication problems, they may still face difficulties if they do not have the words to describe their perception of the situation; or because they are fearful of reprisals if they discuss the undiscussible.

In this inquiry a process of ‘Human Sculpture’ (Hill 1991b:20) is used to facilitate discussion about the notion of ‘script’ in the organisational setting. The ‘Human Sculpture’ process is as follows:

At the outset of the process the participants are divided into two groups. One group which will build the sculpture. The other group will observe the building of the sculpture.

When the participants are asked to form a ‘Human Sculpture’, no theme is given for that sculpture. It is intended that this will provide an open-ended gestalt, onto which the participants will project their interpretations of a statue made with the juxtaposed bodies of other participants. The sculpture group is asked for one of them to form a statue. A second participant in the sculpture group is invited to walk around the space of the first statue and to add an additional statue. There are no rules concerning the relationship between the two statues:

- They can touch or not touch.
- They can make eye contact or avoid eye contact.
- They can be on the same or different levels.

The facilitator does not state the absence of rules.
The other participants of the sculpture group are invited to form additional statues by progressively joining the sculpture. The remaining observers are invited to view the sculpture, and to do so by walking around it.

Following the viewing, the first person into the sculpture is invited to remove themself from the sculpture. The facilitator says ...

'You were the only person who did not have another to respond to. Look at this sculpture and decide if the position you held is the one you want to hold. If it is not go to a new place in the sculpture.'

If the first person chooses to make a change, then the sculpture can be viewed again.

Everyone in the sculpture then relaxes in their position and listens while their audience discusses their perception of the sculpture and the meaning which the audience constructed. The facilitator nominates the participants to the sculpture, in sequence, inviting audience to comment about the statue formed. For each participant the facilitator says ...

'When (name) formed a statue, how did it mean to you?'

At the end of the commentary from the audience the facilitator invites the statues in the sculpture to comment on their feelings about building the sculpture, and the meaning they intended to construct.

When one sculpture has been finished and discussed, the groups swap and the process is repeated. After all participants have participated in a sculpture, the sculptures are discussed with regard to the issues which they were addressing. The participants are asked whether any of these issues are relevant to their organisation, and if so, how could those issues be addressed. The final part of the process is to plan the action which will address the issues which have emerged.

The purpose of this thesis is to document an inquiry into 'Human Sculpture'.

The inquiry method is Action Research in the Post Positivist Research Paradigm.
The inquiry is written in four chapters. These chapters are best described by using the metaphor of an explorer ...

When an adventurer, an explorer goes in search of a new land, even though he or she is unsure of exactly where the new land lies, they usually start with a map which suggests what they know and usually leads them to what they do not know. In their journeys, as they come to know more about this land for which they are searching, the map changes.

My chapters are somewhat like rivers on a map, and I have written as if I travelled each river independently.

    This was not the case.
    As I travelled one, the other intervened.
    Like flotsam
    found floating in one river
    which I knew
    could only have come from the other river.
    Sometimes I did not know how those rivers were connected.
    Only that they were!

Chapter 1 establishes the context of the inquiry by examining the use of the notion 'script' within the discipline of therapy and the discipline of organisational studies. From these sources emerge a discussion about the salient features of 'script'.

Chapter 2 debates the appropriateness of the positivist paradigm for human inquiry, reaching the conclusion that a post positivist paradigm needs to underpin a human inquiry of the nature of the inquiry about 'Human Sculpture'. The chapter concludes with a discussion of several models of action research and details the changing model of inquiry used to explore the inquiry issue.
Chapter 3 documents the nine cycles of the inquiry.

Chapter 4 discusses the learnings which have emerged from this inquiry, addressing the primary focus of the inquiry ...

‘The procedure and facilitation of “Human Sculpture”,
as well as two secondary foci which emerged during the inquiry ...

‘The notion of “script”’ and ‘The Facilitation of a Human Inquiry’.
The second of these foci is based on this inquirers experience of engaging in a ‘Human Inquiry’ into ‘Human Sculpture’.

Parts of the inquiry are written using devices different to traditional research writing. The traditional research writing device (writing in the third person) is seen by this writer to be tantamount to endorsing the basic assumptions which the Post Positivist Research Paradigm is seeking to challenge. Hence, this writer would argue that it is an incongruous device for post positivist research.

The work contained in this thesis is original and has not been submitted for a higher degree at any other institution.

Geof Hill