

to G [redacted] / Turin  
To Te [redacted]  
To Melanie E [redacted]  
To Morgan  
W [redacted]  
[redacted]

Sheelagh [redacted] asked me to do a session on her train-the-trainer course around Actio research.

I gave them Melanie's ~~Wright's~~ article on things Polish from the book of Birmingham papers.

I then told them I wanted to a bit of AR of my own with them.

My hypothesis: directionality of the voice in space strongly affects the reception of an oral story  
~ use or denial of eyecontact does too.

Data collection: I told Story 1 with the group in a tight ~~horseshoe~~ horseshoe- I was sitting on the floor facing out of the horse-shoe telling the story to a volunteer listener.

They wrote a reaction diary entry.

I told Story 2 standing, facing the horseshoe. I used fast moving eyecontact, gesture and occasional dramatisation, picking on one person as a person in the story.

They wrote a diary entry.

I told Story 3 They listened to this sitting in two rows, one behind the other, with eyes shut. I sat on a table behind them and tried to broadcast to all of them equally. I realised afterwards that this was a Wright telling, very visual and with the rather thin high voice that can go with this mode of internal awareness (Brocade story) (the voice aspect was not part of Andrew's telling style).

They wrote a diary entry.

I find the diary entries fascinating- tho I am not sure where I go next in the AR cycle.

I finished the session by asking them to formulate hypotheses they want to check out in their training rooms/classrooms

Experiential presentation of AR can be useful to some.

  
(RINVO)