

## Editorial

Alan Fogel, Editor  
Rosen Method International Journal  
Rosen Method Bodywork Practitioner, PhD, LMT

Writing is hard work. Ask the authors whose articles appear in this issue of the Rosen Method International Journal. They each wrote multiple drafts, multiple revisions, all in response to the issues and questions that I posed to them as editor of the journal, and in response to independent reviewers' comments. To tell the truth, I am very demanding as an editor in terms of achieving clarity of expression, accuracy and consistency in the details, and relevance to the topic of the article and to Rosen Method.

Why this demanding process is important may not always be clear to authors. It is easy to become attached to one's ways of writing and talking, to one's ideas, and to one's way of doing things as a bodywork practitioner or movement teacher. There is nothing wrong with that: we are each individuals and the freedom of Rosen Method is the gift that keeps us involved and inventive.

Practicing live with a client or in a movement class, however, is NOT the same as writing about it. In the live situation, we get thousands of subtle cues from other people – though sound, vision, and touch – that help us adjust our actions to best effect in those situations. There is also an audience with whom we interact as a writer but we can't see, hear, or touch them. Writing is partly about inventing the audience, endeavoring to choose our words and sentences in a way that deeply communicates what we mean and why. When we write, we have only the words: no gestures, no touches, no sounds, no movements.

When authors receive critiques from the editor and reviewers on their writing, those critiques are in words without soothing looks or touches or sounds to moderate the emotional impact on the author. I have been writing professionally for 40 years and I almost always have the same reaction to reading reviews and critiques. If I think what I originally wrote is brilliant, my feelings are anger and indignation: Don't they get it? What's wrong with them? If I feel like the critiques are justified, I still can't stop myself

from feeling rejected and hurt. And then there is the impatience: I've got so many things to do, and now this? I just don't have the time to deal with re-writing, so forget it! If that's what they want, fine, but it's not what I want to be doing.

Usually, if I leave it all alone for a week or two and work with my emotions and where they came from, I can then read the critiques more objectively and get busy with the task of trying to make my words clearer to the reader. Re-writing is not only emotionally engaging, it is intellectually challenging. How do I find the right words? What is it that the reviewer does not understand? What resources do I have available to help me find the answers and fill in the blanks?

So, why is all this important? First, it gives us an opportunity to share our work with a wider audience and spread the word about Rosen Method. Second, when you work through all of the challenges and you see your article in print, there is a feeling of pride in a job well done. Even though you have integrated other people's suggestions, the article is still in your words but now you can see those words as others see them, which expands your own horizons as a practitioner and teacher, and makes you a better writer. Because the process of writing and being critiqued is emotionally challenging, like Rosen Method itself, it leads to greater awareness, confidence, and a better understanding of what is really important to you.

Yes, I and the reviewers are demanding, but we are also helpful and supportive. We will work with you from the time you have an idea for an article until it (hopefully) finally gets published. Several articles have been submitted to the journal that authors are still working on and thinking about. They have not yet been published. Maybe they will appear in the next issue or the one after that? I hope so. I guarantee that authors can count on my help but I also promise that as long as I am editor, readers can and should count on high quality and professionally valuable articles for this journal.

This is your journal. Please write for it and commit yourself to trusting that the writing process will, eventually, lead to new openings and amazing discoveries. Words have the power to change people and lives, the author's included, and can help to bring others to a greater understanding of our work.

#### *In this Issue of the RMIJ*

This issue contains two original articles, and one commentary on a previously published article with an accompanying reply from the author. The commentary is on the article by Mary Kay Wright, which appeared in the first issue of this journal. Marion Wehner, a Rosen Method Bodywork Intern from Toronto, Canada reflects from her own training experience on the changes proposed by the Rosen Institute for the governance and teaching of Rosen Method worldwide.

The first original article, by Maracie Wilson and Sylvia Nobleman of Napa Valley, California, is an investigation of the effects of an employee wellness program in which Rosen Method Bodywork was one of the components. The other is a case description by Teresa da Silva of Copenhagen, Denmark, of how Rosen Method Bodywork helped a client to manage her level of severe pain and lower her excessive dosage of pain medication for the first time in many years. In both of these articles, authors (Nobleman and da Silva) were the bodywork practitioners in the cases they described.

These two articles reflect a high level of what I call Process Inquiry. **Process Inquiry** is the examination of one's own, or someone else's, change process through time. Process Inquiry is itself a process of forming and re-forming impressions gleaned from repeated review of multiple sources of information. In the dialogue between editor and author, these authors were asked to re-think and revise their writing about the bodywork sessions on which they report in their articles. Each time they took the time to re-write, they were able to describe the sessions in more detail and with more relevance to the topic of their article. In Process Inquiry, this iteration, interpretation, and revision continue until a consistency begins to appear such that additional re-examination does not yield new interpretation. The technical term for this interpretive process is called the **constant comparative method** (Patton, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

In Process Inquiry, observers are deemed more **credible** if they have a prolonged engagement with the data and a record of persistent observation of the phenomenon under investigation (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). This takes a certain amount of discipline and perseverance to continue the interpretation and revision in light of possibly conflicting evidence to one's initial ideas, which may include a natural resistance to accept a changed view of oneself or one's ideas (Fogel, 2006; Schwandt, 1994).

Process Inquiry is not scientifically objective in the traditional sense since people are observing themselves and others with whom they have maintained an ongoing relationship. On the other hand, it is not entirely subjective. The re-interpretive process is one way in which the inquiry rises above simple first impressions and inherent observer biases. One way to make such work more objective is to use independent sources of information. In the Wilson and Nobleman article, this was done by doing pre- and post-assessments of a range of health-related indices as well as participant self-evaluations. In the da Silva article, the client kept a daily record of her perceived pain and medication dosage. The articles show how changes in these measures correspond to the changes observed during the Rosen treatments, making a strong case for supporting the effectiveness of Rosen Method.

Process Inquiry can never be conclusive since it is partly subjective and typically based in case reports. Scientific "proof" about Rosen Method must await the use of large-scale studies with control groups and standardized measures. Nevertheless, Process Inquiry plays a vital role in the early stages of building a scientific portfolio that supports the effectiveness of a treatment modality such as Rosen Method. Process Inquiry also has the great advantage of bringing to life what actually happens in Rosen sessions for the reader, and showing how small changes that occur within sessions can lead, over time, to bigger changes in a person's wellbeing.

#### *Invitation to Write a Commentary about Any of the Articles in the RMIJ*

As in this issue, the RMIJ provides a section for commentaries on articles from previous issues. If you would like to comment on any article for the next issue of the RMIJ – to agree, disagree, or dis-

cuss – please submit to [editor@rosenjournal.org](mailto:editor@rosenjournal.org) by July 31, 2009. Commentaries should be in the form of a WORD document and no more than two pages in length. Please include your name and your level of certification within the Rosen community. As in the current issue, authors will be given an opportunity to reply to the commentaries.

*Invitation to Write an Article for the Next Issue of RMIJ*

Submissions for articles for the next issue of the journal are due no later than July 31, 2009. I encourage you to contact me soon if you have an idea for an article so that I can help you prepare it for submission.

*References*

- Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Fogel, A. (2006). Dynamic systems research on interindividual communication: The transformation of meaning making. *Journal of Developmental Processes*, 1, 7-30.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (second edition). Sage Publications.
- Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 118-137). London: Sage.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.