

Using Kinaesthetic Exertion to Engender Team

Psychological Safety in UK Higher Education

Everybody flew and now that we have all flown together, we have bonded (André)

Authors: A.J.B. Roberts, Ioanna Iordanou

Introduction

This chapter is based on educating UK Undergraduate Business School students with the opportunities afforded by an Open Space Learning (OSL) environment. Our use of the Arts-based Intervention (ABI) of physical performance challenges normative Business School pedagogy that has been claimed to reduce students to becoming “voracious copy machines” (Beghetto and Kauffman, 2009, p. 300). Instead, the series of physical exercises that culminated in students “flying” generated “Kinaesthetic Exertion (KE)” – that is, the simultaneous exertion of both body and mind.

The chapter will show how the nature of physical performance engenders a team environment where individuals felt free to express themselves without fear of repercussion - an attribute that can bring welcome benefits in any learning context. This climate of “Team Psychological Safety” (TPS) (Edmondson, 1999), engendered by the antecedent of kinaesthetic exertion, extends the dominant focus on cognitively generated TPS environments and instead, considers and promotes the important and often overlooked interplay between both physical and mental processes. The chapter’s contribution is generated by investigating how KE as a pedagogical intervention enriches TPS and how this in turn, improves the educational experience via ‘sensuous learning’. For the purpose of this chapter, we define ‘sensuous learning’ to be a pedagogical approach that extends beyond simply involving the visual and auditory senses that are prevalent in normative Business School education. In addition, ‘sensuous learning’ is a more holistic approach to learning, as it mobilises a larger

range of senses that include smell, touch and importantly, proprioception ‘the perception or awareness of the position and movement of the body’ (oxfordictionaries.com).

This, as we shall explain below, is particularly pertinent in OSL environments (Monk et al., 2009) where KE engenders a form of TPS that transcends a learner’s conscious pre-occupation with both proprioception and the sense of being touched. Reflections and lessons learned from the module lecturers are also offered to help readers in their potential future use of such an intervention of ‘sensuous learning’ to the benefit of students and teaching.

Conceptual Framing

This chapter will start by discussing the issues that inform the application and use of ABI in Undergraduate Business School learning. Notably, the normative nature of Higher Education (HE) is highlighted plus claims for ABI within Management learning recognized. The role of OSL is discussed as a challenge to the levied critiques of typical business school pedagogy and therein, challenges centering around vulnerability within such settings are explored. With respect to this, such issues of TPS are unpacked before the chapter considers how the ABI contributes to, extends and enriches theories of TPS. Ultimately, the chapter contends that via the ABI of physical performance, the combination of both intra-psychic and inter-physical movement generate KE, which, engenders TPS in an OSL Undergraduate educational setting.

The Current Landscape of Business Education

Cunliffe (2002, p. 35) notes that the traditional, normative form of management education “... fails to consider that practitioners deal with ill-defined, unique, emotive and complex issues”. Scholars have called for a creative turn in Management education (see Robinson, 2001; and Baker and Baker, 2012) with knowledge generation through creative

Arts-based experiences increasingly being propagated as more holistic approaches to learning (Adler, 2006; Taylor and Ladkin, 2009). Barry and Meisiek (2010) further argue that Arts-based methodologies potentially enable individuals to see things differently and to generate a wider and less limited viewpoint of phenomena.

OSL affords such an opportunity often through ABIs and this chapter maintains that its necessity is rendered more pertinent given the often unimaginative deliveries within the context of Management education. Taylor (2008, pp. 399-400) highlights the benefits of such a pedagogical approach; embodied forms of knowing, the holistic interpretation of ideas, the more relevant sense making that is generated through the more personal experience, and the longer lasting impression that creative interventions generate due to their enjoyable nature. This is illustrated in the following quotation from the OSL Project Group at Warwick University, a team that is committed to collaborative and creative OSL learning across the whole University. This is also the institution where our study was conducted,

“At a practical level OSL is an example of what might be recognised as the ‘workshop model’ of teaching and learning. The workshop is the basic unit in pedagogic interaction between facilitator and participant in OSL. The open space of the workshop allows the participants to become the producers of knowledge by creating an environment that prevents the reformation of the rigidly hierarchical arrangements of lecture theatre and seminar room” (The OSL Project Group).

OSL is an emergent paradigm of learning informed by psychology and neuroscience (Clark, 1997) and largely, the theoretical approaches of Vygotsky (see Daniels, 2001) and Kolb (1984) amongst others. Epistemologically conceptualizing knowledge as ‘unfinished’ (see Freire and Shor, 1987; Sternberg and Lubart, 1999; Wells, 2008), it encourages learners to critique any claims to knowledge and to holistically navigate the unknown through body and

mind (see Monk et al., 2011).

The experience of OSL with its flexible, less hierarchical use of space vis-à-vis the more traditional lecture format typically encourages activity-based, social, collaborative and research-led teaching and learning (see Savin-Baden, 2008; Kolb, 1984; Daniels, 2001; Jackson et al., 2006). Any claims to knowledge within OSL are open to be made, provisional and collectively formed (see Freire, 1970; Bruner, 1982; Dewey, 1997). Each learner brings their own experiences and world-views to the learning, propositional knowledge is placed in context, and the whole person is involved in learning practices. A multitude of learning styles can be accommodated within open space pedagogy (Csíkszentmihályi, 1999) and those involved stand to gain from cognitive learning that is also affective, physical and interpersonal (Gardner, 1985, Seltzer and Bentley, 1999).

The Multiple Meanings of Space and Safety in Vulnerability

As knowledge production takes a more fluid, collaborative form of existence, implications are generated for organizational power, leadership and decision-making dynamics and the primacy of the traditional, mutually exclusive relationship of learner and educator is challenged (Lambert, 2007). In this sense, the physical space disrupts the accepted practice in Business Management lecture theatres that traditionally resigns students to being “voracious copy machines” (Beghetto and Kaufman, 2009, p. 300).

It is a premise of the OSL methodology that space is an important factor in the quality of a learning event (Monk et al., 2011). Space is defined pedagogically by how learners place themselves within it, and in this sense should be considered philosophically as well as physically (see Bhabha, 1994). Questions are therefore raised as to the implications of spatial

constraint in determining OSL practices and also its apparent dichotomy with traditional forms of learning.

“In OSL we open public space as well as the private spaces in which we learn... Experience involves risk-taking, it involves experiment, it involves not knowing the outcome of particular areas of exploration, but being willing to take the opportunity that the opening of a space affords them” (Monk et al., 2011, p. VI).

Antonacopoulou (2014, p. 89) denotes that a “sense of freedom to be authentic as one experiences learning to feel safe being vulnerable lies at the core of learning” so, while the impact of OSL experiences may be profound, it is not exempt from challenges where learners may feel a sense of vulnerability. A vulnerability that may potentially be exacerbated given the lack of focus on OSL within Business higher education. Scholars have however, acknowledged the importance of helping learners to experience learning ‘in their own terms’ and have therefore championed this focus of learning to generate long term impact (Antonacopoulou, 2014, p. 89; Freire, 1972). Accordingly, this chapter investigates how ABI can counteract any felt student vulnerability via the generation of TPS in OSL environments. This chapter will now evaluate the cognitively-led literature on TPS that informed our decision to introduce the application and use of ABI. It will begin by defining the concept, its relevance and antecedents before detailing how ABIs can enrich our understanding of TPS.

Team Psychological Safety

Kahn’s (1990, p. 708) definition of psychological safety denotes a “sense of being able to show and employ one’s self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status or career”. Psychological safety research experienced a renaissance in the 1990s with many scholars focussing their attention on the derived organizational benefits for both

learning and innovation. Here, importance is placed on feeling safe in inter-personal interactions. It is therefore argued that non-threatening and supportive climates enhance the risk taking of proposing new ideas (Baer and Frese, 2003) and that rather than discouraging team disagreements, psychological safety facilitates these discussions (Bradley et al., 2011). A team's performance stands to benefit from climates of strong psychological safety (Tjosvold, 1991). The many advantages of TPS include enhancements to learning behaviour with creative potential unlocked as a result of freedom of expression without fear of repercussion (see West, 1990; Edmondson, 1999), and advances in team learning (Edmondson, 1999).

Edmondson's (1999, p. 350) seminal work posits TPS as "a shared belief held by members of a team that the team is safe for inter-personal risk taking" where "a team climate characterized by inter-personal trust and mutual respect in which people are comfortable being themselves" (ibid, 354). The willingness of team members to offer mutual support or to avoid each other is therefore informed by their perceptions of their team (Schulte, Cohen and Klein, 2012). Many academic studies denote both trust and mutual respect as critical factors that influence interpersonal climate and therefore, one that engenders psychological safety. It is necessary to clarify the differences between trust and psychological safety as both intra-psychic states link with interpersonal experience (Edmondson, 2004). Although there is no agreed upon, universal definition of trust (Creed and Miles, 1995; Kramer, 1999) most encompass a perceived risk of vulnerability (something that psychological safety also includes, albeit within a more defined scope) (Granovetter, 1985; Rousseau et al., 1998).

Similarities can be seen here with psychological safety where an active awareness of minimizing negative consequence occurs. However, Edmondson (1999) suggest that the two are distinct yet complementary interpersonal beliefs that can be distinguished by three elements - the object of focus, timeframe, and level of analysis. When considering the object

of focus for trust, there is an outward locus that considers the future actions/trustworthiness of others, more succinctly, deciding whether to give others the benefit of the doubt (see Edmondson, 2004). In contrast, an internal locus is taken with psychological safety where considerations of whether others will give you the benefit of doubt in certain situations are explored (see Edmondson, 2004). Edmondson's second factor is a temporal distinction with trust's range being larger in relation to the anticipated consequence of actions. Contrarily, "the tacit calculus inherent in psychological safety considers the very short-term interpersonal consequences one expects from engaging in a specific action" (Edmondson, 2004, p. 8). The final factor is the level of analysis where the typical, dyadic relationship of trust (between individuals or organizations) is contrasted with the group-level construct of psychological safety. In the latter, it emerges from the collective and denotes the level of interpersonal safety within that team (Edmondson, 2004).

Five antecedents of TPS have been proposed by Edmondson (2004) the first being the favourable position of leaders in order to foster TPS. The dominant viewpoint is that this is developed by leaders as a tool (see Garvin, Edmondson and Gino, 2008), and that it emerges from the immersion of individuals in teams over extended periods of time (Eggers, 2011). Edmondson (2004) notes how three facets of leader behaviour engender TPS. The first is approachability where the accessibility of leaders promotes a closer relationship away from distant leaders in their offices. The second involves the active inclusion of employee discussion that exhibits the importance placed on valuing the thoughts' of others. The third facet considers how leaders act as role-models for acceptable behaviour with employee' mimetic tendencies emulating the openness/fallibility of the leader.

Edmondson's (2004) second antecedent builds on the work of Kahn (1990) who notes that trusting and supportive interpersonal relations promote psychological safety. Shared

perceptions therefore inform the meaning of team-level trust (De Jong and Elfring, 2010) with trust positioned as a key social resource that may enable cooperative social interactions (Gibson and Gibbs, 2006). Other studies have directly shown trust to have significant effects on TPS (May, Gilson and Harter, 2004) where employees avoid the perception of co-worker judgments that may negatively affect their reputation (Moingeon and Edmondson, 1998). The third antecedent is that of ‘practice fields’, forums that enable rehearsal so as to permit learning and reflection on the initial outcomes (Senge, 1990). Leaders are well positioned to suggest, implement and establish fields of practice that can actively attempt to build psychological safety with the fear of mistakes from the trials being eliminated throughout the process. The penultimate antecedent reflects the informal, developing group dynamics where individuals assume different roles or ‘characters’ (Bales and Strodtbeck, 1951) while Edmondson’s (2004) final antecedent considers the degree of context support offered to teams by the organization. Here, team insecurity and defensiveness are claimed to be reduced by the availability of both information and resources, and this promotes TPS. Hackman’s (1987) research into the design of teamwork has demonstrated that the structural aspects of teams (including context support) can increase effectiveness. Furthermore, teams that enjoy psychological safety yet face challenges (such as time demands for individuals away from the team) have been shown to increase the shared sense of cohesion by overcoming these barriers (Edmondson, 1999). Additionally, Amabile (1998) has noted the importance of providing a conducive environment for creative risk taking and it has been shown that team members are less likely to demonstrate creative behaviours; such as expressing new ideas; challenging established assumptions; and openly accepting responsibility for mistakes where psychological safety is not present (Edmondson and Mogelof, 2006). Accordingly, TPS enables creativity by supporting the propensity for interpersonal risk taking (West, 1990).

The Impact of Arts-based Interventions: Kinaesthetic Exertion, Team Psychological Safety in Open Space Learning

Many studies investigate the implications of the above antecedents in terms of learning and the development of innovation (Schein, 1996; Edmondson, 2004). However, within OSL environments, the openness of the space allows a freedom of movement for individuals that traverse the respective arena both physically and mentally. Previous literature on “exertion interfaces – an interface that deliberately requires intense physical effort” suggests that social bonding may be generated as a result of the intense physical and mental demands placed on team members (Mueller et al., 2003, p. 1). Examples of physical sport that fosters team spirit have been well-documented and accounts of formally arranged team-building activities in organizational contexts often engender positive social relations that may lead to trusting relationships (see, Mueller et al., 2003).

The importance of play has been investigated by many scholars (Vygotsky, 1978; Whitehead, 2010) and parallels can be forged with the literature on team involvement. Spreitzer et al. (1999, p. 73) note that team involvement is “the behavioural version of Hackman’s (1987) team spirit or synergy, where every member acts committed to the team and is willing to work hard to make the team the best it can be”. Furthermore, Lawler (1992) notes how performance is higher with employees that are more behaviourally involved with their work. It is also argued that trust develops through these relations and that over the long term, routines and culture generate the necessary conditions for trustworthiness (Zack and McKenney, 1995). Furthermore, it has been noted that face-to-face interactions build team trust (Rocco, 1998) or more succinctly, Handy (1995: 45) asserts that “trust needs touch”.

It would therefore appear that intra-psychic considerations of climate (including those of ‘leader’ behaviour) are central to understanding any felt TPS. Combining the inter-physical

and intra-psychic states, our study introduces the concept of “kinaesthetic exertion” which we define as the simultaneous exertion of both body and mind that in turn, produces a climate of TPS. As per the seminal work of Edmondson, this chapter’s unit of analysis for psychological safety is that of a group-level construct and although we acknowledge the usefulness of investigations on the outcomes of TPS, our interest is predominantly based in better understanding its antecedents. This empirical chapter therefore broadens Edmondson’s (2004) conceptualization of TPS, and investigates whether this phenomenon can be engendered via physical performance.

Context and Content

Following widely acknowledged calls for ABI initiatives in management education (Adler, 2006; Starkey and Tempest, 2009; Taylor and Ladkin, 2010; Baker and Baker, 2012), a key strategic initiative at Warwick University is to champion student creative competencies via active, experiential learning. At the University there is an Institute for Advanced Teaching and Learning (IATL) that supports the development of innovative practice in teaching and learning through inclusiveness and interdisciplinarity. Two specific pedagogies have been generated out of this department, OSL and Student-as-Researcher. The ABI discussed in this chapter is underpinned by the former, where significant financial investments have been made in the provision of six University drama studios that are used for OSL. One such learning space is at the centre of Warwick Business School (WBS, see below). This Create Space is run and used by a team of specialists of national acclaim that champion creative education within the school. The team is called ‘WBS Create.

[Insert Image ONE here]

Styles of Coaching and Team Leadership, the module upon which this chapter is based, runs in The Create Space and is one of four originally proposed modules that support IATL's

strategic initiatives. This is on account of its design that examines and illuminates coaching and team leadership through a variety of interdisciplinary approaches and in practice. Via a rich, practical and pluralistic appreciation of coaching and team leadership, the module encourages students to pursue the principal aims and objectives that can be viewed in Table One. Furthermore, an illustrative outline of the module syllabus is offered in Table Two. While our intention in the module is not to actively create Volatile, Uncertain, Complex and Ambiguous (VUCA) conditions, the overall module's design is in response to such a marketplace that the module's learners are likely to soon enter upon their imminent graduation. It is an articulated premise in the first session of the module that the use of ABIs help to explore alternative ways of thinking in a far less didactic manner to the normative modes of learning to which the students may have become accustomed. This approach aligns with the traditional WBS values of 'seeing things differently' and 'curiosity'.

In terms of delivery, the module runs annually for final year Undergraduate students over ten weeks in one academic term. Each week, 60 minutes of experiential, disciplinary-grounded material is delivered by a subject specialist and this is followed by a further 60 minutes in which the students and module leader develop the learning in an interdisciplinary style. The first two weeks offer introductory and critical sessions on the core concepts of coaching and team leadership. These sessions are followed by three weeks of interdisciplinary-grounded material. Notably, investigating the different styles of coaching and team leadership in the disciplines of physical movement, music and drama.

Our study is based on the physical movement session from two independent iterations of the module. Two physical movement practitioners were the facilitators of these two, two-hour sessions for final-year Undergraduate students (of varying disciplines). Fifty-four students completed two specific physical tasks in WBS's Create Space that emulates the environment

of an entrepreneurial laboratory and time was given in the space for post-activity reflection. Due to the nature of the physical activity required in the intervention, the research team verified the ability and desire of participants to engage in the active session and no one student participated in both sessions. Over the two iterations and given the physical capabilities of the students, six students attended the session and acted as observers. No prior description of the physical movement exercises was given to either group of students and both sessions commenced with students firstly removing their footwear (so as not to damage the semi-sprung floor). After entering the Create Space, students would typically speak to others in the room while the physical movement specialists would set up their music player and begin to stretch. These dynamics created a mixture of curiosity plus excitement amongst those in the space. Following an introduction of the ABI facilitators by the module leader and the former speaking a little to their work, students were informed that there were two tasks that they would undertake although not, in any detail.

The first task placed all students in a circle in which they would become “walkers” and “callers”. “Walkers” would traverse the open space in the centre of the circle and approach their selected “caller”. This “caller” would then have to call out the walking person’s name or shout “help” if they were unsure, in which instance, the “walker” would then say their name and stand back in the circle next to the “caller”. If they knew their name, then the “caller” would become the “walker” and continue the exercise by repeating this with another person. The session facilitators would play loud, upbeat dance music when the students engaged with the exercises and also encouraged the participants to increase their speed following the growing familiarity with the activity. This ultimately resulted in a frenzy of inner circle activity (see below images).

INSERT IMAGE 4739 next to 4831

The learning of this first exercise was to go beyond the intrigue of the students and to initiate an environment where both TPS and confidence could emerge.

The facilitators emphasised “being present” as typically, students would initially appear to feel embarrassed with the exercise itself or later, upon not knowing someone’s name. The session was the third time that many of the students had met ever met each other and that, plus the novel exercise, may account for these feelings. With the encouragement to “be present” and to not speak to any person that stood next to the students in the circle as they awaited a “walker”, the facilitator would ask for everyone to spend a few seconds focussing in on whom they were going to run up to. This appeared to generate a sense of purpose and a focus that enabled them to transcend any additional talking and to fully engage with the exercise with both body and mind.

The second exercise involved “flying”. Here, students stood at the centre of The Create Space and formed a horseshoe shaped curve (see the below images). One participant at a time was asked to run-up and dive into this U-curve only to be caught and lifted by their team members. This task had increased vulnerability of a physical nature and this is where the KE, that is, the simultaneous exertion of both body and mind appeared to be heightened. The learning objective of this particular ABI was to investigate the degree of TPS that had been generated via the series of physical movement exercises thus, examining the levels of developed collective trust, confidence and their relationship with KE.

Insert Image 4819 here

Both researchers were present in the session and like the student observers, extensive field notes (Burgess, 1984) were taken both during the ABI and in the following period (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982). The open space of the room enabled all participants to observe other partnerships and to learn from each other’s experience of the exercises. Following the

completion of the “flying” exercise, the buzz in the room was palpable and students were invited to sit on the floor in a circle with the module leader and ABI facilitators for all to engage in collective reflection. This was initiated by a series of questions that centred around; their overall experience of the session; their feelings at the end of session compared to its start/the beginning of the module; their learning about coaching and team leadership in ambiguous, unknown and vulnerable environments; what enabled this learning to happen; felt TPS; plus, their thoughts on the usefulness of such an ABI for university education and professional practice.

In addition to this post-ABI reflective process, on both occasions, students were invited to share their more in-depth reflections of their ABI experiences with an independent researcher. The objective nature of the researcher was important given that the students at that time faced future summative assessments. Forty-eight students took the opportunity and these interview discussions were digitally recorded and transcribed.

Process of Learning: Participants’ Experience of Physical Movement

Based on the interviews with the independent researcher, the students’ comments enthusiastically encapsulated the new educational experience that was fostered through their perceptions of this fresh, Arts-based approach to learning. This was built upon the specific environmental conditions (OSL) and the creative engagement with the tasks that fostered trust and stronger team dynamics, as part of the learning experience,

Through the open space it was a totally different setting than what could have been established in a classroom setting. (Ralph)

People lost their inhibitions, especially when the tutor turned the music up. Within five minutes the room went crazy and people started not thinking about their self- image

and think more about involvement. They were literally so involved in the activity that it didn't matter what was going on outside. (Jade)

A sense of openness also appeared to become engendered as a result of the environmental characteristics,

In this instance you don't have this wall in front of people. When you work in groups with other people you have some kind of wall or ice. You just talk about the work. But in this module/session you're more willing to talk about different things. The ice breaks. (Jean)

The environment had an influence on us to do it (getting to know each other). But there was an emphasis on community and oneness and cohesion and collaboration. (Georgette)

Here, the enthusiasm and support of the facilitators was also seen as conducive to the ABI,

They [facilitators] were very enthusiastic, which they needed to be, and they were very confident, which they also needed to be, because if they weren't, then we would have all been freaked out because we've never done this before. And the fact that they trusted each other was showing that it was something we could do. They couldn't always know if you were capable, because they don't know if you're strong and they don't know if you're flexible but the fact is that they didn't show any worry towards that. Even the fact that there were no mats on the floor made me feel like it's fine because if it wasn't going to be fine then they would have taken precautions or they would have been more precise with the pairings. (Rhona)

Moreover, students remarked how this creative, physical session enabled deeper learning about the significance of inter-personal trust and also how this engendered feelings of mutual respect,

The whole theme of trust was quite a big thing that I hadn't learnt so much in other modules, because you do so much group work in other modules but it is more of an academic thing rather than physical movement and trusting in that way. You have to trust those you are working with, but there needs to be mutual respect, otherwise there's not much point in doing things. (Nadine)

I've done a lot of group-work at the Business School but this was definitely the most unique kind of teamwork. If you're not all on the same level things will go wrong. Bonding is so important because if you don't know the people, then you won't be able to play to their strengths, everything will crumble. (Susan)

The vulnerability of students also seemed to lessen as a result of the KE,

That physical interaction was what created the bond ... mixed-gender physical interaction, so being able to get over that and having other people see you in all states of vulnerability and making a joke out of it and taking it light-heartedly, that for me made all the difference. (Aaron)

It's showing your weak side to the people that you don't know much and trusting them that they will not take advantage of it. And I felt that happened... knowing that they will not laugh at me, not criticize me was probably what built the trust quicker... because they were in the same situation, they were showing me their weak side too. (Trisha)

It was a different kind of trust. This was a trust in a group environment. A kind of physical trust. A trust that you're not going to let the team down as opposed to an intimate, one-on-

one personal trust. A boundary has been broken, we have something to talk about.

(Katrina)

Additionally, the playful nature of the session appeared to engender TPS and although it is beyond the scope of our current chapter, given the methodological approach, learners reflected that this appeared to happen more quickly,

Trust was done through fun. In other situations trust takes longer to build. What you can learn from such activities is that working together but outside from the professional task can be beneficial to then approaching a professional task. (Katrina)

The nature of the trust was different. It is usually built over time but through the physical exercises it was built much quicker and you're in a situation where either you trust them or you don't trust them. If you don't trust them you don't do the exercises. So it's very black and white whereas outside you're more like in a grey area. (Ralph)

Your reliance on that person establishes that trust on a short time frame - I learnt that trust can be built in a matter of minutes as opposed to years or a long period of encounters. (Josh)

We developed a sense of belief that we can do it. We relied on each other a lot more. It seemed like a deeper connection because we actually had to trust the person. (Mike)

Students also remarked on the longevity of the trust that was developed in the session, as it was reinforced by the facilitators' positive attitude towards both the ABI and the students' ability to actively engage in it and learn from it,

The fact that the exercises were gradual made us trust each other more easily but the trust definitely stayed afterwards. You [the facilitators] made it so that we didn't have to make that decision consciously. We were not coerced into trusting each other, it sort of came

that way and that trust stayed because you [the facilitators] managed to make us do something more terrifying than flying. (André, referring to the “flipping” exercise that followed)

Additionally, students appreciated the gradual build-up of the Arts-based exercises, that was conducted in such a way so as to permit iterative learning and reflection (Senge, 1990). Many students remarked on this in the interviews and also in the session itself,

“There was the build-up of trust that the facilitator initiated. He was so supportive in what he was saying. He taught us everything step by step. He started with something that was not too much out of our comfort zone. The fact that we started by just shouting each other’s names and that’s all it was and it was a progressive build-up of trust, that helped”. (Jade)

With the name games at the beginning that it took a while to get people going, the personalities and the pro-activeness started showing and from about half way through everyone was in a similar frame of mind of reactivity and enthusiasm. (Katrina)

When we first walked into the room it was very quiet, we all just put our bags onto the side and sat in our presenting groups wondering what would happen. We were crazy by the end of the session. Everyone was communicating, smiling, clapping became a big thing towards the end because people were really cheering people up and shouting when they actually achieved it! (Grace)

The fact that we were taking it [the activities] in very small steps introduced the camaraderie element, the fun and games element, everyone was laughing, and when you take these baby steps as a team you feel that you can take the next step so it’s that gradual introduction. If we would have gone straight into lifting each other off the ground, it would have been difficult. But, after we did the lifting exercise, where we went into individual lifting stuff, that

was much easier, no one questioned it, even though we were doing harder and more challenging and more dangerous lifts, no one really questioned it as much because we'd already built up a team collective or team trust and as long as the person you were lifting was part of that team, you would trust them too. (Aaron)

Furthermore, students alluded to the lack of judgement given the opportunity to rehearse in the open space setting,

Because there was trial and error and you got another chance to do something, there was no judgement. (Heather)

As the physical movement exercises escalated, students experienced new learning insights that centred on learning as a collective. Indeed, the ABI deployed in this module seems to have highlighted the benefits of learning from others and about others as part of a wider whole. The emergent team-dynamics, as they evolved from the gradual build-up of the physical movement exercises, played a pivotal role here:

I find it really easy now [after the session] to discuss with people in my group. Much easier than in other groups. When we meet, it's just like a bunch of friends... I feel much more confident about doing the group project that we have in two weeks with them than I would with another group. Also, based on that, I feel that as a group we're much more confident about doing something creative and we feel like we're not going to be judged by doing this, because, we've done that before, because we know that we've done some pretty cool stuff, so, it's like "let's go"! Having done this we feel much closer as a group. (Henri)

Before the class there was no team dynamic because we were all there from different courses, difference walks of life, different backgrounds, different languages and no one

knew each other but after you've been so close and joined as a team in this immersive learning environment I feel like we became much closer. (Aaron)

The above student (Aaron) had the biggest physical stature of all participants and in the post-workshop observations, he was the first to answer the question of “what surprised you in the session?” with “that they were able to lift me ‘cos I’m so big”. The positive, generated team dynamic was clear for all to see and following genuine, non-threatening laughter from his peers, Aaron then confidently and swiftly followed that with “it was all about trust”. Others offered similar sentiments,

It's so difficult to explain... it's like people forgot who they were and where they were. I don't know what happened, it just did, it just evolved. After the session we were all gathered outside and we were all talking as if we were friends. We all knew each other's names and that's such a big thing. The big aspect is social inclusion. So we were all there to reach one solution and that was to get Aaron in the air. It happened, it was like magic. (Jade)

Ultimately, the KE that emanated from the physical performance exercises enhanced the students' sense of TPS during this innovative ABI within an OSL environment,

[Physical performance] helps you loosen up a bit... When there's physical activity it almost makes you feel like kids again, it makes you feel like it's playtime and it eliminates some kind of fear. The open space changes things too... it breaks down boundaries when you're sitting on the floor and sitting so close, it ties in with the whole child-like theme again, it makes you feel like you're back at school. That helps to relax you because it puts you in a familiar situation, it's far less formal. (Nadine)

Students remarked that the escalation of vulnerability that was built within and between the two exercises aided their understanding of others and that KE also resulted in quicker relationship formation,

Physical contact makes things happen more quickly... Being in a team slows down the process, it doesn't really allow for a quick reaction... The benefit of the physical contact was getting to know people more quickly. (Natalia)

The physical intimacy generally breaks down these barriers so much quicker than if we'd been in that room playing quizzes or theoretical games, I think this would have been much slower because there would have been that sense of competitiveness, whereas if you get physical with someone it definitely breaks down a barrier and I think that's what bonded us so quickly and it was just throwing us straight into the task, there was no hesitation. Not knowing what we were going to do added to it. There was no time to dwell or become conscious of what you're about to do - That made people go for it and break down barriers! (Heather)

The physical contact united all of the individual students at a team level,

They [the physical exercises] did help us to build the team dynamic that we have now as a class rather than what it was before... now we have definitely become just one class... we have unity. (André)

Acknowledging the importance of building team rapport amongst these students, it was highlighted that physical contact was central in forging such sentiments,

The physical exercises are like a language that everyone's speaking. (Ralph)

The physical contact does help with breaking boundaries, the trust, the closeness, you've got a rapport on a new level. Maybe now at the end of work you might hug because you've

got that experience. Whereas before the closest form of contact you'd have would be a handshake. (Katrina)

This is a different kind of connection, the physical connection, rather than just talking to each other. And I think it goes further rather than why we just don't do it in society that much, because things that we did in that session I haven't done with my very close friends, and so it does become quite an abnormal thing to do and that abnormality is what makes it stand out. (Calam)

The benefits of physical contact are such that it engenders TPS,

That physical element or that physical cohesion or bonding helped a lot in terms of reducing the time to become closer, whereas in a group project that I've done before it took a week or two before we even became acquainted with each other, consequently forgetting names, but the fact that we were forced into this task from day one, it was like "we haven't got time for the formalities so let's just get on with it". (Aaron)

The nature of the exercise definitely substituted for the time that it would have taken to trust these people. I would recommend it. It works as an ice-breaker and, whether consciously or subconsciously, you get to trust your team members a lot more. You tend to know them a lot more. It makes you feel like "ok this is someone that I know is going to catch me when I fall", both metaphorically and in real life. (Liam)

The Impact of ABI

In agreement with Edmondson (1999) and her later work with Mogelof (Edmondson and Mogelof, 2006), we acknowledge the lack of empirical research into the factors that promote TPS. Our findings challenge the conventional understanding that TPS is developed over prolonged periods of time through actively managed leadership structures and other

mechanisms (see Edmondson, 1999; Eggers, 2011). Instead, our empirical data illustrate how physical performance generates KE (the simultaneous exertion of both body and mind) that in turn, produces a climate of TPS that enhances the learning experience.

Amabile (1998) highlights the importance of providing an environment that is conducive to creative risk-taking. Our study extends this work to investigate the synergy between OSL contexts (Monk et al., 2011) and TPS. Within our entrepreneurial lab, the student lived experience denotes how, the collaborative learning experience was at once cognitive, affective, physical and inter-personal (Gardner, 1985; Seltzer and Bentley, 1999) and how it led to TPS. The power relations within the open space environment (Lambert, 2007) also enabled a more fluid form of knowledge generation and permitted the investigation of the role of physical performance in engendering TPS.

Edmondson (2004) and others (Tyler and Lind, 1992) have noted the importance of team leader behaviour in creating a climate of psychological safety. The approachable and inclusive relationships fostered between the facilitators (perceived here as those leading the learning process) and the students in this ABI add empirical evidence to support this claim in a HE context by demonstrating a relational and distributed leadership between facilitators and students such that all engaged in interacting with each other as learners. Notably, students favourably remarked on their inclusion with the facilitators and the importance of leader responses to events that influenced the team's perception of appropriate and safe behaviour. In terms of leader approachability, Rita commented that,

“If they (leaders) had been uptight, I’m sure no one would have been as loose as we were at the end of the session, so I think that because they were very loose and easy going and fun spirited that made a huge difference”. (Rita)

A further facet of leader behaviour is that of team inclusiveness and this was widely noted by the students,

“They (leaders) were showing that they were having fun with what they were doing and that translated into how we experienced it. And that it was ok if things were embarrassing. They were really engaging and included everyone. I liked that they didn’t stand on the side and giving instructions but they were part of the whole experience”. (Katrina)

“There was no judgement or air of authority by the leaders. They were almost part of a team. They were there supporting. Despite being the authority they were acting as part of the team as well.” (Heather)

Role modelling behaviours have also been shown by Edmondson (2004) to be an important facet of TPS generation. As captured by one student, the demonstration of apparent leader confidence led to a change in their behaviour/intra-psychic state,

“If they [the leaders] were not confident I don’t think I would have done it, because, you felt that you were in safe hands. If they [the leaders] were showing some concern, I think I would have been quite hesitant.” (Susan)

“They [leaders] were very enthusiastic, which they needed to be, and they were very confident, which they also needed to be, because if they weren’t, then we would have all been freaked out because we’ve never done this before. And the fact that they trusted each other was showing that it was something we could do. They couldn’t always know if you were capable, because they don’t know if you’re strong and they don’t know if you’re flexible but the fact that they didn’t show any worry towards that. Even the fact that there was no mats on the floor made me feel like it’s fine because if it wasn’t going to be fine then they would have taken precautions or they would have been more precise with the pairings... So the fact that

they didn't look into this things but let you go and give it a go made me feel kind of comfortable because, actually, despite the fact that I have reservations because of reality they are fine about this and they're not being over-protective of anyone.” (Rhona)

“You can take a few pointers from the way the guy was telling us to do the activities, making it engaging and fun, being accepting of it, being part of the group himself, he was a bit jokey and light-hearted, kind of a role model.” (Rita)

This evidence denotes the importance of the value that students placed on such facilitator attributes with the latter also demonstrating role-model behavioural traits that facilitated the active promotion and generation of TPS in what was a novel, complex and potentially ambiguity-filled educational context.

The pedagogical structuring of the ABI enabled the opportunity for learners to benefit from a “practice field” with the rehearsal space of the entrepreneurial lab permitting the opportunity for ‘practising’ (Antonacopoulou, and Sheaffer, 2014; Antonacopoulou, 2008b). Our empirical findings confirm that the nature of this iterative engagement with the creative task facilitated TPS through emerging team dynamics. Our study contributes to the study of ABI in HE by combining our investigation of both intra-psychic and inter-physical movement. Notably, we uncover how the combination of these elements generates KE - the simultaneous exertion of both body and mind – that in turn, is empirically shown to foster a climate of TPS that engendered safety in vulnerability (Antonacopoulou, 2014) in an OSL environment.

Lessons Learned

We understand that ABIs are not suitable to every academic context: Time constraints and limited resources, in combination with institutional pedagogic strategies and priorities, can generate barriers to this creative and ‘sensuous’ approach to learning. Similarly, this

unconventional yet more demanding type of learning may not be welcomed equally by all students. Yet, the physical, indeed more holistic engagement with the learning process can render the latter more independent and imaginative. As such, we believe ABIs are conducive to “sensuous” learning and we would like to share some takeaways – or lessons learned – that we hope will encourage educators to develop or adopt this approach.

- It is paramount that the educator espouses the instrumentality of ABIs in the learning process, and embraces such methods with fervour and enthusiasm. The teacher’s attitude can be infectious and has the potential of distilling more trust in the process, on the part of the students.
- Specifically for ABIs that are conducive to KE, open space venues are important. As such, these approaches are more likely to be adopted by institutions that welcome creative, experiential learning, and willing to invest on and promote such initiatives.
- Our experience delivering Arts-based, experiential learning courses for a number of years has been that these approaches are not for everyone and are better suited to elective, rather than compulsory modules. This is due to several reasons. Firstly, auditory learners who prefer more conventional teaching methods whereby the lecturer discusses a key topic and the student listens and takes notes, might not easily welcome this creative approach to learning. Secondly, smaller elective modules of around thirty students comprise enough participants to render the activities enjoyable and easy to engage in, while creating an infectious enthusiastic atmosphere. And thirdly, the open space needed for such ABIs to be effective might not be readily available for larger compulsory modules of over 100 students. In this respect, the students who elect to take such modules will be more attuned to such approaches. Still, constant encouragement of the students to see past the activity and embrace this experiential learning is key in the quest for knowledge. Fourthly, although it may not

always be the case, students that overtly illustrate instrumentality or preoccupations in following prescriptive, unambiguous rules so as to gain good grades, may not be as favourable to this style of learning. From our experience, certain students that appeared to be of this type have given the impression of transcending such habits and have remarked on the illuminating pedagogy as a key element in unlocking their wider desire to learn. Finally, the nature of the session with the option of participating as an observer does not preclude students with physical disabilities from being an integral part of the session. Observers bring an important, alternative cognitive perspective to those that engaged physically and are invited to bring their thoughts to the reflective part of the session.

Finally, we would like to encourage colleagues not to be discouraged by any initial hesitancy on the part of students. As is often the case with anything innovative and unknown, acceptance and adjustment take time, patience, and open-mindedness. Our experience has been that once the students clearly understand the rudiments of ABIs, they enjoy the learning process immensely. In fact, the energy and enthusiasm they put into these refreshing pedagogical approaches is testament to the fun they are having while learning. We have found that generating KE early on in respective modules/programmes is extremely valuable in eliciting buy-in and that this, in combination with constant encouragement, enthusiasm and faith in the process (on behalf of both the teacher and students) will be key. Ultimately, any potential initial setbacks provide an excellent opportunity for both teachers and learners to reflect critically on such pedagogic approaches.

In conclusion, then, writing this paper as both teachers and researchers of ABIs employed in the Business School, we are guided by the empirical findings related in this chapter to

call for a more holistic understanding of TPS via ABIs and therein, the vital role of KE. As evidence from this paper illustrates the benefits of such a pedagogic methodology in order to better understand team dynamics within a Business School context, this call creates a platform for future exploration. Firstly, from a teacher's perspective, we believe that there is scope for our community to use KE as a platform upon which to build a knowledge base in this area. Secondly, from a researcher's perspective, we see potential future research avenues that are borne out from this study. These could focus on the extended analysis of the use of physical activity in order to foster TPS. Given the design of our ABI, we would not currently suggest that the question of 'accelerating' the development of TPS can be investigated here compared with traditional mechanistic forms. A suggestion for future designs to capture this would include testing similar exercises with and without KE and looking for differences in change rates. Ultimately, we invite educators to embrace such ABIs in their curricula, in order to foster pedagogical environments conducive to 'sensuous learning'. This, we believe, is an end worth of its means.

Published in:

Sensuous Learning for Practical Judgment in Professional Practice, Volume 2:

***Arts-based Interventions* [ISBN: 9783319990484] / edited by Elena P. Antonacopoulou and Steven S. Taylor (Palgrave, 2019).**

References

- Adler, N.J. (2006). The arts and leadership: Now that we can do anything, what will we do? *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 5(4), 486-499.
- Amabile, T.M. (1998). How to kill creativity. *Harvard Business Review*, 76 (September-October), 77-87.
- Antonacopoulou, EP (2008b) On the Practise of Practice In-tensions and ex-tensions in the ongoing reconfiguration of practice. In Barry, D and Hansen, H (eds) *Handbook of New Approaches to Organization Studies*, London: Sage, pp. 112-131.
- Antonacopoulou, E.P. (2014). The experience of learning in space and time. *Prometheus*, 32(1), 83-91.
- Antonacopoulou, EP and Sheaffer, Z (2014) Learning in crisis: Rethinking the relationship between organizational learning and crisis management. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 23(1): 5–21.
- Baer, M., Frese, M. (2003). Innovation is not enough: Climates for initiative and psychological safety, process innovations, and firm performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(1), 45–68.
- Baker, D.F., Baker, S.J. (2012). To "catch the sparkling glow": A canvas for creativity in the management classroom. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(4), 704-721.
- Bales, R., Strodtbeck, F. (1951). Phases in-group problem solving. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 4(4), 485-495.

- Beghetto, R.A. (2010). Creativity in the classroom. In J.C. Kaufman R.J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Creativity* (pp. 447-465). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bhabha, H.K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bogdan, R.C., Biklen, S.K. (1982). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Bradley, B.H., Klotz, A.C., Postlethwaite, B.E., Hamdani, M.R., Brown, K.G. (2011). Reaping the benefits of task conflict in teams: The critical role of team psychological safety climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1), 151–158.
- Brown, S.P., Leigh, T.W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 81(4), 358–368.
- Burgess, R.G. (1984). *In the Field*. London: Routledge.
- Clark, A. (1997). *Being There: Putting Brain, body, and world together again*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Creed, D.W.E., Miles, R.E. (1995). Trust in organizations: A conceptual framework linking organizational forms, managerial philosophies, and the opportunity cost of controls. In R.M. Kramer T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers in theory and research* (pp. 16-38). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing
- Daniels, H. (Ed.) (2001). *Vygotsky and Pedagogy*. London and New York: Routledge.

- De Jong, B.A., Elfing, T. (2010). How does trust affect the performance of on-going work teams? The mediating role of reflexivity, monitoring, and effort. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3), 535-549.
- Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience and Education*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Edmondson, A.C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383.
- Edmondson, A.C. (2004). Psychological safety, trust, and learning in organizations: A group-level lens. In R.M. Kramer, K.S. Cook (Eds.) *Trust and distrust in organizations: dilemmas and approaches* (pp. 239-272). New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- Edmondson, A.C, Mogelof, J.P. (2006). Explaining psychological safety in innovation teams. In L. Thompson H. Choi (Eds.). *Creativity and innovation in organizational teams* (pp. 109-136). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Edmondson, A.C., Lei Z. (2014). Psychological safety: The history, renaissance, and future of an inter-personal construct. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(1), 23-43.
- Eggers, J.T. (2011). Psychological safety influences relationship behavior. *Corrections Today* 73, 60-61.
- Freire, P., Shor, I. (1987). *A Pedagogy of liberation: Dialogues on transforming education*. New York: Bergin and Garvey.
- Gardner, H. (1985). *Frames of Mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic.
- Garvin, D.A, Edmondson, A.C., Gino, F. (2008). Is yours a learning organization? *Harvard Business Review*, 86 (March), 109-116.

- Gibson, C.B., Gibbs, J.L. (2006). Unpacking the concept of virtuality: The effects of geographic dispersion, electronic dependence, dynamic structure, and national diversity on team innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(3), 451-495.
- Granovetter, M. (1985). Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3), 481-510.
- Hackman J.R. (1987). The design of work teams. In J.W. Lorsch (Ed.) *Handbook of Organizational Behaviour*, pp. 315-342. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Handy, C. (1995). Trust and the virtual organization. *Harvard Business Review* 73 (May-June), 107-120.
- Jackson, N., Oliver, M., Shaw M., Wisdom, J. (Eds.) (2006). *Developing creativity in Higher Education: The imaginative curriculum*. London: Routledge.
- Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagements and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lambert, C. (2007). Exploring new learning and teaching spaces. *Warwick Interactions Journal*, 30, 1-6.
- Lawler, E.E. (1992). *The ultimate advantage: Creating the high involvement organization*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- May, D.R., Gilson, R.L., Harter, L. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77(1), 11-37.

Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M. (1994), *Qualitative data analysis*, 2nd Ed., Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publishing.

Moingeon, B., Edmondson, A.C. (1998). Trust and organizational learning. In N. Lazaric and E. Lorenz (Eds.). *Trust, learning, and economic expectations*. London: Edward Elgar.

Monk, N., Chillington Rutter, C., Neelands, J., Heron, J. (2011). *Open space learning: A study in trans-disciplinary pedagogy*. London: Bloomsbury.

Mueller, F., Agamanolis, S., Picard, R. (2003). Exertion interfaces: Sports over a distance for social bonding and fun. *Proceedings of CHI 2003 conference on human factors in computing systems*, April 5-10, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida.

www.oxfordictionaries.com

Rocco, E. (1998). Trust breaks down in electronic context but can be repaired by some initial face-to-face contact. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems*, April 18-23, Los Angeles, CA.

Rousseau, D.M., Sitkin, S.B., Burt, R.S., Cramer C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 393-404.

Savin-Baden, M. (2008). *Learning spaces: Creating opportunities for knowledge creation in academic life*. Maidenhead and New York: McGraw Hill/Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Schein, E.H. (1996). Culture: The missing concept in organization studies, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(2), 229-240.

Schulte, M., Cohen, N.A., Klein, K.J. (2012), The co-evolution of network ties and perceptions of team psychological safety. *Organization Science*, 23(2), 564-581.

- Seltzer, K., and Bentley, T. (1999). *The creative age: Knowledge and skills for the New Economy*. London: DEMOS.
- Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Spreitzer, G.M., Noble, D.S., Mishra, A.K., Cooke, W.N. (1999). Predicting process improvement team performance in an automotive firm: Explicating the roles of trust and empowerment. In E. Mannix M. Neale M (Eds.). *Research on managing groups and teams* (pp.71-92). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Vol. 2.
- Stake, R. (2000). The case study method in social inquiry. In R. Gomm, M. Hammersley, and P. Foster (Eds.). *Case study method*. London: Sage Publishing.
- Starkey, K., Tempest, S. (2009). The winter of our discontent: The design challenge for business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(4), 576-586.
- Sternberg, R.J., Lubart, T.I. (1999). The concept of creativity: Prospects and paradigms. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.). *Handbook of creativity* (pp. 3-15). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, S., Ladkin, D. (2009). Understanding arts-based methods in managerial development. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(1), 55-69.
- Tjosvold, D. (1991). *An enduring competitive advantage*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Tyler, T.R., Lind, E.A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 115-191.

- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). The role of play in development. In *Mind in Society*. (Trans. M. Cole). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wells, G. (2008). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a socio-cultural practice and theory of education (Learning in doing: social, cognitive & computational perspectives)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- West, M.A. (1990). The social psychology of innovation in groups. In M.A. West J. L. Farr (Eds.) *Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies* (pp. 309-333). Chichester: Wiley.
- Whitebread, D., Pino Pasternak, D. (2010) Metacognition, self-regulation and meta-knowing. In K. Littleton, C. Wood, J. Kleine Staarman (Eds.) *International Handbook of Psychology in Education* (pp. 673-711). Bingley: Emerald.
- Zack, M.H., McKenney J.L. (1995). Social context and interactions in on-going computer-supported management groups. *Organization Science*, 6(4), 394-422.

Table One:

Principal Module Aims and Objectives

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• help students grasp abstract and complex ideas from a range of disciplines (= transdisciplinary), and to reflect in order to synthesize these (= interdisciplinary) into rounded intellectual and coaching responses |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• help students understand the symbiotic potential of traditionally distinct disciplines |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• engage students fully with “active” learning. It is faithful to the notion that participation and experiential learning foster “deep learning” |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• enhance and consolidate students’ academic and research abilities, while also stimulating team-work and collaboration, thus creating a pool of transferable skills that students can acquire and practise |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• stimulate collaboration amongst themselves and across various disciplines through group work and embodied learning in OSL environments |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• make connections between their own discipline/s and the object of study, and so devise original research questions and so devise original lines of enquiry and practice |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• make productive links between theoretical ideas and coaching practical applications |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• build an interdisciplinary appreciation of coaching and team leadership, both through content and also experience of different (= trans) disciplinary approaches to the subject |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• investigate in detail the means by which new ideas and techniques are formed, changed and developed – as seen through the lenses of different disciplines and by coaching practitioners |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• develop a wide transdisciplinary understanding of coaching and team leadership as (a) major cultural and social theme, text/s, object/s, idea/s |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• develop an awareness of how their knowledge and practical appreciation of coaching and team leadership can be made accessible to wider publics, especially the undergraduate population |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• explore the relationship between coaching and team leadership concepts/techniques, and implementation, especially with undergraduates |

Table Two:

| Outline of Styles of Coaching and Team Leadership Syllabus |
|---|
| <p>The module leader attends all of the sessions, to integrate and stimulate the interdisciplinary learning. The teaching and learning approach embodies an interdisciplinary emphasis, using IATL's OSL pedagogies balanced by methods, including case studies, with which students are more likely to be familiar.</p> <p>Indicative weekly topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Introduction to 'Styles of Coaching and Team Leadership' - Core and Critical Concepts2. Psychology of Leadership Profiles, Individuals and Group Dynamics3. Coaching and Team Leadership in Physical Movement4. Coaching and Team Leadership in the Music5. Coaching and Team Leadership in Drama6. Team Presentation Rehearsals7. Team Presentations8. Coaching the Coach9. Coaching Performance through Open Space Learning10. Digital Coaching and Social Network. |