Play-scripting: Testing a means of accounting for social value

Authors:
Biagioli, Monica
University of the Arts London
m.biagioli@lcc.arts.ac.uk

School of Design
London College of Communication
University of the Arts London
Elephant & Castle
London SE1 6SB
England
+44 (0)7930 357 583

Pässilä, Anne
Lappeenranta University of Technology
Lappeenranta, Finland
Anne.Passila@lut.fi

Owens, Allan
University of Chester
Chester, England
a.owens@chester.ac.uk

Chamberlain, Owen
University of Chester
Chester, England
owen@owenchamberlain.com

ABSTRACT

The arts based outcomes produced for this project are a way of testing the presentation of qualitative forms of research and analysis in the public realm. This paper, presented in play-script format, is an attempt to convey through artistic form findings that account for the social value of activities and changes to communities, specifically the redevelopment of a disused rail goods shed in a market town in the North of England. The text presented draws on the transcript of an Evocative Report produced as a moving image in 2015. It expresses subjective experience as a means of analysis. It aims to build the case that non-measurable forms of representing experience are a valid means of conveying value, specifically social value, as they can capture more of what Dewey termed complete experiences (1934).

The concept of evocative reporting was originally developed by Mellanen and Pässilä (Video 2013) as an alternative to written reporting which often only reaches a very limited audience and tends to quickly find itself on a shelf. It is designed to utilise multi-media approaches in allowing for collective voicing. This is in the form of a nine-minute film (Pässilä, Owens, Biagioli and Chamberlain, 2014). It is part of working together in collaborative research (Gershon, 2009) employed by scholars such as Saldana (2003) and Belliveau (2007) and within innovation in particular by Passila (2012, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c, 2014). The actual names of places and people have been replaced with fictional names throughout for ethical reasons.

KEY WORDS

qualitative analysis, social value, arts based initiative, local community, collective voice

INTRODUCTION

This was the second research based process created to engage the public in the redevelopment of the disused railway goods shed in Neaton town centre. In May 2015, a total of seven focus groups ran for one and a half hours each, under the headings of: Impact, Sustainability, Creativity, Hospitality, Building, Tourism and Social. An Arts Based Initiative (ABI) approach (Schiuma, 2011) was used to create a space for dialogue and the same aim informed each session, which was to let as many voices as possible rub up against each other in the course of one and a half hours. Our intention was to use methods that, in Ranciere's words, might 'reconfigure the map of the sensible' through processes that 'open up space for deviations, modify the speeds, the trajectories and the ways which groups of people adhere to a condition react to situations,' (2004, p.39). The process in each participative focus group was characterised by dissensus, in which the aim was not to settle conflicting voices in order to achieve resolution, but to engage in the mode of creativity itself, allowing participants to take the step from bystander to actor through voicing their own imaginative conjectures (Adams and Owens, 2015, p.105). The data collected built on the first participatory consultation process conducted in March 2014, and is deliberately expressed in qualitative, rather than quantitative form, so as to capture more of what Dewey (1934) referred to as the entirety of a subjective experience.

This form of intervention is situated in the broad based approach to innovation in community and regional development pioneered by Harmaakorpi and Melkas (2012) and the use of ABIs within it, in this case the brokerage process run by the town Foundation, a social enterprise limited company, and with initial backing from the Royal Society of Arts Venture Fund (RSA, North West England). There is much rhetoric in both public and private sectors about enabling people to take an active role in solving problems in their own communities, and yet public consultation still usually takes a top-down approach and is consultant-driven. Conventional models of consultation in such cases in the UK usually take the form of quick online questionnaires or street surveys, which provide a useful indication of interest but are minimal in terms of public engagement. In the participatory approach to consultation, inclusive arts based methods are used to generate ideas as part of a research process that values dialogue, the collective and 'slow knowledge work' (Holtham, Ward & Owens, 2010). Our intention was to use ABIs to meet the need for a different approach that puts local knowledge and knowing into practice.

Building on the previous consultation phase, advertising on the Neaton Foundation websites and the distribution of over 2,000 leaflets, people from the town were invited to attend any of seven sessions depending on their interests. Sessions took place over one week in the disused Neaton Good Shed. A local company provided a marquee, heating and lighting free of charge so that participants could stay together for an hour and a half for each session. The outcome of the process was that different levels of action and activities were mapped, creating value for the people and businesses of Neaton. (Adams and Owens, 2015)

Players
Liz : Narrator (Chief Executive Officer of The Neaton Foundation)
John: (The Neaton Foundation and RSA (Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts,
Manufactures and Commerce))
Ronny: (Professor in Arts and Education at the Local University)
Pilvi: (Senior Researcher, Innovation Unit of a Technical University, Finland and Visiting
Researcher at the Local University)
Fiona: (Artist and Researcher at a London University)
Scott: (Doctoral Student of Professor Bridges and Dr. Autere, Musician and Audio Specialist)
P1-P60 (members of the Neaton community who participated in the sessions)

ACT ONE
Action takes place at the railway goods shed in Neaton

Liz: As I walked from my car over the muddy yard towards the light shining through the
partly opened heavy industrial doors of the old disused railway goods shed on a wet
Monday evening in March, I was wondering who would turn up on such a cold night even
though I had been mailing, phoning, blogging, meeting with so many people in my town for
the past month to let them know about the event. I had let the local electric company into
the space at lunch time and was so happy to see they had erected a tent with two gas
heaters glowing warm orange.

The two researchers Pilvi and Ronny were moving a table closer to the heater on which they
placed theatrical post card sized images, red ribbon, finger lights, white folded card and pens
(Passila, 2012). I had known them for 6 months now, our previous process with them had
dealt with how and what should be done with this old disused building. My interest as a CEO
of a social enterprise was to be as inclusive as possible in allowing citizens of my small
home market town of 25,000 people, between our two nearest big conurbations in the north
west of England, to say what they thought about the use of the building.

The old goods shed had not been used of years and I and my fellow board members sensed
the huge potential of the building. The previous stage of co-operation with Pilvi, Ronny, and
Scott had involved members of the community in sharing their hopes, dreams and fears of
the use of this geographically-central building. They had audio recorded all the sessions and
documented them with photographs and then gone through this data to identify emerging
themes which all pointed to the potential the building had as learning centre, small local
businesses hub and community corner. All of this had been shared with a firm of local
architects who asked me to describe in more detail now how this space could be used and
what it might look like as a social public space for participation.

Back at the table Pilvi and Ronny were still placing each post card sized image showing
masked characters engaged in some sort of action with each other. On one card a person sat
on a chair two others pushing. In another, one pulling a rope, another cutting it. Their
doctoral student, Scott, was untangling the cable for the audio equipment that would be
used to capture the voices of participants and then turned to check the batteries in the
camera. The third researcher came towards me and I guessed it must be Fiona, the artist
designer from London that Pilvi and Ronny had invited to bring her specialism of applying
qualitative forms of analysis into the project.

For the next 15 minutes people slipped in from the dark and I welcomed each, thanking

them for making the effort, talking about the cold, about our last conversation, inquiring about those I did not know. How did they find out about the session? Some I had known for years. All the time I was apprehensive that one well-known disruptive individual would walk in and was preparing for it, but by 6:00pm he had not shown and it was time to start. A warm welcome to everyone, then I could hand over to Pilvi and Ronny who started by giving a short explanation about why this was not taking the form of a traditional focus group meeting based on direct discussion, but a more oblique approach, designed intentionally to draw on the imagination, to let go of preconceived ideas and for a while engage in the act of imagining what if…? (Passila, Owens and Pullki, 2016)

After two or three minutes, participants were gathered around the table having small group discussions. Some held post card images in their hands, sharing their experiences through them. Others had placed them on the table and written around. Others had made a map with links. The conversation flowed easily and readily:

P1: This place needs to be inclusive and welcoming. Although we do talk massively about it being arty and creative and so on and so forth, I think it should be welcoming to people who can actually be a little scared of the arts, in terms of, "Oh, I'm not arty, so I can't get involved".

P2: That could be by having meetings. It could be by showing best practice. Getting things talked about. Getting things talked about in the local media.

P3: Overlay our respective reasons for being here on top of each other. So we were talking about how we might be able to, for example, create heritage trails around the town.

P4: Could we make it adaptable so that you could book a small meeting space?

P5: Small change shops and independent shops of bespoke things.

P6: Pop-up space so that if you wanted to host an event.

P7: We were just saying that it needs to operate almost like a tourist information point where particularly people from out of the area can come to find out what they can do in the area.

P8: Opportunities that could be here for using it as a social centre where people, rather than being sent to or dragged to, are attracted to.

P9: Choose to go.

P8: You know, they wish to come here.

P10: You use it to meet somebody.

P11: There is nowhere to go that is a safe, creative, warm, brilliant place, other than the official toddler groups that would be from 9 till 10, and then, what do you do? That you could go and have a coffee, put your baby down on the floor, and, you know, they welcome the noise of the baby or whatever. So, you know, a space like that where they could have a wet play area or moms could sit and talk and connect and young and old are all together and everything like that so a venue for theatre or for gigs, or for expressing yourself just generally

with workshops.

P12: Something we can celebrate the people who come in and enjoy being with them.

P13: Yeah, like a beacon.

P12: Yeah.

P14: Yeah.

P15: Continue with the flexibility that all the chairs could, could go for other uses of that space.

P16: Maybe half the young population that would want to go to the youth club. The others wouldn't be interested in that, but just want to go and relax and have a chat in a place that is nice, warm and welcoming.

P17: All of us have turned an empty building into a home in a matter of hours.

P18: So it's not just heritage, it's heritage meets everything else. It's not just, you know, having a nice meal out, it's having a nice meal out because you're doing something else in the afternoon.

ACT TWO
Sessions at the rail goods shed in Neaton

Liz: We were talking, but our attention was also on the various materials used for the session and this seemed to allow us to relax and let our guards down and speak more freely about our concerns. I wanted to hear what people had to say and I was quite worried that any comment from me might be misinterpreted. It was so important for me to get a sense of what people wanted and I had worked quite long hours just to set this up and bring people into the discussion. But many people were not used to speaking in public and had difficulty speaking up. This is where the activity props really helped as it allowed people to be active during the session whether they contributed with verbal comments to the whole group or had quiet conversations with one or two other participants. There were a lot of comments that related to ownership, and how authority and freedom is managed. I sensed the potential of this creative sort of freedom, but also the need for encapsulating the fullness of the experience within the space that arts based methods offered.

P19: There are a lot of things you can't do unless you're with other people.

P20: No ownership of the spaces, you know. You come and go when you please.

P21: If we're going to make it a creative space, then we should take full advantage of that. Like, if we're going to have a meeting group, let's make it with white boards and chalk boards and all sorts of creative resources for people to throw ideas around.

P22: I think flexibility is key because if you want to have your official meeting with someone

and feel a bit better, you can do that. If you want to have something that's a little bit more in keeping with being a bit more creative, you can do that. You can do whatever you want with the space.

P23: You could actually get all those pods up in the top if people wanted to go. We were talking about shift yourself away to do some work but also the ability to be open. And you could have some work spaces up there; places that you can go in and be, be on your own but within a nice environment and then come down and start to intermingle some more. And actually, if you want to come socialise and relax, you can go to the cafe at the bottom. And you're in that place because that's where you want to be at that time.

P24: Restful place to sit and watch things going on.

P23: Maybe it is just a flexible working place that you can go when you're absolutely wanting to interact with other people.

P24: You see these, these farm house cottage designs and the leaver wall so that you can remember what happened. And I think that's important here. And I think that's important, because it is still the railway, it is still an important part of the past.

P25: People given the creativity to work the way they want to.

P26: You can almost speak in shorthand because you just don't have to have formalities, because you accept each other straight away.

ACT THREE
Planning for how to make it happen

Liz: For me as CEO of a social enterprise, the key is turning these ideas into a structure that can work for people and that can regenerate itself over time, giving space for change to happen, building that change into the process. This is the most difficult bit because when you are setting out to create a working environment it seems that people expect set structures to be put into place. But those can solidify over time and my goal is to allow for conversations and decisions to help shape the space and its uses over time. So it's important for me to step back during these sessions and listen to what people have to say and have a way of accounting for that and to make that process iterative.

P27: So I wonder if this could be seen as a stepping stone for people who want to try businesses.

P28: The shops that have whatever is going to be available in here. That it is all connected. It is all, all into the arts, more like, independent shops, bespoke things.

P29: You mentioned putting solar on the roof, didn't you?

P30: A suggestion that we generate our own power.

P31: That we build the system so that the walls could be opened up. So that you could have bigger productions and maybe that you could have vintage fairs and other community

happenings that you can operate in different scales. Yeah.

P32: Vertical grow area on the south-facing wall. Aquaponic tanks that grown the fish. Seed library for heirloom seeds.

P33: Yeah. Locally-sourced content, you know. So, businesses, food, people, place. Of the people, for the people, not being exclusive.

P34: You've got a business need and there's a database there of people locally that you can go, ok, right; do I need a graphic designer? And there is a list of six that work in Neaton.

P35: It could generate opportunities.

P36: For employment. For apprenticeship. For apprentices who could come in and work with it and learn sustainability skills to take outside. So that could be a whole range of things; ranging from sustainability of food, technical sustainability of the building, and society's sustainability and how to impact change on society. Because the young people of the future are going to be the people who are going to do this.

P37: How it starts off might not be, well actually it cannot be necessarily how it goes on. It needs to evolve.

(*This process led to the establishment of a network of creative entrepreneurs in Neaton, who are already asking what they can do for Neaton and for the development of the Good Shed*)

P38: It means going financially, ecologically, socially. So it's not just a one-off, carries on for a bit, and then it stops.

P39: Beyond the shed. It's the building, but activities in it, and activities run from here as well. So heritage walks could be run from here. It doesn't necessarily have to be in the shed. We could come back for a coffee and a soup made from our local allotments. To run the building is a core thing, but then put activity on top.

P40: It's got to bond not just with visitors, but with Neaton residents.

P41: Moving, moving from the building being a showcase building, to actually be one that is commonplace and that is part of the community. And people are using it. It's not just that, you know, look at what we've done. It's, it's commonplace.

P42: And it's not a museum. It constantly evolves with new fresh ideas, new energy.

P43: Lovely.

P43: If it becomes known as somewhere where it's all offices and digital businesses, people are not going to want to shop there. It will be considered a shopping centre.

P44: I think it needs to be a destination for out of the area too.

P45: Those two images are actually linked for me. And this is, and it represents two things: one is sustaining of motion. It's sustainability. It's a form of extending something beyond its normal limit. And the second part of it is presenting the image and our work on sustainability

to a wider audience both individually and as a team.

P46: The building is not change the world, but actually it will be a starting point.

P46: To changing some people's mind about sustainability and how that, how that, how they can impact upon it.

P47: Might I be a part of this? What could be here for me?

P48: It's not just getting the building done. It's what comes out of the building afterwards.

P49: A hive thinking.

P50: Mmmm.

P51: Ahhh.

P52: Yes.

P53: Nice.

P54: So the hive generates the ideas.

P55: Yup.

P54: It's the…

P55: Yeah, you can define the space. The space doesn't define you or what happens in it. That's the key thing.

P54: And the whole hive resonates with that message in order to transmit it.

P55: But it will have to be a bright, light place.

P56: Extended opening hours. Open at all hours.

P57: Definitely down to a community to drive forward.

P58: Information point.

P58: Where particular people from out of the area could come to find out what they can do in the area.

P59: I just want to link to that we want information for Neaton residents. It's got to be with us not just with visitors, but with Neaton residents. Because we have a great art centre, a great community association. But it all needs to come together.

P60: A more community-based and partnership route where everyone has some dialogue. And everyone realises that possibly to get these approvals, there has to be development. And the developer realises that to get that development, there's got to be improvements. And if that can be done over a pint, over a no-brand coffee

(Laughter)

P60: It'll make for a far more productive and rewarding process for everyone. And it's almost starting with this complete blank canvas from what everyone wants and what it can be.

ACT FOUR
Action takes place at John Ride's living room in Neaton

Liz: So I took all of these ideas forward and communicated them to people in the community via social media and began to make plans about how to make that happen. Along with John, we were working on getting funding structured to take the work forward into practice. An application was in process that was very promising and we felt encouraged by the level of participation in the sessions. But then, in the midst of all of this, a member of the community started deriding our work using social media and wrote to the funding council not to support our application.

Pilvi: Doesn´t this highlight a paradox – that your or our attempt to reflect collectively on community has mobilised power relations that resist reflection?

Liz: I was massively disheartened, but I took a step back, consulted closely with John, did some research and found that we could realise our vision at a fraction of our estimated costs by working with shipping container structures. The model for me was Box Park in Shoreditch, London. And then, it all fell into place. People wanted flexible spaces. The containers are designed in a modular structure so that they can be reused and reshaped to suit new uses. People needed affordable spaces for their small businesses and the containers cost a fraction of what we were anticipating, meaning that we could keep rents down for their use and open up social and community spaces in, on and around these.

Pilvi: It seems that you have managed to shift from monologue into multi-voiced dialogue, moving from an authoritative monologue towards more critical and responsible actions.

Liz: John and I were delighted and we started drawing up the plans asking: How do we fund this? Who will support it?

Pilvi: Practice was unsettled by a member of the community. So were you forced to find how you could act differently?

Liz: We were nervous. The researchers we were working with (you and Ronny and Scott and Fiona) had scheduled sessions with participants. But we found ourselves in a different situation and used the opportunity of their visit to sound out our ideas with them. And they thought it was great and encouraged me to take it forward. And this is where we are at now: testing out the use of containers with a small group of local entrepreneurs.

ACT FIVE
Conclusion and final thoughts at this stage

Fiona: Social value in the form of community-level discussion and action is recognised here

as a key factor in brokerage processes like the Good Shed. Using play-scripting like this is one means of accounting for the subjective experience of these actions and discussions via qualitative techniques. There is policy in England and Wales at the government level that backs up the importance of wellbeing and the validity of social value and makes it possible for local communities to take more control of procurement decisions that have an impact on wellbeing for the communities affected. The Public Services (Social Value) Act of 2012 is a case in point. It is "an Act to require public authorities to have regard to economic, social and environmental well-being in connection with public services contracts; and for connected purposes" (legislation.gov.uk, 2012). The aim is to make qualitative methods a credible means of accounting for the effectiveness of regeneration activities at the local level applying policy such as the Public Services Act of 2012.

One of the reasons I was happy to get involved with the project was the core idea we discussed about moving away from management towards creative facilitating (Passila and Owens, 2016). This is an attempt to address one of the key problems facing communication in the workplace: the inability to raise difficult points or handle debates that can inform practice. For this I find Edward T. Hall's theory of culture (Hall, 1959) particularly relevant, as he saw cultural knowledge and assimilation happening on three distinct but porous levels that could influence each other: the informal, the formal, and the technical. I understand arts based facilitation as happening on the informal level, and that can have an effect on the technical level of how spaces and communities are created, managed and distributed (Biagioli, 2015a, 2015b). Changes in organisational structure can allow for a variety of voices to be part of the decision-making process at the technical level. This in turn can reinforce core values (Hawkins, 2012) at the formal level that are key underlying motivators in the decision-making process.

Scott: I brought this quote along as it seems central to this discussion, it's by Satinder Gill who sees the arts as a relational interface.

"The arts necessarily deal with the relational level of human engagement and hence are essential for any discussion on what it means to be human, on how we engage with each other, and on the technologies that increasingly form part of our everyday lives.

Pilvi: I agree but rather than suggesting that the arts provide a magic bullet for difficult issues of communication in the workplace, let's be critical here in a wider sense (Malin, Passila, Owens, 2016). So for example, looking back over the script so far the reader could be forgiven for thinking that there are no problems and issues in this process when there clearly are. My proposal is that we talk about these to offer some other perspectives on what we are trying to do, what was achieved and what the limitations are.

Ronny: Okay, to start I would say that while we tried to create spaces for social engagement and collective voicing surely on one level we just conformed to market ideology? As a practice-based research team I know we reflected on our methodological approach and its consequences (Adams and Owens, 2015).

Scott: Yes, in my notes I remember writing about our positive intention to work alongside people offering our skills using arts-based methods to assist with mutual understanding through critical self-reflection (Cotter, Passila and Vince, 2016). If there is chance later I would like to talk about what I see as the distinct leanings in the way you, Pilvi and Ronny, lead the sessions that I think tend towards a different form of control outside of the usual.

Ronny: Of course, yes you are right to bring up this power issue (Passila and Vince, 2016). if we have time, but to return to Pilvi's point and to be provocative let me explain what I mean. I mean that our work could be viewed from another perspective as propping up a central government regime that has deliberately run down local government and with it local democracy, and subject to manipulation by an unelected social enterprise company to smooth over social relations in order to liberate free-market economics (Adams and Owens, 2015, p.106).

Pilvi: I think we could contest that by highlighting the relationship of increasing trust created between the Foundation directors, members, ourselves and other collaborating partners, like Bill in local government who attended sessions. Building trust is fundamental when organizing reflection using arts based initiatives. If you don't have trust you can't organize reflection (Passila and Owens, 2016).

Fiona: What this situation highlights is that at different points in the brokerage process, there will be bottlenecks created by dissensus. Lack of trust, in the process, in each other, can lead to momentum dissipating and dispersing. But if you trust that a messy, contentious process can lead to better questions asked and better judgements made, then the bottlenecks are welcomed and expected, not feared. It is the ability to doubt (Gill, 2015) that we've lost trust with. So we follow certainty, when questioning is what is required. Subjective records such as this one can remind us of the many bottlenecks along the way towards solutions, and in this way help us trust in a process of decision-making that integrates many views. If we are only to be swayed by the certainty of data (Gill, 2015) that can be measured and compared, we will lose the ability to contextualise that data within the experience that contains it.

Pilvi: I wonder if the Foundation's work has been subservient to our creative practice and academic research interests?

Ronny: I don't think so.

Scott: Why not?

Ronny: Because there has been time for us all to ask what Taylor calls 'the vital question 'what am I doing this work in the service of?' (Taylor and Thellesen in: Darsø, Meisiek,& Boje,2007 p.30). Our approach has been about trying to find ways that articulate questions that make problems visible that we are perhaps not yet aware of.

Pilvi: Okay, I agree that Liz and John really locked on to Ranciere's notion of the Uncoupling question' (Adams and Owens, 2015, p.98) that pulls away professional knowledge security.

Scott: And which you are so good at asking!

Pilvi: Well I am trying! And the trust has built as we have begun to more openly share the principles and values that underpin this question for each of us as appreciative critical friends. (Kember, 1997). I remember the first time we did this having lunch in the pub after one of the sessions.

Scott: Through working together in this practice based way we've had chance to see the values underpinning Foundation's objective of community capacity building in action.

Pilvi: I have been so impressed by the way they seek resources and support that strengthen the skills and abilities of people and community groups.

Fiona: Yes, to take effective action and leading roles in the development of their communities.

Ronny: Hey, come on! Is this Hollywood?

Fiona: It is the push and pull of negotiation, movement and change. There is no happy ending in Neaton, but there is action and response. It's an ongoing process. Subjective forms of documentation can remind us of original goals, routes not taken, observations noted, moments of decisions and how that felt. By accessing those material records of subjective experience further down the line of a process, we have the quality of the experience, not just its constituent parts, to inform action along the way.

Pilvi: I'm smiling Fiona, we're falling in to heroic talk here. Our need to produce a specific outcome rather than focusing on what comes out.

Ronny: We've got to be sharper or this heroes discourse will become part of what we think.

Pilvi: Yes. It's not been Utopia. Our practice is messy, on-gong and unique, we're shining it up to make it sound unproblematic.

Fiona: Okay we can say that this was an attempt to create a space for reflection with all its imperfections. The Foundation has had chance to work alongside us, to see our values in action, maybe something of the potential value of arts based methods in opening things up. We can talk about making the unseen seen through fictionalising the real, to provoke, to create space for voices to be heard, but this is us talking here.

Pilvi: Yes, our values and strategies in acting for the public good were certainly not identical!

Ronny: I agree with that too. It seems to me that the Foundation subscribes to the market ideology in seeing individual employment, employability and development of skills as the 'first steps towards a larger life'.

Scott: Whereas we foreground the creation of social value.

Pilvi: I think it's too easy to say that. The Foundation are deeply concerned with the creation of social and cultural value.

Ronny: See- it's not so easy! Our attempt to use the arts to achieve what we knew beforehand could not entirely succeed, as many of the issues are not just local but systemic and global. Yet at the same time I would argue that we recognised that the process itself has potential to help us and participants collectively question the 'taken-for-granted' and so start to re-shape ways of living together that are regulated not only by money and individualism, but the building of community.

Pilvi: The main point for me is that our relationship is dynamic, open, ongoing and can be perplexing. I get so bored with the clichéd view about the dualities of arts and business that sets an evil corporate world motivated by power and control against the sacred art world, motivated by personal freedom and exploration. The reality is much less clear and I'm

interested in working through the tensions in that. The forms, styles, purposes, and values of Arts Based Initiatives such as these are still taking shape, and it is hard to answer many of the questions this raises as fully as they deserve.

Fiona: The biggest problem this approach faces is credibility, due to its inability to quantify (measure) results (Belfiore and Bennett, 2008, p.5). If we allow that knowledge is skilled embodied performance (Gill, 2015), then forms that express that knowledge in subjective form should have more credibility and weight at the time of making decisions. But the opposite is true. We are being forced more and more to make the case about our embodied experience (knowledge) through forms that break the experience down into its constituent parts. This disrupts our ability to weigh decisions based on factors beyond data; to take an overview of different elements and perspectives and say, this is what needs to be addressed next, not with certainty but with trust.

REFERENCES
Adams, J. and Owens, A. (2015) *Creativity and democracy in education: the practices and politics of learning through the arts*. London: Routledge.
Belfiore, E. & Bennett, O. (2008). *The Social Impact of the Arts: An Intellectual History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Belliveau, G. (2007) *Engaging in drama: using arts-based research to explore a social justice project in teacher education*. International Journal of Education & the Arts, Vol 7 (5).
Biagioli, M. (2015a). *Zones of intensity invested with desire*. Култура/Culture, (12), 7-15. Retrieved March 15, 2016, from http://journals.cultcenter.net/index.php/culture/article/view/177/161
Biagioli, M. (2015b) *Zones of intensity: reinforcing a sense of place*. Paper presented at the IFKAD conference, Bari, Italy 2015. http://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/view/creators/Biagioli=3AMonica=3A=3A.html
Gill, S. (2015) *Tacit engagement: beyond Interaction*. London: Springer.
Hall, E. T. (1959) *The silent language*. New York: Doubleday.
Hawkins, R. Director of Public Interest Research Centre. (2012) *Common cause: the case for working with values and frames*. http://valuesandframes.org/ (viewed 02/09/15).
Kember, D., Ha T., Lam B., Lee, A., NG, S., Yan, L. & Yum, J. (1997) *The diverse role of the critical friend in supporting educational action research projects*. Educational Action Research, 5:3, 463-481, DOI: 10.1080/09650799700200036
Mellanen, L. and Passila, A. (2013) *Evocative report for the Finnish Education and Cultural Ministry*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LQasQFNYW5I)
Pässilä, A. (2012) *Reflexive model of research-based theatre – processing innovation at the crossroads of theatre, reflection and practice-based innovation activities*. Acta Universitatis Lappeenrantaensis 492: Lappeenranta University Press.
Pässilä, A., Oikarinen, T. & Kallio, A. (2013) *Creating dialogue by storytelling*. Journal of Workplace Learning, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 159-177.
Pässilä, A. Oikarinen, T. Harmaakorpi, V. (2013) *Collective voicing as a reflexive practice*. Management Learning, Vol. 44, No. 4, pp.42-52.
Pässilä, A. & Oikarinen, T., (2014) *Research-based theatre as a facilitator for organisational learning.* In: P. Meusburger, A. Berthoin Antal, L. Suarsana (Eds.), Learning Organizations: Extending the Field. Dordrecht, Springer Verlag. pp. 203-221.
Pässilä, A. and Vince, R. (2015) *Critical reflection in management and organization studies*. In T. Beyes, M. Parker & C. Steyaert (eds.) The Routledge Companion to the Humanities and Social Sciences in Management Education.

Passila, A., Owens, A. and Pullki, M. (2016). *Learning Jam*.

Pässilä, A. and Owens, A. (2016) *Sensible sensitivity: art and art pedagogy in management development.* (eds.) in: Managing Organizations: approaches, Solutions and Performance, London: Kogan Page.

Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012. http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2012/3/enacted (viewed 07/04/16).

Ranciere, J. (2004) *The politics of aesthetics: the distribution of the sensible*. (trans. Gabriel Rockhill). London: Continuum.

Saldaña, J. (2003). *Dramatizing data: A primer*. Qualitative Inquiry, 9(2), 218-236.

Schiuma, G. (2011) *The value of arts for business*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Webb, J. & Brien, D.L. (2008) *"Agnostic" thinking: creative writing as practice-led research*, Working papers in art and design, vol. 5, http://sitem.herts.ac.uk/artdes_research/papers/wpades/index.html (viewed 18/08/09).