

Dance of Awareness™: Evolving a 'Free-Form' approach to exploring early developmental patterns in a group setting

Clare Osbond* and Tim Brown

Directors, Brighton School for Embodied Therapy, Brighton & Hove, UK

* Email: info@embodiedtherapy.org.uk

The Version of Record of this manuscript has been published in the Journal of Body, Movement and Dance in Psychotherapy Vol 10, 2015, and is available via the following link:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17432979.2015.1092474>

Abstract

This paper describes the development of the Dance of Awareness™ movement practice, including the evolution of a new variation known as Free/Form. We aim to demonstrate how this provides a meeting point for body psychotherapy (BP) and dance movement psychotherapy (DMP). We reflect on evidence gathered over many hours of practice which we hope may be of benefit to practitioners from both disciplines and encourage joint working.

Keywords: Dance movement psychotherapy; body psychotherapy; developmental movement patterns; character structure; authentic movement; five rhythms.

Introduction

The roots of Dance of Awareness™ (DoA) begin in the late 1990s when the authors were involved with Five Rhythms (Roth, 1999) - a dance practice which might be considered as therapeutic in intent. We were struck by the energetic trajectory of the 5R classes, often described as a 'Wave', and its possible correlation with concepts of energetic charge and discharge familiar from neo-Reichian body psychotherapy (Lowen, 1976). Further, we noted a similarity with the 'breath wave' identified by Painter (2002) linking the cycle of breath charge and discharge (and disruptions thereof) with early developmental history and resulting character style. Models of character style, structure or position continue to develop in psychoanalytic developmental psychology (Johnson, 1994), body psychotherapy (Totton & Edmonson 2009) and developmental trauma therapy (Heller & LaPierre, 2012).

It was a short conceptual leap for us to map character positions onto the Five Rhythms, and Dance of Awareness was born. We identified six movement phases - Sensing, Grounding, Expressing, Releasing, Connecting and Completing - which allowed for the exploration of character in its developmental sequence, in a music-led wave of energetic charge and discharge.

The essential components of DoA are shown in Table 1. Initially based on neo-Reichian character structure, it grew to integrate other influences which span BP and DMP, including psychoanalytic theory (e.g. Mahler, Pine & Bergman, 1975), developmental psychology (e.g. Stern, 1985), Gestalt (e.g. Kepner, 1987) and Authentic Movement (e.g. Adler, 2002), and emphasises an attitude of mindful presence as an important underpinning to body-centred work (e.g. Weiss, 2009). Table 1

illustrates how the DoA cycle provides a framework for the embodied exploration of developmental history. We describe the theory and practice of DoA fully in another paper (Osbond & Brown, 2012). The reader is referred to this paper for a literature review and detailed examples of how we work with the model in group settings.

DoA is presented as ‘...a group movement practice that aims to increase self-awareness and self-acceptance.’ (BSET, 2012). The programme has run since 2002 with over 1500 hours of weekly classes, day and weekend workshops and residential retreats. Clients are self-referred, mainly from Brighton and the south-east of England. Two trainings were run in 2013. We have a database of over 400 participants who have been willing to give email addresses – some hundreds more will have had at least some experience of the form. Events would start with an opening circle and finish with a closing circle, where participants had an opportunity for verbal sharing. Groups were often large (up to 40), open-access and not explicitly therapeutic in presentation. The format worked well as a non-clinical model for working in the community, but we noticed that in closing circles people rarely spoke about our meta-objective of re-experiencing and re-embodiment early developmental movement patterns. Perhaps this was not surprising, and might reflect unrealistic expectations on our part.

Development of Free/Form

It is through touch and movement that we first learn about our self and our relationship to others (Frank, 2001). We realised that there needed to be more of an emphasis on recovering this early non-verbal experience and expressing it through words. Thus we felt inspired to include a closing circle with conditions more conducive for participants to integrate material from the movement phase. Making meaning of these primal experiences accords with trauma research (van der Kolk, Bessel, McFarlane & Weisaeth, 1996) and sensorimotor methodologies (Levine & Frederick, 1997; Ogden, Minton & Pain, 2006; Rothschild, 2000), which emphasise the importance of integrating instinctual, emotional and cognitive ways of experiencing self. The DoA cycle was initially a music-led process. We further realised that whilst music can support group process, it can also distract participants from paying attention to what is happening in awareness. For the work to move closer toward a therapeutic model, we decided to work without music, with the intention of creating a more bounded, small group format for a conscious exploration of early movement patterns. We call this Free/Form.

Free/Form is a committed (‘closed’) eight week group with up to nine members and two facilitators (the current authors). To date, six such groups have been run. We assess prospective clients by interview, on the basis of group and/or movement experience, and their presenting self-understanding. Every week the same format provides a container that supports group safety over a two-hour session. In the opening circle there is a short introduction from the facilitators followed by an opportunity for checking-in. A movement phase takes place between the opening and closing circles using the DoA cycle as a reference framework for movement. The closing circle allows group members to reflect on their movement experience. There is an emphasis on integrating non-verbal experience back into words. This interplay between words and movement in group process draws on DMP practice elaborated by, among others, Chaiklin & Schmais (1986), Payne (1990) and Karkou (2006).

An important aspect of group process is to build up the group’s capacity for self-regulation and self-direction. At the beginning of the life of each Free/Form group, the facilitators determine the structure and length of the opening circle. As the group progresses, members are invited to take responsibility for the check-in part of the opening circle and hence how much time is left for the movement phase; the closing circle is of fixed duration, starting at the same time each session. In the early life of the

group, the movement phase is mostly guided by the facilitators. Simple experiential exercises encourage group cohesion to build alongside individual self-confidence and self-awareness. Towards its end, sessions become less structured and progressively member-led: we refer to this as moving in 'free-form', where movement becomes increasingly intuitive and improvisational.

Themes emerging from Free/Form

In reflecting on emerging themes from Free/Form we draw on: written feedback from participants which was collected by email at the end of each eight-week group; our own notes of participants' verbal and non-verbal contributions to each session (collated weekly); our subsequent reflections on the life of each group; and discussions with the supervisor who we chose to assist us with reflections on the group process and our personal and professional interaction. Quotes are not verbatim but are indicative of real responses. In referring to movement observation, we embrace perceiving not just with our eyes, but with our whole body. Inevitably our observations are subjective and formed through our experience of the other, with all our associated biases and preconceptions.

Interplay between Freedom and Form

A key question arising from our experience with DoA was the degree to which spontaneity and free expression is supported, or inhibited, by structure. We define 'structure' as elements of movement practice which can provide points of reference, familiarity, predictability and safety. One form of structure was provided by music. By eliminating this element in Free/Form, we were able to focus more clearly on other factors. Here we distinguish two kinds of structure: 'container' structure and 'process' structure.

'Outer' container structures are firm and non-negotiable. They include: the space itself; the DoA cycle; the eight-week commitment; the regular ritual format of each session; and the ground rules. The ground rules are agreed by all group members (examples – confidentiality, duty of care). Within the outer container, the group are encouraged to shape a more flexible and responsive 'inner' container. Included here are a set of group guidelines (examples – creating a sanctuary area, keeping the floorspace clear), which we initially introduce but can be discussed, negotiated or changed. We concluded that the structure provided by both elements offered a degree of safety which allowed participants to move quite quickly towards deep work, both in the material they shared verbally and in their movement interactions. 'Process' structures include invitations to work experimentally in dyads or small groups (with more or less guidance), and interventions by the facilitators in the dynamic group process. Experience with process structure was mixed, divided between occasional irritation: ('...I was really annoyed when you asked us to get into pairs as I was just getting into a deep connection with the ground...'), and appreciation: ('...I found the exercise witnessing my partner releasing surprisingly moving...'). There was also some inconsistency in apparent resistance or reluctance to engage in process structures at the time, whereas retrospective feedback on structure was often positive.

We felt that there was no optimal mix of structure and freedom. Some participants might be moved out of contact with their own process by structure, others might access new material in response to structure. Our challenge was to know when, or whether, to intervene. We questioned our facilitation style. We met before each session and discussed overall themes, and possible 'set piece' exercises which might assist their exploration. In the event, we would often modify or adjust our interventions according to the prevailing group dynamics. We also questioned (what we discovered to be) our

implicit assumption that free expression is somehow to be preferred over structured movement. Is the latter to be transcended in order to attain the former? In fact, the interplay between structure and freedom demonstrated how the two are not polarities but interdependent aspects of the same dance. The stronger the scaffolding and safety net, the more permission there is to improvise and take risks. For example a simple exercise in the Grounding phase might involve inviting two movers to make contact shoulder to shoulder, leaning in to each other in order to explore the experience of support from the ground, and from each other. Having been given permission to explore this particular structure, we would see movers return to it in subsequent sessions, as part of a movement repertoire that might not have developed unbidden.

Outside-in vs inside-out

We each have a familiar repertoire of movements (Hartley, 1989). From infancy, each participant has adapted to their environment in their own unique way, and so will naturally favour or have an affinity with some phases of the DoA cycle over others, matching individual character (Osbond & Brown, 2012). By applying the cycle in a structured way, we aim to influence movement quality and so shift energy levels and mood. From a DMP perspective, the concept of affecting one's emotional or psychological state by expanding movement repertoire is familiar ground (e.g. Chaiklin & Schmais, 1986). We experiment consciously with directing or re-patterning a movement expression to see what happens in the body-mind. Initially by engaging the conscious mind, unconscious material is awakened, expressing itself as it takes form. Alternatively, we can create the conditions that are conducive to following our natural movement impulses, letting the movement come from within. Here we are freely following our unconscious moment-by-moment experience of the inner feeling self. These are both ways of accessing unconscious experience and bringing it into conscious awareness – one can be seen as active, working outside-in, the other receptive, working inside-out. As movers, we may favour a more active, form-driven approach, or a receptive, freedom-based mode. As facilitators we aim to pulse between the two. We reflect form, we reflect freedom.

Applying the DoA framework

There is a natural sequence of perceptual and movement patterns that emerge during our early development. When disruptions occur in this sequence, certain capacities may not become fully embodied, which will later affect sensorimotor functioning (Hartley, 1989). Several researchers have correlated developmental non-verbal behaviour with psychological theory. Bainbridge Cohen (1993) describes how the development of basic movement patterns and corresponding perceptual relationships are the formative elements of learning and communication. Frank and La Barre (2010) identify six fundamental movements which hold psychological meaning and provide essential support in finding and creating 'self' and 'other'. Kestenberg's movement profiling is a psychoanalytic assessment tool for studying non-verbal behaviour by looking at the rhythms and shape forms of movement within a developmental framework (Kestenberg, Loman, Lewis & Sossin, 1999), and is influenced by Laban movement analysis (Laban, 1980).

Through the DoA cycle we are inviting the body to revisit these early developmental patterns. The phases of the cycle embody themes of human development from pre-birth through to around five years. These stages of development are mapped by DoA as successive and overlaying, moving through an energetic cycle of charge and discharge (see Table 1 for details of the cycle). As the group goes into process and movement unfolds, movers begin to report images or affects that seem to echo these stages of early development. Examples are given below. Nonetheless we have also observed

how certain qualities, gestures and symbols are unique to each individual, no matter what is happening in the space.

Each week, following the opening circle, the **Sensing** phase allowed for arriving into the world, the space, the group, the body. Large cushions were available, and group members typically curled up or knelt ‘child-pose’ on their cushions. The atmosphere was often very still, ‘...like looking at a nursery of sleeping babies...’ commented one participant. The Sensing phase invites the creation of safety in the group, addressing the key issue of survival that is encountered at this stage in life.

In the second phase, **Grounding**, the developmental theme is about developing a sense of core self, which according to Stern (1985), is the primary task of the infant at this stage. As we explored finding support and opening to contact with the environment, there was often a profound reluctance to leave the inner world and make contact with the outer/other. ‘...I really didn’t want to leave the cushion. I was exhausted and not ready for contact...’ Equally noteworthy was the resistance to make the transition from horizontal grounding – lying, rolling and crawling – to vertical grounding – standing and taking first steps. Given our invitation for participants to trust their inner impulses, on occasion some never progressed beyond moving from a lying position throughout the movement phase.

Of all the phases, **Expressing** differed most markedly in its manifestation from its DoA precursor (where the musical emphasis tended to encourage assertive ‘outswing’ expression). In Free/Form the invitation to check in to ‘how I am right now’, and allow it to be expressed through movement and sound, evoked a much wider and richer response, particularly when validated through the ‘enthusiastic’ witnessing style. The exploration of the narcissistic toddler - the practicing phase identified by Mahler, Pine and Bergman (1975) - in all its moods marked a key energetic transition in the cycle, as charge began to build perceptibly.

The **Releasing** phase tended to be the most chaotic, as we explored the release of charge in a number of ways, using the breath wave to encourage free breathing. Releasing could range in form from fine trembling to loud catharsis, and mutual support in small groups was often effective. Of all the phases, this attracted the most comment about when or whether it was ‘safe’ to let go, with some participants veering towards overwhelm in such an energetically charged environment. (In later groups we introduced a ‘sanctuary’ area to allow those who might be feeling unsafe to manage their arousal, so providing an additional resource for self-regulation). A common theme of discussion in the circle was whether or how to express strong affect or ‘negative’ emotions in the group, as well as concern over how it may impact on other members. The psychodynamic trail leads back to a time when free expression may have been squashed or discouraged in the family system (Johnson, 1994), thus evoking the very issues that are addressed by this phase of the cycle. Additionally there was some resistance to the instructions or suggestions of facilitators. Given the masochistic themes of autonomy and parental control here, perhaps this was not surprising.

Connecting brought up relationship – to each other and to the group, and movers’ relative comfort with contact. This phase would tend to happen naturally towards the end of a free-form session, gradually and tentatively coming into relationship. Sensitivities around forms of contact were explored and shared. This would often feed into the final **Completing** phase where participants find a natural completion in space and time. This might take the form of a physically connected group sculpture, or individual outliers, with no position given preference.

As each group becomes increasingly resourced over the eight week period, we progress from structured sessions to free-form, where the group is invited to move intuitively and responsively, without input from the facilitators. When in free-form mode, the group would generally follow the early stages of the DoA cycle quite closely. However, the later phases of Expressing and Releasing, at the top of the 'wave' of energy, were embodied by some but not all members. We suggest that the permission and containment offered by the more structured sessions empowered participants to feel more able to 'express' or 'release' together within the group.

Assessing the DoA framework

It was only when in free-form mode - when control was given over to the group - that we were able properly to study and be curious about whether the DoA cycle helped or hindered the group's natural organicity, the ebb and flow of group process. We had intended the DoA cycle to be an important part of the Free/Form group scaffolding, partly because we expected the group to follow the typical charge and discharge waveform of a DoA session, and partly because we assumed the model's inherently developmental basis would lead movers instinctively to follow the natural sequence of phases we had identified. In practice, this was less clear-cut, not least because the DoA cycle is presented as being optional; each individual is free to use it or not, in a way that serves them best.

On balance, our impression is that the cycle gave movers, particularly those who were new to movement or body work, the confidence to trust in and follow their own process. However it seemed to take others away from the simplicity of letting the body lead them into a free movement exploration. Moreover, some reported that they tended overly to focus their attention on the cycle, suggesting the model was a distraction to them. Those who were already familiar with DoA and shared the common language, could usefully locate themselves within the cycle ('... there was a point in Connecting when I had a feeling of unity with the group...'). Those who were new to the model did not always do so ('...frankly I don't know where I was in your cycle, I just let it move organically...'). We reflected on how discussion of DoA themes in the opening circle would 'set the scene', helping participants to make links in subsequent sharing and movement explorations.

We remain uncertain whether the adoption of a group task based on a developmental progression is inherently self-organising and allows for evolution and expansion, or whether we are simply noticing with interest and curiosity participants' reaction to an artificially imposed structure (in other words, we might just as usefully be exploring reactions to dancing the tango). Our sense is that, even when participants were not consciously identifying with developmental issues, the implicit framework provided by the DoA structure spoke intuitively to an inner embodied knowing in individuals, which allowed them to dive quite deeply into process and to work in a spirit of mutual support. A number of participants mentioned how quickly they felt 'at home' in the group.

Four roles: mover, witness, supporter, responder

Whilst we explored the value of the DoA cycle as one framework for movers to locate themselves, we also discovered another. We encouraged movers to become aware of one of four roles they might be playing in any moment. We identify these as: Mover (inner focus, moving from inner impulse); Witness (giving open attention to a mover); Supporter (giving active support to a mover, including physical if appropriate); and Responder (allowing movement to be influenced by, or respond to, another mover).

Participants found this helpful in a number of ways. We worked in dyads or triads with one person moving and others witnessing, responding or supporting. In the free-form phases they were able to move in and out of these roles more consciously and notice habitual or preferred roles ('... I find myself easily drawn in to supporting other people...'; '...I notice I respond to others' movements rather than staying with my own...'). It also provided a vehicle for focussing attention – right now, am I moving, responding to another, witnessing or supporting someone? ('... I think I move quite quickly between roles when I'm dancing - moving, then responding to others, or witnessing, which I guess can also be a kind of supporting...').

The movement phase is designed to access formative material, so it is likely that habitual roles are adopted. For instance, as individuals take on the role of supporter or being supported, they may tend towards a familiar identity, such as a caretaking or dependency position. We bring awareness to familiar roles and encourage conscious adopting of unfamiliar roles.

Integration

The value of the closing circle was confirmed as we heard participants speak in depth and bring awareness to formative material. Some movers find it difficult to retrieve the words to describe our pre-verbal ways of organising experience. The theoretical model of Sensorimotor Psychotherapy (Ogden, Minton & Pain, 2006) affirms the significance we came to place on integrating movement and sensation with cognition. Sensorimotor Psychotherapy is a model predominantly used for working with emotional and developmental trauma. It emphasises working between three different levels of how experience is organised; cognitive, emotional and sensorimotor. These levels are interdependent, higher level cognitive processing reliant on emotional and sensorimotor functioning. Sensorimotor reactions - such as body-held tensions - sometimes remain unassimilated or unresolved in the body, held out of awareness. Hence our decision to move between a predominantly cognitive opening circle, into a movement phase which contacts emotional and sensorimotor levels, and ultimately back to a closing circle with the aim of organising experience by integrating all three levels.

Group facilitation style

As facilitators we need to feel 'comfortable and mindful' when bringing our subjectivity into the group (Grossmark, 2007). A running theme in our co-supervision sessions is our transparency, or how much we should disclose of our selves; both in movement and in words. We both participate in the opening circle check-in, and have tried to calibrate the degree of self-disclosure to allow for congruence whilst remaining safe containers for the group. As we co-facilitate we take it in turns to lead during the movement phase. When not leading, the other facilitator takes on the role of participant observer; joining in the group whilst at the same time staying aware of our own and the group's process. Members commented positively on our willingness to speak of our experience, and to flow between roles of facilitation and participation.

As co-facilitators we find ourselves adopting a decentralised position, discovering, as Yalom (1975) suggests, that both our self-disclosure and participation encourage greater openness between group members, aiding group autonomy and cohesiveness. For instance we would note how the physical or emotional states we brought to each group (e.g. feeling tired, charged-up, affected by a bereavement, scattered...), allied with our own psychological demons (e.g. trancing out, lack of presence, not feeling competent...) would, to the degree they were shared, provide a means of engagement with the group, and become agents for our own movement and transformation. 'A group leader is effective in

being engaged, moved and changed along with the group' (Grossmark, 2007). The forming and shaping of each group is an intersubjective experience; relationship develops not only between us and each member, but between members, and with the group as a whole. Projections and transferences develop accordingly. As facilitators we are part of this experience (our experiencing self) whilst at the same time maintaining a witnessing self which holds the boundary of the group experience.

Prejudices became evident. Initially we thought that an apparent lack of movement synchrony indicated a lack of group cohesion. Actually, each participant is doing what she or he needs to do. There may be times when all movers are moving on their own. Other times there is a mix; some people moving on their own with others interacting in pairs or moving in small groups. We had to let go of trying to make things happen in a certain way. One participant commented that when the group was in free-form, it gave her the freedom to 'stay on the edge'; from this place she was still able to feel included whilst regulating her contact.

The closing circle is intended for group members to share and reflect on their experience. There are of course many opportunities to intervene and provide interpretations. One theme in our supervision has been how much to intervene, since 'objective' interpretations do not sit easily with the subjectivity that we otherwise bring to the check-in and movement process. Drawing from Authentic Movement (Adler, 2002), we usually limit any verbal input to offering witnessing of an experience already described by a mover, or by helping an individual to focus attention on their movement experience. If a mover makes a general statement about their move, we may ask for clarification; '...can you remember the movement when you noticed/felt/imagined that?' We also encourage members to continue to respond to each other, as they have been doing in the movement phase, thereby maintaining a relational dynamic.

In our reflections outside the sessions, we consider transference questions. The journal we write after each session helps us to contain this, as well as enabling us to reflect on the contents of the sessions. It feels significant to hold the contents in this way; including our personal reflections; all that wasn't spoken about by members and all that wasn't referred to by us.

The DMP perspective

Free/Form developed from DoA, which had its origins in BP. When viewed through the lens of DMP, we can gain further insight into how, and why, this may be an effective therapeutic model. In Free/Form groups, experiences belonging to preverbal stages of development are re-enacted in the present. Telling one's story would not have been a possibility until the later development of the verbal self (Stern, 1985). We draw on DMP's approach to accessing and recovering non-integrated or undeveloped aspects of the non-verbal self through an exploration of movement, rhythm and play.

The co-facilitators alternate between leading and participating in the group process. The value of participating as observer is well known to dance movement psychotherapists, who understand the importance of forming body-oriented therapeutic relationships. In Free/Form such relationships were formed, sometimes between facilitator and group participant, and sometimes between participants. These interactions illustrate kinaesthetic empathy (Chaiklin & Schmais, 1986) and affect attunement (Stern, 1985), both of which are primarily non-verbal ways of communicating the feeling state between one person and another without the use of language. Kinaesthetic empathy may be regarded as being a non-verbal expression of what Yalom (1975) called 'universality', or a sharing of similar experience. Affect attunement describes mother-infant interactions which allow the dyad to regulate

their arousal levels reciprocally. The therapist (or responder) is letting the client (or mover) know that she is feeling something like what they are feeling, thereby communicating to them that they have been seen and accepted. We are witnessing a 'dance between', anchored in participants' infant movement experience and body history, and communicated through non-verbal dynamics (La Barre 2001). In recent years the crucial role of this primary inter-subjective relationship in self-regulation has been confirmed by psychoanalytic theory, (e.g. Beebe & Lachmann's (2002) dyadic bidirectional regulation) and neuroscience (e.g. Schore, 1994), significantly strengthening the disciplines of both DMP and BP.

Conclusions

The Dance of Awareness model provides a map for both body psychotherapists and dance movement psychotherapists to explore early developmental issues from an embodied perspective, drawing equally from DMP and BP. The evolution of the Free/Form group format allows participants to combine movement and reflection within a structure which permits the safe re-experiencing and integration of early somatic patterning. In describing the model, synergies and differences in emphasis emerge, reflecting our respective orientations, which have stimulated joint learning. From DMP we have drawn on experience with non-verbal forms of communication, rhythm and play, and awareness of the movement repertoire. From BP we apply ideas of character development and energetic charge. Shared underpinning concepts include the importance of mindfulness as a prerequisite for transformation, and the integration of embodied relationship on physical, emotional, psychological, and spiritual levels. We encourage other practitioners to experiment with the model, and hope that our reflections on experience to date will assist in this endeavour. In particular we would welcome research exploring the use of the DoA template in partnership between dance movement psychotherapists and body psychotherapists.

References

- Adler, J. (2002). *Offering from the conscious body: The discipline of Authentic Movement*. Rochester: Inner Traditions.
- Beebe, B. & Lachmann, F. (2002). *Infant research and adult treatment: co-constructing interactions*. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.
- BSET (2012). *Dance of Awareness*. Brighton School for Embodied Therapy. Accessed on 17/04/15 from www.embodiedtherapy.org.uk/danceofawareness.htm.
- Chaiklin, S. & Schmais, C. (1986). The Chace approach to dance therapy. In Lewis, P. (Ed.) *Theoretical approaches in Dance Therapy (Vol 1)*(pp. 17-36). Dubuque, USA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Bainbridge Cohen B. (1993). *Sensing, feeling and action: The experiential anatomy of Body-Mind Centering*. Northampton, MA: Contact Editions.
- Frank, R. (2001). *Body of awareness: A somatic and developmental approach to psychotherapy*. Cambridge MA: Gestalt Press.
- Frank, R. & La Barre, F. (2011). *The first year and the rest of your life: Movement, development and psychotherapeutic change*. New York: Routledge.
- Grossmark, R. (2007). The edge of chaos: Enactment, disruption, and emergence in group psychotherapy. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 17, (4): 479-499.
- Hartley, L. (1989). *Wisdom of the body moving*. Berkeley: North Atlantic Books.
- Heller, L. & La Pierre, A. (2012). *Healing developmental trauma: How early trauma affects self-regulation, self-image, and the capacity for relationship*. Berkeley: North Atlantic Books.
- Johnson, S. (1994). *Character styles*. New York: Norton.

- Karkou, V. (2006). Dance movement therapy (DMT). In Karkou, V. & Sanderson, P. (Eds.), *Arts therapies: A research-based map of the field* (pp. 233-270). London: Elsevier.
- Kepner, J. I. (1987). *Body Process: A Gestalt approach to working with the body in psychotherapy*. New York: Gestalt Institute of Cleveland Press.
- Kestenberg Amighi, J., Loman, S., Lewis, P., & Sossin, M. (1999). *The meaning of movement: Developmental and clinical perspectives of the Kestenberg Movement Profile*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Kurtz, R. (1990). *Body-centred psychotherapy – the Hakomi method*. Mendocino, California: LifeRhythm.
- Laban, R. (1980). *The mastery of movement*. Plymouth: MacDonald and Evans.
- La Barre, F. (2001). *On moving and being moved: Nonverbal behaviour in clinical practice*. Hillsdale, NJ: The Analytic Press.
- Levine, P. & Frederick A. (1997). *Waking the tiger: healing trauma*. Berkeley: North Atlantic Books.
- Lowen, A. (1976). *Bioenergetics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Mahler, M.S., Pine, F., & Bergman, A. (1975). *The psychological birth of the human infant: symbiosis and individuation*. London: Maresfield.
- Ogden, P, Minton, K & Pain, C. (2006). *Trauma and the body – a sensorimotor approach to psychotherapy*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Osbond, C, & Brown, T. (2012). *Dance of Awareness in theory and practice*. Brighton School for Embodied Therapy. Accessed on 05/04/15 from www.embodiedtherapy.org.uk/DOA_in_theory%20practice.pdf.
- Painter, J. (2002). *Stages in natural energy flow*. International Community of Psychocorporal Integration Trainings. Accessed on 05/04/15 from <http://icpit.org/charts-energetic-cycle/>
- Payne, H. (1990). *Creative movement & dance in groupwork*. Oxon: Winslow.
- Roth, G. (1999). *Sweat your prayers: Movement as spiritual practice*. Dublin: Newleaf.
- Rothschild, B. (2000). *The body remembers: The psychophysiology of trauma and trauma treatment*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Schore, A. (1994). *Affect regulation and the origin of self: the neurobiology of emotional development*. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.
- Stern, D. (1985). *The interpersonal world of the infant: a view from psychoanalysis and developmental psychology*. London: Karnac Books.
- Totton, N & Edmondson, E. (2009) (2nd ed). *Reichian growth work*. Ross-on-Wye: PCCS Books.
- Van der Kolk, B., McFarlane, A., & Weisaeth, L (Eds.) (1996). *Traumatic stress: the effects of overwhelming experience on mind, body, and society*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Weiss, H. (2009). The use of mindfulness in psychodynamic and body oriented psychotherapy. *Body, Movement and Dance in Psychotherapy* 4, (1) 5-16.
- Yalom, I.D. (1975). *Theory and practice of group psychotherapy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ziehl, S. (2003). Unpublished handouts, *Deep Bodywork Advanced Training*. London: Entelia Institute.

Table 1: Dance of Awareness summarised

DoA phase >	Sensing	Grounding	Expressing	Releasing	Connecting	Completing
Themes	I exist, safety, holding myself together.	I need, holding on, giving & receiving support.	I want, validation, being seen, holding myself up.	Freedom and control, holding myself in, letting go.	Invitation, desire, excitement, sexuality, holding others, my place in the group.	Individuation into my own dance.
Process	Arriving safely, coming into a body.	Attaching (being supported, giving weight) and Hatching (beginning separation & individuation).	Self-agency, autonomy, continuing separation & individuation. Being witnessed and encouraged.	Letting go, relaxing control, liberating new energy, being free in myself, moving to my own rhythm.	Open to connecting love & sexuality – connecting to others, and staying connected to my core.	Surrendering, unifying, realising the Self.
Music	Silence, or quiet, meditative, introspective.	Seamless, fluid, rooted, encouraging connection with the ground.	Assertive, expressive, defined beat. Rock, hip-hop.	Repetitive beats, trance, pulsing, drumming.	Celebratory, emotional, interactive. Disco, latin, traditional dance music, heartfelt songs.	Contemplative
Witnessing style	Holding, containing.	Supporting, affirming, mutual mirroring.	Enthusiastic validation, delight.	Permissive, encourage the let-go.	Interactive, relational.	Internal witnessing, hold in awareness.
Movement	Impulses in response to inner focus, interoceptive sensing. Working from core to extremities.	Yielding, pushing, reaching, grasping, pulling. Hips, legs & feet, taking steps. Gravity & physicality, contact & support, reaching out, exploring kinesphere.	Exploring space, ‘this is me’. Working with body image, self-esteem, witnessing, proximity & boundaries, leading & following, rhythm and repetition.	Loosening, softening, shaking, effortless movement. The body lets go of whatever energy may be ready to move. Working with freedom & choice, shame, control.	Dyads, triads, whole body, whole group. In & out of energetic orbit. Touch, contact, display. Celebration, play, sexuality, my place in the group/tribe / family.	Allow movements, gestures, shapes or sounds to be resolved.
Character position*	Schizoid / Fragmented / Boundary	Oral / Symbiotic	Psychopath / Narcissistic / Inflated / Control.	Masochist / Holding	Oedipal / Rigid / Thrusting – Crisis	Integrated
Reichian segments (Totton & Edmonson 2009)	Inner, core sensation. Eyes & ears, neck.	Mouth, throat, holding arms.	Chest and expressive upper body.	Head, shoulders, spine & pelvis, open mouth.	Pelvis-heart connection, fingertips, eye contact.	Returning to awareness of breath, body and awareness itself.
Breath Wave (Painter 2002)	Secure breath	Nurturing inbreath	Exploring outbreath	Free breath	Excited breath	Integrating breath
Stern (1985)	Emergent self	Core self	Self-with-another	Self with a self-regulating other	Intersubjective self	Narrative self
Mahler (1975)	Normal autistic, symbiotic	Separation, individuation	Practicing	Rapproachment		
Gestalt (Kepner 1987)	Sensation	Figure	Mobilisation	Action	Contact	Withdrawal
5 Rhythms (Roth 1999)	Body parts warmup	Flowing	Staccato	Chaos	Lyrical	Stillness

* Drawing on Lowen (1976), Johnson (1994), Kurtz (1990), Ziehl (2003), Totton & Edmonson (2009)